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Abstract

This thesis examines the collection of Whistler etchings assembled by Howard Mansfield (1849-1938). The first section examines the beginnings of Mansfield’s collection considering the initial motivations that drove the collector to begin his collection. The motivations that sustained his collecting activities between 1876 and 1919 are considered. The context of the American Etching Revival is also considered. The second section is a comparison between Mansfield’s collecting activities and those of Whistler’s chief patron, Charles Lang Freer (1856-1919). Both collectors’ motivations are considered in relation to the purchase of Whistler’s first etching *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, (figure 2.1, K1). The third chapter of this thesis looks at Mansfield’s writings on Whistler, especially his catalogue raisonné of Whistler’s etchings published in 1909. This catalogue is compared to the better known and commonly used catalogue compiled by Edward G. Kennedy (1849-1932) and published in 1910. Chapter four looks at exhibitions of Whistler etching that Mansfield organised; these are examined in relation to Whistler’s own exhibition activities and techniques and reveal the ways in which Mansfield promoted Whistler’s etchings in America.

The overall aim of this thesis is to establish the significance of Howard Mansfield as a connoisseur in the context of contemporary public and private collections, thus contributing to print and collecting studies.
Introduction

James McNeill Whistler's American print collectors greatly influenced the way in which the US cultural landscape developed. This statement may seem ambitious but it can be proved quickly and concisely. Consider the case of Samuel P. Avery (1822-1904). This collector and dealer gifted 14,931 etchings, almost 300 of created by Whistler, to the New York Public Library at the beginning of the 20th century. With this gift he stipulated that the library establish a separate print room for the study and care of the works. In doing this Avery changed the shape of the library and altered its focus. Now the library is one of the key centres of print and fine art study in the US, and indeed the world. Another example of a Whistler collector impacting American culture can be found in Charles Lang Freer (1856-1919). Freer was a Detroit industrialist and millionaire who gifted his collection of Asian and American art to the US nation in 1919. This collection included over 700 impressions of Whistler etchings, the largest collection in the states at that time. Freer's gift included funds to build a museum to house this collection, thus establishing the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. The activities of both men have been the subject of much discussion and investigation, therefore it is not the subject of this thesis to analyse them; instead this thesis will examine the activities of a fellow collector and one of their contemporaries, Howard Mansfield (1849-1938).

---

3 Please see Appendix C: Howard Mansfield Biography.
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Mansfield was a New York lawyer and avid print connoisseur living and collecting during the period of the Etching Revival. The Etching Revival happened in the late 19th and early 20th century (c. 1870-1930). This period saw a boom in the practice of, interest in and writing about, the art of etching. The Revival began in France and spread quickly to Britain before making its way to America. The fact that Mansfield accumulated a large collection of Whistler etchings during this period is unsurprising as the artist was a leader of the Etching Revival and, as such, was much sought after by print lovers, collectors, connoisseurs and dealers alike.

Mansfield is an important figure to consider because of the size and quality of his Whistler etching collection. This collection grew to 420 impressions from 320 plates, making it the second largest contemporary Whistler etching collection in the US. The scale of Mansfield’s collection is testament to the need for an analysis into the means, motivations and methods that went into its accumulation. It is not only the scale of Mansfield’s collection that makes him an important connoisseur. Mansfield is also important because he was an early patron of Whistler’s. He began to accumulate Whistler’s etchings in 1876, relatively early in the context of the American Etching


While I have listed some of the many types of people that sought Whistler’s prints, I would like to emphasise the fact that it is possible to be a connoisseur and a collector, or a print lover and a dealer.

These numbers are taken from Frits Lugt: Les Marques de Collections de Dessins & d’Estampes, (Alan Wofsy Fine Arts, San Francisco, 1975, original Vereenigde Drukkerijen, Amsterdam, 1921), p.240. Henceforth referred to as Lugt. These calculations have been chosen over Mansfield’s own; see Mansfield: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings and Dry-Points of James McNeill Whistler, (The Caxton Club, 1909), which states that Mansfield’s collection consisted of 411 impressions from 371 plates. The decision to choose the Lugt calculation over the Mansfield one was made because the Lugt catalogue is the most recent in date.
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Revival and it was he who was responsible for introducing Freer to Whistler's etchings and other US based collectors.7

In addition to being an early admirer and collector of Whistler's prints Mansfield was also an interpreter and disseminator of Whistler's art through his publications and exhibition activities. The collector loaned to, curated, arranged and co-ordinated many important Whistler etching exhibitions in America. For example the collector was significantly involved with the World's Columbian Exposition held in Chicago in 1893 and the Copley Society memorial exhibition of Whistler's work held in Boston in 1904. These exhibitions and others in which Mansfield was involved saw him networking with other collectors and dealers. He brought many etchings from various collections together in order to secure the best possible show for Whistler. Mansfield also wrote about the artist and his prints, publishing articles in The Print-Collector's Quarterly8 and in 1909 the Caxton Club published, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings and Dry-Points of James Abbott McNeill Whistler, arranged and compiled by Mansfield; this was the third catalogue raisonné of Whistler's etchings. These publications and Mansfield's involvement with exhibiting Whistler's prints, prove him to be a key figure in the dissemination and interpretation of Whistler's graphic art in America.

Despite the rise in the study of patronage and collecting, very little has been written about Mansfield's Whistler collection or his collecting activities. One reason for this

7 Other American collectors that Mansfield introduced to collecting Whistler's etchings include Walter S. Carter (1824-1904). Carter began collecting Whistler's etchings in 1888 and continued until his death.

is the fact that the collection did not remain intact. The entire collection was sold through the firm of A. H. Hahlo & Co in 1919 to Harris G. Whittmore\(^9\) of Connecticut and has since dispersed. Due to the fragmented nature of Mansfield’s collection a physical analysis of it was impossible. However reconstructing Mansfield’s collection was possible. Using resources such as exhibition catalogues, catalogues raisonné, dealer stock books and museum records, Mansfield’s collection has been reconstructed. The result being Appendix A: DB1: Mansfield’s Collection, an Access database of Mansfield’s collection with details of state, inscriptions and sales.\(^{10}\) This database has enabled a retrospective examination and interpretation of Mansfield’s collection and has been used as the basis for the majority of the arguments throughout this thesis.

It should be noted that while no author has solely addressed Mansfield’s Whistler collection, the collector does feature in Whistler scholarship at significant yet under-emphasised moments. For example Mansfield is briefly mentioned by Katherine Lochnan and Linda Merrill\(^{11}\) and there is a reasonable amount of correspondence between Mansfield and Whistler available as part of the online edition of Whistler’s correspondence www.whistler.arts.gla.ac.uk.

Considering the scale and quality of Mansfield’s collection, and the fact that the collector was a keen exhibition organiser and Whistler scholar, it is difficult to understand why Mansfield’s collecting activities have not been studied in depth. Part


\(^{10}\) Please see Appendix B: Database Methodology and Resources, for a detailed explanation of how and why this database was created.

\(^{11}\) See Katherine Lochnan, The Etchings of James McNeill Whistler, pp. 15-16, 50, 269; and Linda Merrill, With Kindest Regards: The Correspondence of Charles Lang Freer and James McNeill Whistler 1899-1903, pp. 13, 73n, 103, 134.
of the answer to this lies in the fact that Mansfield's collection fragmented. Further explanation lies in the fact that print collectors and collections as a topic are usually neglected in favour of those who collect paintings. This bias is reflected in the literature on Freer. For example Thomas Lawton and Linda Merrill's *Freer: A Legacy of Art* is an excellent analysis of Freer's collecting motivations and methods, yet it does not analyse Freer's print collection to the same level as it does his collection of oils.

More general texts on collecting in America include L. B. Miller's *Patrons and Patriotism: The Encouragement of the Arts in the United States* and William Constable's *Art Collecting in the United States of America*, these texts deal with American collecting trends and they too place an emphasis on painting. Theoretical writings prove more useful, as rather than being object-based analyses they discuss collecting motivations and activities as impulses. For example Jean Baudrillard's essay "The System of Collecting," discusses, on a theoretical level, what distinguishes collecting from accumulation, an important qualification given the volume of Mansfield's collection. Walter Benjamin's "Edouard Fuchs, Collector and Historian" was also useful as the author analyses the multiplicity of the figure of the collector. Mieke Bal's essay "Telling Objects: A Narrative Perspective on Collecting," was also extremely useful as Bal's theories allowed one to consider collecting activity from a new and distinct angle.

---
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Lee Wiehl is the first, and so far, the only author to approach the subject of Whistler's American print patrons, in the exhibition catalogue *A Cultivated Taste: Whistler and American Print Collectors* published in 1983.16 Wiehl's text can be seen as an introduction to this topic as the author points out significant collectors and collections, such as George A. Lucas (1824-1909), S. P. Avery, Richard Canfield (1855-1914), Charles Lang Freer and Mansfield. However, because the catalogue is short, Wiehl is unable to consider these figures or their collections in any great depth. The author provides basic information, giving details of who the collectors were as well as when and how they began their collections. No in depth considerations or analysis is given. It is the purpose of this thesis to analyse Mansfield's activities further.

While many current academics neglect prints and the activity around prints from this period, it was not so during Mansfield's lifetime. Many authors commented on the role of collectors and connoisseurs. One of the most influential texts of the time was Philip Gilbert Hamerton's book *Etching and Etchers.*17 Three editions of Hamerton's text were published in the years 1868, 1876 and 1880. This text is a history of British and French etching, with chapters dedicated to significant etchers such as Whistler and Francis Seymour Haden (1818-1910). Authors Frank Weitenkampf18 and J. R. W. Hitchcock19 specifically assessed the American Etching Revival. While Weitenkampf and Hitchcock do note the influence of collectors their texts concentrate on American etchers and how they reacted to the climate of the American Etching Revival. Despite

---

this, these writings have been extremely useful both theoretically and practically as they provided a context in which to consider Mansfield.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. Each chapter has been designed to reveal and investigate different facets of Mansfield and his collection. The first chapter will examine the beginning of Mansfield's collection and the methods and motivations that contributed to its construction. The following chapter is a comparative analysis of Mansfield's collection and the etching collection of Charles Lang Freer. Each collector's motivations for acquiring the early work of the artist will be examined, assessing whether the collectors sacrificed personal taste for historical continuity. Chapter three will use a comparative method also; in this chapter Mansfield's catalogue raisonné of Whistler's etchings will be examined in comparison to E. G. Kennedy's catalogue of 1910, the aim being to establish the level of scholarly interest Mansfield had in Whistler's work. Finally chapter four will look at how Mansfield promoted Whistler's art to an American audience by publicly displaying his collection at specific exhibitions. The level of involvement that Mansfield had with these exhibitions in terms of works of art and display methods will be revealed and considered.

The overall aim of the thesis is to remove Mansfield from the footnotes of Whistler print scholarship and establish him as a significant and influential Whistler collector.
Chapter One: Mansfield’s Collection

This chapter will consider the reasons behind Mansfield acquiring a Whistler etching collection and the motivations and methods that sustained this collection over a 40-year period. The chapter is divided into three sections – the first of which is dedicated to the foundation of Mansfield’s etching collection, aiming to establish the collector’s initial motivations. The methods Mansfield used to continually renew, update and add to his collection will be outlined in the second section. The final section will consider whether Mansfield sacrificed personal taste for the goal of historical continuity.

Beginning the Collection: Motivations

Attention must be given to the beginning of a collection because initial motivations determine the shape a collection will take. The aim of this part of the chapter therefore is to establish when and where Mansfield first started to collect Whistler etchings.

Mansfield states on three occasions that his Whistler etching collection began in 1876. In his catalogue raisonné of Whistler’s etchings published in 1909, Mansfield writes:

The collection belonging to the compiler of this catalogue was begun in New York in 1876.¹

This date is confirmed in papers belonging to Mansfield at the New York Public Library,² and in 1920, when in correspondence with Joseph Pennell (1860-1926), Whistler’s co-biographer, Mansfield states this specific year once more.³

¹ Mansfield, Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings and Dry-Points of James McNeill Whistler, p. iv.
² Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
³ Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell: 16 August. 1920. [1013-3014], Pennell Collection, LoC.
With the year firmly established it is now important to consider 1876 in context. What was it about this year that brought Whistler prints to Mansfield's attention? Significant happenings such as the publication of a set of etchings, a particularly successful or notorious exhibition, or an event in Whistler's life that would serve to magnify the artist's fame; are all ways in which an artist could be brought to the attention of the art-buying public. At this point it is important to remember that Whistler expressed no desire or need to be appreciated by the American public. For example when Freer visited Whistler in 1890 the collector noted that the artist 'felt in no hurry to force himself on this side of the water.' Later, in a letter to the New York dealer Edward Guthrie Kennedy (1849-1932), Whistler reiterates this opinion:

I am more and more impressed, as our letter writing goes on, with the vast far offness of America! –

Money - is the only consideration - the only inducement to offer to the artist for sending his work so far away from Paris - and that they won't give enough of - You told me you wouldn't sell the etching "Cameo No 1" at the price I would have asked, because of the thinness of the drapery!!

This view of Whistler's was flexible. While the artist made the above fierce pronouncement in 1894, Linda Merrill credits the success of the earlier World's Columbian Exposition, held in 1893, with a change in his opinion. Whistler also showed a more positive attitude towards American audiences towards in 1888. Whistler had considered creating a series of etchings to be entitled "Whistler's

American Etchings. This series would be accompanied by a visit to America and a lecture tour. One could suppose that while Whistler expressed a low opinion of America and Americans at times, he was still willing to court their custom as he recognised the buying power of this economically booming nation. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Mansfield was an American collector beginning to collect the work of an artist who had little interest in 'send[ing] way out there things that go to continue one's history here.'

In 1876 Whistler's activities were based in Britain, as the artist was working at Frederick Leyland's (1832-1892) London house on the Peacock Room. Leyland had commissioned Whistler to make some alterations to his dining room; the artist exceeded his commission quite considerably. The following dispute between the Liverpool shipping magnate and the artist over the cost of the decoration did not begin until 1877, one year after Mansfield began his collection. Another significant event in Whistler's career comes in the form of the Ruskin libel trial. 1875 had seen Whistler exhibit Nocturne in Black and Gold: The Falling Rocket (YMSM 170) for the first time. The notorious controversies surrounding John Ruskin's (1819-1900) comments about this painting did not begin until 1877 when the work was exhibited at the Grosvenor gallery in London. The libel trial was held in the following year. Both of these events were well documented in the British and American press and both are too late in date to be considered as factors in bringing Whistler to Mansfield's attention.

---

7 Please see correspondence available at www.whistler.arts.ela.ac.uk, record numbers 01443, 01448, 01449, 01450, 01451, 00144, 00141 for a more detailed explanation of "Whistler's American Etchings".

8 For more information on these events please see Linda Merrill, A pot of paint: aesthetics on trial in Whistler v. Ruskin, (Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institute, Washington D. C., 1992) and by the same author, The Peacock Room: a cultural biography, (Yale University Press, London, 1998).

a celebrity, therefore it is reasonable to assume that Mansfield was not attracted to the artist because of his notoriety.

Another context to consider the year 1876 in is that of Whistler's etching career. Whistler had produced approximately 175 etchings by this year, and had produced two sets of etchings, the "French Set" (1858), and "Thames Set" (1871). Whistler's productivity facilitated the need for a catalogue raisonné, which was compiled by Ralph Thomas (1840/41-?) and published in 1874. Emma Chambers notes the way in which sets were a marketing tool employed by artists to capitalise on the Etching Revival's emphasis on creating a "complete" collection:

Print collecting is an activity which lends itself to a systematic completion where a collector can possess a complete set within his chosen categories, since theoretically a number of identical objects exist to fill the categories which define the collection. The possibility of limiting a print collection to certain completable sets, and the ability to extend these sets once complete by adding on new categories, provide it with a completely different dynamic from that of the collection of paintings.

Marketing on the part of the publisher, the galleries and the dealers involved in selling Whistler's sets would have brought the artist to the attention of many new collectors. By issuing defined sets Whistler, like many of his contemporaries, exploited the collector's desire to fulfil their 'chosen category.' However, Frank Weitenkampf in his book American Graphic Art, concluded that the impact of Whistler's early sets in America was minimal, Weitenkampf writes:

Whistler began his French set in 1858, but there was no immediate response here to the appeal that his works constituted. It remained for the next generation to appreciate fully such works as his Kitchen, Vielle aux Loques and Black Lion Wharf.

---

6 Whistler had privately published the "French Set" with Ellis and Green of Covent Garden issuing the "Thames Set."
7 Chambers, An Indolent and Iffurdering Art, p.67.
8 Weitenkampf, American Graphic Art, p.4.
Mansfield belongs to this 'next generation,' as he began his collecting activities twenty years after the "French Set" and half a decade after the publication of the "Thames Set." Therefore it is reasonable to assume that Mansfield, like many Americans, was not attracted to Whistler's graphic art through the promotion of these sets.  

However, in 1877 Whistler proposed the publication of a Venice set. Mansfield could have known about the proposed set through the dealer Samuel Putnam Avery as he was buying from him at the time. Avery is listed as one of the subscribers to this proposed set. It is unsurprising that Mansfield came into contact with Whistler through Avery. The dealer was a prominent figure in the nineteenth century art world; his diaries show many contacts with Whistler and prove that he was buying Whistler's etchings from as early as 1872. The dealer was also significantly involved in the publication of Ralph Thomas' catalogue raisonné and was responsible for promoting Whistler's etchings to many American patrons. Avery could have persuaded Mansfield to take an interest in Whistler at the time of this proposed Venice set. No proof of Mansfield's concern or involvement with this venture exists and there are questions concerning the amount of interest Mansfield would have had in the proposed activities of an etcher whom he had not yet began to collect; such as how much contact would Mansfield had with Whistler's etchings at this point.

12 While Weitenkampf's analysis of the impact of Whistler's first two sets in America is useful, it is important to remember that these sets were available in America. Whistler's mother, Anna Matilda Whistler (1804-1881) was still living in America at this time. Through her contacts Whistler did sell these sets in America.

13 Whistler did not make the trip to Venice until September 1879 when the Fine Art Society, London commissioned the artist to make a series of etchings. This trip resulted in the "Venice Sets" as well as a number of pastels. For more information on Whistler's time in Venice see Margaret T. MacDonald, *Palaces in the Night: Whistler in Venice* (Lund Humphries, Hampshire, 2001).

14 See: 2 December 1877, GUL MS Whistler NB 1/100, GUW 13071, accessed 2007-04-25.
The reasons for Mansfield beginning his collection in 1876 are revealed when the collection is considered in the context of the growing appreciation of modern prints happening in America at the time.\(^{15}\) During Whistler's lifetime there was what was termed then, and still is now, an Etching Revival. During this period there was a boom in the purchasing, selling and making of etchings, as well as a parallel boom in literature, as new periodicals and books on the subject were published. The American Etching Revival is understood by many authors as beginning with the establishment of the New York Etching Club in 1877,\(^ {16}\) later in date than its French counterpart, the Société des Aquafortistes that had been established in 1862 by the Paris based print publisher Alfred Cadart (1828-1875). While authors consider 1877 as the beginning of the American Etching Revival, signs of the Revival spreading from Europe to the US were shown much earlier than this. For example Cadart visited America in 1866, and on this visit he established an American branch of the Société des Aquafortistes as well as holding exhibitions at the Derby Gallery, No 625 Broadway, New York. J. R. W. Hitchcock, a contemporary commentator who published his work *Etching in America* in 1886, writes of Cadart's activities:

> This gave the general public and a majority of our artists their first opportunity to see a collection of modern painters' etchings.\(^ {17}\)

Rona Schneider, in her article, "The American Etching Revival: Its French Sources and Early Years," credits Cadart's visit as having a significant influence on Avery, who had established his own Art Rooms in New York in 1864. It was, in fact, in the Fifth Avenue shop of Samuel P. Avery that Mansfield bought his first Whistler

---

\(^{15}\) See Appendix D: Chronology.


\(^{17}\) Hitchcock, *Etching in America*, p.29.
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etching. This is unsurprising since it was Avery who first exhibited Whistler's etchings in America. In 1867 Avery showed five Thames views at the 43rd Annual Exhibition, at the National Academy of Design in New York. Whistler's graphic work was exhibited in America during the late 1860s and early 1870s however it was not until the 1880s that the artist's work was regularly seen in US galleries.

The first etching that Mansfield purchased was the fourth state of *The Pool* (figure 1.1, K43) from Avery's shop in New York. This etching was published as part of the "Thames Set." It was mentioned earlier that sets were used as a marketing tool by artists to exploit the etching revival's emphasis on the "complete." Considering Mansfield's entire collection, (looking at Appendix A: DB1: Mansfield's Collection), we can see that the collector owned a significant amount of etchings published as part of sets; examples exist from the "French Set," "Thames Set," and both "Venice Sets." At some point in his collecting career Mansfield purchased the third state of *The Pool;* it is mentioned in his catalogue raisonné of Whistler's etchings, and was loaned by Mansfield for exhibition at the Copley Society Whistler Memorial exhibition held in 1904 (see Appendix A, collection number K04303).

Two years after Cadart's visit, the dealer Frederick Keppel (1845-1912) opened his own print shop. Keppel provided sales figures for Hitchcock's book, *Etching in America.* These figures have been taken from the Hitchcock's text and put into graph format, see figure 1.2. Authors have paraphrased Keppel's sales figures - for example, Lee M. Weihl notes that in 1875 modern etchings comprised two percent of Keppel's sales, and by 1883 this percentage had risen to a massive seventy-three percent. This

---

18 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
19 Please see Appendix D: Chronology. This appendix notes Whistler's early American exhibitions that displayed his etchings.
summary is misleading as it simplifies the story that the numbers have to tell. Turning to figure 1.2, one can see that this graph clearly shows that the rise in sales is not as "meteoric" as identified by previous authors. One can see that sales increase steadily until 1877, and then there is a dip in the market before it increases more radically, to reach its height in 1883, after which the sales lower and level off. It will be shown that the sales reflect and are a reaction to events that shaped the American Etching Revival. For example the first increase peaks in the year 1877, significantly the year the New York Etching Club was established. The establishment of this club would have stimulated artists and collectors' interest in the medium. The second edition of Hamerton's *Etching and Etchers* was published in 1876 and would have affected the amount of attention modern etching was receiving. Both Schneider and Hitchcock see Hamerton's book as having an important impact. Hitchcock writes:

> I think it hardly possible to overestimate the effect of Hamerton's writings. [...] I deem it no exaggeration to say that the modern revival of etching has been due very largely to this book. Mr. Hamerton interested the public as well as artists, and he gave an unprecedented value to the work of some men who had received little recognition, like Mr. Haden and Mr. Whistler.[21]

Mansfield did own a copy of Hamerton’s text; in fact Mansfield owned the 1868, 1876 and 1880 editions of the Hamerton book. If Mansfield had bought the 1868 edition of Hamerton’s book, the same year it was first published, then he would have been aware of Whistler’s activities as early as then. Why it then took him until 1876, simultaneously the year Hamerton’s second edition was published, before he began his collection is a mystery. Funds availability and contact are all possible issues. Hamerton’s text will be discussed in more detail in chapter three.

---


[22] Folder 5, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
The largest percentage of sales is shown to occur in 1883. Stimulating interest in etching around this time was the surgeon and etcher, Francis Seymour Haden (1818-1910), who gave a lecture tour in America in 1882-1883. Haden was a leading Etching Revivalist and his theories on the medium were very influential. He was also Whistler’s brother-in-law and the “French Set” is dedicated to him, although they later became estranged from one another. Hitchcock writes of the influence of Haden’s tour:

That he did something toward placing painter-etching in its true light before our public there can be no doubt. On some points he was controverted, but the presence of an etcher strong enough to provoke lively discussion was thoroughly beneficial.\(^\text{23}\)

Another significant event around this time was the H. Wunderlich & Co. gallery hosting of Whistler’s *Arrangement in Yellow and White* exhibition of the second Venice set, in October 1883.\(^\text{24}\) This exhibition was very influential design wise (as will be discussed in chapter four) and, as such, received much attention from the public and press.

With this year-by-year breakdown of Keppel’s figures one can see that the sales react to particular events. The date that Mansfield first began collecting Whistler’s etchings corresponds with the first peak in Keppel’s sales and thus corresponds with the establishment of the New York Etching Club and the publication of the second edition of Hamerton’s influential *Etching and Etchers*. The reasons Mansfield had for beginning to collect Whistler’s etchings find their best explanation here, when seen in the context of the Etching Revival as it developed in America.

\(^\text{23}\) Hitchcock, *Etching in America*, p.38.

\(^\text{24}\) For more information on the significance of this exhibition see Chapter Four: Mansfield as Exhibitor.
Sustaining the Collection: Methods

It is important to consider the acquisition methods Mansfield used, as they are evidence of the relationship the collector had with Whistler. They also display the collectors networking activities and involvement with contemporary collectors and dealers.

Mansfield collected from print shops during the 1880s. By this time Herman Wunderlich (1839-1892) had established his New York based print firm H. Wunderlich & Co. Through Edward G. Kennedy, Whistler began dealings with the company in the early 1880s. The dealer's stock books show that Mansfield was buying from H. Wunderlich and Co. throughout the 1880s. For example on the 26th of March 1886, Mansfield purchased the etching *San Giorgio* (K201) from the dealers.

In the archives of New York Public Library are the Howard Mansfield papers; these papers contain letters, exhibition cards, catalogues and lists of etchings, all concerned with Mansfield's Whistler collection and collecting activities. This is significant as Mansfield also had a large Charles Meryon (1821-1868) and Japanese collection, yet the papers contain no information on these collections. Within these papers lies an index card catalogue of Mansfield's Whistler etching collection as sold to Harris G. Whittmore in 1919. Each card is dedicated to one etching; a total of 407 from 369

---

27 Mansfield's Meryon and Japanese collections did not disperse in the same way his Whistler collection did, which is perhaps the reason why there is no information about these collections at the New York Public Library. Mansfield's Meryon collection was sold to the Art Institute of Chicago and his collection of Japanese art was gifted to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
28 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

plates are catalogued. Mansfield is particular in the way that he catalogues the etchings; he gives his catalogue raisonné number and title, followed by the state and further information on inscriptions and provenance is, in the most part, stated.29 One entry is particularly revealing of Mansfield’s methods; the card entry for The Forge, (figure 1.3A and B, K68) reads:

M068 The Forge
First state.
Rare and wonderfully fine impression from the Theobald collection. Probably unique. Acquired from M. Knoedler & Co. in November 1906 in exchange for a fine impression of the third state from the MacGeorge collection, on which Whistler had written: Butterfly “imp.” Afterwards bought by Mrs. Parker of Detroit.30

This example is evidence that Mansfield exchanged etchings, as well as purchasing them. This was a common practice for print collectors and is one reason for the database, (Appendix A: DB1: Mansfield Collection) containing more examples of etchings than both Lugt and Mansfield suggest the collection was made up of.31 Further evidence that Mansfield would exchange etchings in an effort to continually renew and enhance his collection can be found throughout the H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books. For example on 8th April 1892 Mansfield exchanged an impression of Weary (figure 1.4, K92) that he had bought earlier in the year for £12.12, for an alternate impression of the same etching.32 This exchange is even more revealing than that of The Forge, because the example of Weary being exchanged shows that Mansfield exchanged impressions of the same print. The collector’s motivations for doing so must be that of upgrading his collection. The dealer did not request more

29 For more information on how this resource was used please see Appendix B: Database Methodology.
30 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
31 Lugt states that Mansfield’s collection consisted of 423 impressions from 370 plates. Mansfield states that Mansfield’s collection consisted of 411 impressions from 371 plates.
32 H. Wunderlich & Co, Stock book, April 8th 1892, transcribed for the WEP, GU by Dr. Grischka Petri.
money, thus it is safe to assume that they saw the impressions as equal, therefore Mansfield must have exchanged these etchings for more personal reasons; perhaps he preferred the paper, the tone of the ink or the state. The method of exchanging in order to upgrade and update implies that Mansfield was not acquiring etchings with the aim of having a “complete” collection; rather, the method implies that the collector was more interested in the merits of the individual impression. The motivation for exchanging, rather than expanding the collection is neatly explained by Russell K. Belk in chapter three of his book *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, Belk writes that:

> In the collecting form of consumption, acquisition is a key process. Someone who possesses a collection is not necessarily a collector unless they continue to acquire additional things for the collection. The collection usually grows as a result, but because some collectors concentrate on upgrading rather than expanding their collections, quantitative growth is not inevitable. Collecting differs from most other types of consumption because it involves forming what is seen to be a set of things – the collection. In order for these things to be perceived as comprising a set there must be boundaries distinguishing what is and is not appropriate for inclusion in the collection. These boundaries can be either conceptual [...] or perceptual [...]. On the principle of “no two alike,” despite sharing something in common with other objects in the collection, the items comprising the collection must not be identical [...].

Mansfield’s exchanges can and should be understood as manifestations of the conceptual and perceptual boundaries that he has constructed for his collection. However, as this thesis will argue, Mansfield is not the only person with an interest in his collecting activities. Belk’s theory has one flaw, it does not account for the external forces, peoples or markets that can and do affect the boundaries of Mansfield’s collection. This argument will be expanded upon throughout the thesis.

---

33 Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, p. 66

As well as exchanging impressions, Mansfield would also keep multiple impressions of the same etching. The following is an example of such from the correspondence, Mansfield writes to Whistler:

The Second impression of the Zaandam is so different from the first, and both are so interesting, that I have decided to keep both. 34

The impressions of Zaandam (figure 1.5A and B, K416) must have been of significant difference and artistic quality to merit Mansfield’s interest in both impressions, since he would have replaced the etching otherwise. Mansfield would also return etchings; again the H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books contain many instances of such practice. For example on the 24th of July 1894 Mansfield returned an impressions of San Giorgio (K201), The Rialto (K211) and Monitors (K318) to the dealers. 35 His reasons for doing so are unclear, however this action does point to Mansfield being particularly assiduous.

Returning to the example of The Forge, it is interesting to note that Mansfield mentions the provenance of the etching. Of the 407 impressions listed in this index, 55 give provenance details. The persons that Mansfield lists are notable figures of 19th century print collecting, such as Sir Francis Seymour Haden, H. S. Theobald (1847-1934), Samuel P. Avery, Ralph Thomas, Mortimer Menpes (1860-1938), Queen Victoria (1819-1901), William Drake (1817-1890), Clarence Buckingham (1855-1913) and Frederick Wedmore (1844-1921). One reason for detailing the provenance is to assert the pedigree of the impression. The collections of B. B.

34 Howard Mansfield to Whistler, 12 July 1890, Glasgow University Library, MS Whistler M261, GUW 03990, accessed 2006-02.
35 H. Wunderlich & Co. Stock book, 24th July 1892, transcribed for the WEP, GU by Dr. Grischka Petri.
MacGeorge (1845-1924) and Joshua H. Hutchinson (1829-1891), were of the highest standard and, by referencing these collections, Mansfield was aligning himself with their standards and was also acknowledging the effort and taste of the collector who had originally accumulated such a collection of quality. This is an important point, as Mansfield did not receive the acknowledgement he deserved. Moving away from Mansfield’s Whistler collection for one moment; I want to consider the example of the collection of J. M. W. Turner’s (1775-1851) Liber Studiorum, assembled by Mansfield between 1886 and 1898. This collection passed in its entirety from Mansfield to Samuel P. Avery. Avery’s generous gift to the NYPL saw them create a print study room, and the first exhibition arranged after the formation of the print department at the library took place from 14th May until 30th June 1900. It was Turner’s Liber Studiorum, the very collection that Mansfield had assembled, that was put on display. Neither Avery nor the Print department of the New York Public Library credited Mansfield for his efforts in the acquisition of this prized collection. The handbook issued to accompany the print collection at the library champions the Liber Studiorum, without mention of Mansfield:

There are few exceptions to the general character of Mr. Avery’s collection. The most remarkable for its extent and quality is Turner’s “Liber Studiorum.” [...] The present collection includes the seventy-one published engravings, in the first state, selected one by one during many years, and fifty-nine of the etchings (of several of the plates no etching was made), also eleven of the unpublished engravings and nine of the etchings, making 159 in all. This collection of prints is supplemented by photographs of fifty drawings for the published plates, and other drawings for the unpublished plates, and nine unengraved drawings. Thus through prints and photographs

36 Of the MacGeorge collection Mansfield noted, “This was probably the largest collection of Whistler etchings ever made in Great Britain, larger, I think, than the Haden collection and larger than the Hutchinson collection.” Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL
37 Of Hutchinson’s collection Mansfield wrote, “The collection of Joshua H. Hutchinson, of London, was one of the finest in Great Britain.” Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL
38 Howard Mansfield to John S. Billings, August 4 1909, Print Department, NYPL

the designs for the entire series are represented, this collection of Turner’s plates being known as the finest one in the country.²⁹

The false presentation of the genesis of the Turner prints angered Mansfield and in 1909 he wrote to John S. Billings, the director of the New York Public Library:

It is not a fact that these engravings were selected one by one during many years, or selected by Mr. Avery at all. This entire collection was formed by me between 1886 and 1898, [...]³⁰

initially Avery had intended to acknowledge Mansfield’s efforts, and wrote to Mansfield stating so;³¹ however, he later retracted this promise and wrote to Mansfield:

That ‘Handbook’ was a long time in preparation. At last it has been printed and the N. Y. P. L. is sending out copies: I have written to send one to you. You will note that when it came to the scratch I had to scratch out the admission that I had been so extravagant as to buy your Liber. You see that, buying my collection one by one, never paying any big lump sum, no one ever knew that I could or would make such a heavy investment – for the public. [...] I am not going to advertise that I have added to my indiscretion by buying from Ward nine of the etchings which you lack, and I won’t even tell you what they cost; now I believe we have all of the etchings but two, [...]³²

In his letter to the director of the library, Mansfield noted that Avery’s commitment to the pretence of collecting ‘one by one’ was not consistent with earlier statements made in the handbook.³³ Mansfield pointed out that the provenance of Avery’s Charles Jacque (1813-1894) etchings was not concealed, since the handbook states:

This absolutely unique collection was originally Jacque’s private one of four hundred and twenty subjects, [...] This collection was sold to an

---

³⁰ Howard Mansfield to John S. Billings, 4th August 1909, Print Department, NYPL.
³¹ Avery cited by Mansfield; Mansfield to Frank Weitenkampf, 6th January 1931, Print Department, NYPL.
³² Avery cited by Mansfield; Mansfield to Frank Weitenkampf, 6th January 1931, Print Department, NYPL.
³³ Howard Mansfield to John S. Billings, 4th August, 1909, Print Department, NYPL.
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English amateur in 1867. Later on it passed into the possession of Mr. Avery, [...]44

It is easily understood why Avery is inconsistent; the Jacque collection was formed
by Charles Jacque himself and passed through the mysterious ‘English amateur’ to
Avery, showing a clear and definite relationship to the artist, as it was the artist who
formed the collection. Mansfield’s collection did not have the same prestigious
heritage; the prints were not all specially selected according to the artist’s preference.

Part of Mansfield’s Whistler collection, however, was. Sixteen of the etchings sold in
1919 have dedications to Mansfield written by Whistler. These include The Little
Lagoon (K186), The Palaces (K187), The Traghetto, No. 2 (K191), The Two
Doorways (K193), The Beggars (K194), Nocturne: Furnace (K213), Cameo, No. 1
(K347), Steps, Amsterdam (K403), Nocturne: Dance-House (K408), and Zaandam
(K416).45 These dedications read ‘selected for Mansfield’ or ‘chosen for Mansfield.’
These inscriptions were cause enough for comment when Mansfield sold his
collection, one reviewer boasted of their importance:

Mr. Mansfield knew the artist intimately, took long journeys with him to his
sketching grounds and was assisted in making his selections of prints by
Whistler. Two wonderful impressions from the famous plates, “The
Palaces”, and the “Two Doorways” have the words ‘Selected for Mansfield’
written on the back by Whistler. “The Beggars,” another great etching, has
the same inscription by Whistler, who is known to have said it the finest
impression taken from that particular plate.46

This reviewer sees these inscriptions as evidence of the developing relationship
between Mansfield and Whistler. This is understandable as when selecting prints
specifically for Mansfield, Whistler was essentially affecting the shape of Mansfield’s

MCMI, p. 6.
45 See Appendix A: DB1: Mansfield Collection, Artist Inscriptions column, for details of what Whistler
specifically wrote and where.
46 “Mansfield Sells Whistlers,” in American Art News, New York City, 8th February 1919, Whistler
 Scrapbook II, FGA.
collection. The artist was not doing this for purely charitable reasons; his American
print collectors were responsible for representing the artist on their side of the
Atlantic, and by selecting and carefully controlling what these men bought, Whistler
was in effect retaining some sort of control over how he was represented in the United
States. However, in a letter to Joseph Pennell, Mansfield downplays the influence of
Whistler on his collection. He writes:

You continue to lay stress on your statement that Whistler helped me make
my collection of etchings. I have already told you that he did so to the extent
of allowing me to purchase directly on the four occasions when I was with
him, and I may add, once through Mr. Freer, impressions that were in his
portfolios. On these occasions he noted that they were selected for me – ![...]
But the fact remains that my collection was begun eight years before I met
Whistler in the summer of 1884, and then included many of the Venice
etchings, ordered through Wunderlich, when I saw them at this place in New
York for the first time. And I cannot recall one rare etching that ever came
to me directly from Whistler.

As well as defending his acquisition methods Mansfield is reflecting on his collection.
This reflection was made one year after he sold the collection, it gives precise dates
and places of significance. By reflecting on his collecting practice in this way
Mansfield is maintaining control over how it is perceived this has much in common
with the earlier case of the Turner’s Liber Studiorum.

This reflection has resonances with Mieke Bal’s narrative theory of collecting, in his
essay “Telling Objects: A Narrative Perspective on Collecting,” Bal writes:

One object must have been the first to be acquired, but then, when it was
first it was not being collected – merely purchased, given or found, and kept
because it was especially gratifying. In relation to the plot of collecting, the
initial event is arbitrary, contingent, accidental. What makes this beginning a
specifically arbitrary one is precisely that. Only retrospectively, through a

---

47 See ‘Chapter Four: Mansfield as Exhibitor’, for a full analysis of the ways in which Mansfield used
his collection to promote Whistler’s art.
48 Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell: 16 August 1920, [3013-3014], Pennell Collection, LoC.
narrative manipulation of the sequence of events, can the accidental acquisition of the first object become the beginning of a collection.\textsuperscript{59}

The fact that Mansfield is reflecting on his collection coupled with the collector's revealing identification of his collection as beginning 'eight years before I met Whistler in the summer of 1884,' illustrates Bal's argument that the beginning of a collection can only be recognised retrospectively as such, and not before.

The statement by Mansfield to Pennell also describes multiple acquisition methods Mansfield used in the accumulation of his collection. These methods were particular; he assessed impressions individually, continually renewing and enhancing the quality of his collection. Along with Whistler's aid it is hardly surprising that the collection became what the American Art News proclaimed, 'probably the finest of Whistler prints in existence.'\textsuperscript{50}

Understanding the Collection: Aims

The main aim of this section is to establish whether or not Mansfield preferred to create a complete collection over one based upon preferences and personal taste.

Mansfield's collection will be considered stylistically; this is important as Whistler's style and technique developed throughout his career, resulting in radically different works. For example, Thames Police (Figure 1.6, K44), an etching from the Thames set dating from 1859, is an etching in the Realist vein, showing a detailed Thames in all its industrial and urbanised glory. By Contrast The Turret Ships, (figure 1.7, K321)

\textsuperscript{59} Mieke Bal, "Telling Objects: A Narrative Perspective," in Cultures of Collecting, p. 101

\textsuperscript{50} "Mansfield Sells Whistlers," in American Art News, New York City, 8th February 1919, Whistler Scrapbook II, FGA.
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of 1887, is more delicate and sketchy rather than detailed, with minimal etched lines illustrating the ships in the distance. There is a definite and remarkable stylistic difference between the two. Obviously Whistler's style developed and changed over a period of time, therefore it is useful to analyse the time period during which Mansfield predominantly collected, as this would show whether Mansfield preferred a particular style within Whistler's oeuvre.

The graph shown in appendix E compares the etchings Mansfield owned from a certain year to the number of plates Whistler etched in the same year. The purpose of this graph is to determine if there was a predominant time period from which Mansfield preferred to collect etchings. If Mansfield had collected from one period, it is reasonable to assume that he would have collected a specific style of Whistler's. The graph clearly shows that Mansfield's collection parallels Whistler's productivity; where Whistler peaks, Mansfield's collection peaks also. The largest peak can be observed in 1887, Whistler's most productive year, in which he etched the Naval review series and other significant prints. The definite parallel between Whistler's output and Mansfield's collection is evidence that Mansfield's collection contains examples from all of Whistler's stylistic periods, and as such should be considered comprehensive and having historical continuity. Could this mean that Mansfield is sacrificing his preference for one style for the sake of creating a comprehensive collection? The answer in my opinion is no, as Mansfield acknowledges Whistler's stylistic differences in his catalogue raisonné. The collector discusses what he terms the 'varied phases' of Whistler's achievements. Mansfield defines eleven periods of Whistler's etching career:

The earliest French period lies within the two years 1857 and 1858, when the etchings produced were wrought in a vein never afterward pursued. The
next period, is marked by a great productivity and is noted for the wonderful Thames etchings and a series of splendid portraits in dry-point. Then ensues an interval of almost complete abandonment of etching, lasting for the rest of the decade. It is followed by what has come to be known as the Leyland period, from 1870 and 1879, chiefly a period of dry-points, and notable for a great renewal of activity and for variety in expression - with figures, interiors, landscapes, and Thames scenes among the subjects portrayed. The year 1879 stands alone, remarkable for a few noble etchings of bridges and shipping on the Thames. From 1879-1881 we have the Venice period, with its many and its marvellous etchings and dry-points, all executed in a style unheralded by previous work. The time 1881 to the autumn of 1887 may be claimed as distinctively an English period, embracing scenes in London and at Sandwich, and Closing with the record of the Jubilee Naval review. Immediately following, from the autumn of 1887 to 1895, is a continental period, within which the Belgian etchings, the Touraine etchings, and the latest Paris etchings were achieved. Even here, while in manner of treatment the Belgian and French etchings show much in common, the Dutch etchings, done in 1889, fairly from a class and claim a period by themselves. With the latest Paris etchings, which appear to have been made between 1891 and 1895, Whistler's work in etching virtually ceases. Only a few plates taken up after irregular intervals, were completed in remaining years.

Mansfield's categories are clear but subjective; one must remember that they are his constructions. Mansfield's method of periodising Whistler's output may be an effort to explain and, in a way, simplify Whistler's achievements for his reader. The sections Mansfield divides Whistler's oeuvre into are logical and follow a chronology that can easily be related to Whistler's career. Despite the success and usefulness of Mansfield's sections one must remember it is an imposed structure that separates certain periods of activity into different aesthetic slots. It does not account for the development of one style to another.

Mansfield owned etchings from all of the periods he defines. This reveals something of Mansfield's admiration for Whistler as an artist in general, as the collector was not motivated by one particular aesthetic. In an introduction to an exhibition catalogue of 1934 Mansfield writes of his attraction to Whistler's art:

---

51 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p.xliii.

[...] it may be fitting for a mere collector to tell of his own appreciation. That appreciation began more than half a century ago, when only the early French etchings and the Thames etchings, and a few portraits, had made their appearance. It grew through all the varied phases of subsequent achievement, and has in no way diminished since. The appeal was through a distinct personality, working without trace of imitation.

The personality that Mansfield is speaking of transcends all periods; for Mansfield’s collection to truly reflect his opinion of Whistler’s work it had to embrace all of Whistler’s ‘varied phases.’

The fact that Mansfield collected from all periods of Whistler’s etching career has been established. But did he collect all of the subjects the artist treated? Whistler’s subject matter varied but it is important to keep in mind the fact that, unlike his stylistic developments, Whistler would approach the same subject again and again throughout his career. Consider Nocturne: Shipping, (figure 1.8, K223) an example from the Venice period; it is stylistically very different from Battersea Reach, (figure 1.9, K90) yet the subject matter is the same; both are images of a harbour scene. Mansfield owned an impression of both of these etchings. Mansfield, in fact, owned a range of portraits, landscapes, seascapes, figures studies etc. In the same way that the acquired examples from all periods of Whistler’s career, he collected all subject matters.

While these two previous examples have pointed out ways in which Mansfield’s collection was comprehensive and representative, it should be mentioned that it expressed the collector’s preferences as well. Lee Wiehl believes that Mansfield had a

---

\(^{32}\) Mansfield, A Whistler Centenary, exca., (October 16\(^\text{th}\) to November 17\(^\text{th}\) 1934, M. Knoedler & Co.), p. 3.

\(^{33}\) See Margaret F. MacDonald, Whistler’s Graphic Art: Amsterdam, Liverpool, London, Venice, exca., p. 4.

‘predilection for oriental paper’\textsuperscript{54} and his collection is rich in impressions printed upon Japanese paper. For example, Mansfield’s impression of \textit{Black Lion Wharf} (K42, database number K04202) was printed upon thin Japanese paper. 27 of the etchings catalogued by Mansfield at the NYPL are listed as printed upon thin Japanese paper. Harriet K. Stratis writes about the papers that Whistler used for printing in her article, “Whistler's papers: Their Appearance, Selection, and Use.” Stratis identifies the thinnest Japanese paper that Whistler used specifically as the fragile \textit{gampi} paper. She writes:

\textit{Gampi} paper is the lightest in color and weight of all the Japanese papers used by the artist, although a light warm cast is always evident. Owing to the thinness of the sheets, however, the tone of any underlying support always affects its appearance. The images seem to float on these lustrous, transparent sheets, and the palest, most subtle transitions of color read beautifully against them.\textsuperscript{55}

Whistler used more than one type of Japanese paper, Stratis and Tedeschi identify at least ten Japanese papers with differing colours, thicknesses and surfaces. While the specific Japanese paper that Mansfield sought after cannot be determined, the fact that he pointed out the impressions printed on Japanese paper in his NYPL catalogue suggests that he had an interest in paper and was particularly enamoured with Japanese papers.

Conclusion

Mansfield began his collection early in the history of the American Etching Revival. His interest in Whistler was spurred by the beginnings of the Etching Revival and maintained by the collector’s deep appreciation for Whistler’s art. The following chapter will further analyse Mansfield’s motivations and methods, holding them up to

\textsuperscript{54} Wiehl, \textit{A Cultivated Taste: Whistler and American Print Collectors}, p.12.

more intense scrutiny and in doing so, will hopefully reveal more of the character of Mansfield's collection.
Chapter Two: Mansfield and Freer

Mansfield’s collection did not exist in a vacuum; the collector was part of a network of galleries, dealers and fellow connoisseurs. Chapter one showed ways in which the collector interacted with the contemporary dealers Samuel P. Avery and H. Wunderlich & Co., as well as touching upon Mansfield’s relationship with Whistler. This chapter will place Mansfield further in context by comparing his collection and collecting methods to those of Whistler’s chief patron, Charles Lang Freer.

There have been many significant American patrons of Whistler, though none more so than Freer, as it was to Freer that Whistler suggested creating ‘The’ collection of his art.¹ This collection would go on to be comprised of 762 impressions of etchings by Whistler, lacking only 39 of the 446 subjects catalogued by E. G. Kennedy.² Despite this, one New York reviewer commented that:

Mr. Freer’s collection, [...] may be somewhat more complete, but Mr. Mansfield’s is of extraordinary high level throughout, and many of his examples are of surpassing loveliness and rarity [...]³

This contemporary opinion shows that there is a precedent for comparing these two collectors, which has since been neglected by scholars. This opinion also gives an clear impression of the reputation Mansfield’s collection had during his lifetime and subsequently.

In order to compare these collectors and their collections successfully this chapter is divided into three parts; firstly a brief account of Freer and his Whistler collection will be given. An analysis of each collector's motivations will follow, using the etching *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, (figure 2.1, K1) as a case study. Finally the methods that each collector used will be discussed, considering how they differ and what this reveals about their aims.

Comparing Collectors: Charles Lang Freer

Charles Lang Freer was an obvious choice for comparison as his collection of Whistler's etchings is the only American collection to outnumber Mansfield's collection and rival it in quality. Furthermore, it was Mansfield who gave Freer his first encounter with Whistler's etchings after the collectors were introduced in 1887 in Frederick Keppel's New York print shop. Freer was familiar with Whistler's etchings at this point and in fact owned a copy of Frederick Wedmore's catalogue raisonné; however he had not been impressed. Freer asked to view Mansfield's collection in order to understand, 'why anyone in the world should make any fuss over Whistler as an artist.' After viewing Mansfield's collection of around three hundred impressions Freer's view altered; he exclaimed, 'I have no words to express my admiration for the genius of this man.' The following day Freer purchased his first Whistler etchings, the Second Venice Set, from Knoedler's in New York, a considerable expense since the entire Second Venice Set was made up of twenty-six etchings. This first purchase

---


5 Mansfield, “Charles Lang Freer,” p.16.

6 ibid, p.16.

7 ibid, p.16; A Set of Twenty-Six Etchings of Venice, 1886 (the second 'Venice set') K.196-216, FGA 1887.2 - PGA 1887.27, FGA.
points to a significant difference between these collectors; that of wealth, for Mansfield’s first purchase had been a modest single etching. If one recalls the earlier argument, based on Russell K. Belk’s theory that the beginning of a collection can only be discussed and identified as such retrospectively, the distinction between Freer and Mansfield’s first purchases is contrasted further. Freer does not fit with Belk’s theory, as he deliberately embarked on a collection of Whistler etchings, purchasing an entire set to begin with. Freer’s Whistler collecting narrative was a self-conscious one, from the very beginning.

Freer’s background was not particularly conducive to a career as a connoisseur. A product of the “Robber Baron” generation, Freer founded a successful railroad car company, making him a fortune and enabling him to take early retirement in 1900, at the age of 44. His retirement allowed him to devote his time entirely to the connoisseurship of the fine arts. Freer accumulated a large collection of American and Oriental art while he was an active collector. His death in 1919 saw his entire collection given to the American nation along with funds to build a gallery to house it, now the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. In leaving his collection to the nation Freer made the study of it in its entirety available to scholars and historians. The opposite is true of Mansfield’s collection. In fact, as stated in the introduction Freer’s collection has been the subject of many books and articles, while Mansfield’s collection has remained obscure.

Freer’s Whistler etching collection, despite its scale, is dwarfed by his collection of Whistler’s work in other media which, is overshadowed by his large Oriental

The literature reflects the physical make up of Freer's entire collecting interests, and because of such, gives Freer's etching collection little consideration. No analysis of the methods and motivations that went into Freer accumulating a Whistler etching collection exists. Authors tend to consider Freer's collection 'en masse,' relating one area of interest to the other quite productively as they reveal Freer's methods, motivations and what Curry describes as Freer's 'synthetic system of aesthetics.' However, authors such as Linda Merrill, Thomas Lawton and David Park Curry do not downplay the significance of Freer's print collecting activities. They all acknowledge its importance; for example Curry writes:

Freer's early interest in prints should not be overlooked. His commitment to print collecting – that continued until his death – casts light upon our understanding of his growth as a connoisseur and a collector not only of Western but of Eastern art. Curry considers Freer's print collecting methods as key to understanding the collector's future collecting practices, seeing Freer's tastes and methods of acquisition as carefully cultivated. Part of this careful cultivation saw Freer consult advisory literature such as Joseph Maberly's, The Print Collector: An Introduction to the Knowledge Necessary for Forming a Collection of Ancient Prints, which Merrill and Lawton believe 'made a lasting impression' on the collector. Although Maberly is dealing with ancient prints, the advice that he gives is logical and can be correlated with Freer's collecting methods. For example, Freer's entire collection began with prints, in line with Maberly's statement that:

All persons are pleased with prints, they are not altogether caviare to the multitude; less initiation is necessary for the appreciation of their excellences. To duly admire and enjoy a fine picture especially of any of the Italian schools, a regular professional education is almost essential. To enjoy

---

6 Freer's Whistler collection constitutes about one third of his American holdings, which make up close to one third of the entire collection, which is dominated by the Oriental collections.
10 David Park Curry, James McNeill Whister at the Freer Gallery of Art, p.13.
11 Ibid, p. 16.
a gallery of painting, or statuary, we must walk about it, and we must have
daylight, but a portfolio of prints may be laid on the table, and give variety
to the amusement of a winter’s night when variety of occupation is most in
requisition, and all the circle, as they sit, may participate in the enjoyment.  

Thus, according to Maberly, print collecting was perfect for the budding connoisseur
such as Freer. They were relatively cheap, especially in comparison to oils; they
required little space and provided great pleasure to the viewer. It is probable that these
same reasons led Mansfield to begin collecting prints. Maberly also recommended
that the collector limit his interests to a few artists, he advises:

“Before proceeding to make any purchases whatever, we would recommend
that a list be drawn up of a certain number of artists, someone or more of
whose works, but no others, should be admitted into the collection; and we
would recommend that this list contain such artists only as are of prominent
importance, taking care, however, to include such as mark areas in the art,
and such as to have invented or introduced new methods of working

Freer seems to have been influenced by Maberly’s writings, as it was an early practice
of his to limit the number of artists he collected. Lawton and Merrill illustrate this
eyearly practice with the example of Freer’s patronage of Carel Nicolaas Storm van
Gravesande (1841-1924). The early loyalty that Freer showed to Storm van
Gravesande was soon overshadowed by Freer’s admiration for Whistler, and the
collector donated his Storm van Gravesande’s prints to the Detroit Institute of Arts in
1905. By 1909 Freer’s print collecting activities were reduced to solely Whistler’s
work in etching and lithography. Mansfield also collected Whistler’s lithographic
work; his collection totalled a notable 158 impressions.

---

13 ibid, p. 117
14 See Lawton and Merrill, Freer: A Legacy of Art, p. 17
15 Freer acquired a complete collection of Whistler’s lithographs. It should be noted that Whistler’s
   lithographs were never as commercially successful as his etchings.
16 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL. See Appendix A: DB9: Mansfield Lithographs.
Freer was a collector who was wealthy, keen and informed. He developed a relationship with Whistler of which many collectors would have been envious. The methods and motivations of this well-established collector shall now be compared to those of Mansfield.

Comparing Collections: Coast Survey as Case Study

This section will consider the motivations that Mansfield and Freer had for purchasing the etching *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate* (figure 2.1). This print was the first etching Whistler ever made; created while the artist worked in the drawing division of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Office between 1854 and 1855. It will be argued that the collectors’ reasons for owning an impression of this etching have more to do with historical continuity and achieving a complete collection than an admiration of the print’s artistic quality. Working from the premise that this etching lacked the artistic merit of better known and applauded works, for example *Thames Police* (figure 1.6, K44), other possible motivations for its acquisition will hopefully be revealed. This argument will not state that the etching is completely devoid of artistic merit; however it will be argued that to see this etching as in anyway equal to Whistler’s later and more complex etchings would be to devalue those later works.

Mansfield writes a revealing comment about what he believes to be the correct criteria for purchasing prints; the collector states:

> With quality of impression [...] as the first criterion of a choice, the ultimate test in the selection of true examples of Whistler’s etched work should be artistic merit, without regard to rarity either of state or subject.17

---

This assertion makes clear that Mansfield believes 'artistic merit' should be of paramount importance to the collector. Why then did two impressions of *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate* find their way into his collection? In order to answer this question one needs to acknowledge that Mansfield's writings and Mansfield's collection do not necessarily correspond with one another.

In the above quote Mansfield states that collectors should choose impressions without 'regard to rarity either of state or subject.' Yet Mansfield's collection is rich in early impressions and rare subjects. In the Mansfield's papers at the New York Public Library the collector chooses to single out rare and early prints in a list he compiled entitled "ETCHINGS AND LITHOGRAPHS BY JAMES MCNEILL WHISTLER ONCE BELONGING TO HOWARD MANSFIELD OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE." The title is revealing in itself, and in this list the collector boasts of his collection's richness in early impressions. For example, he notes the inscription “First state. First proof” on *Nocturne: Salute* (figure 2.2, K226). Furthermore many of the impressions were inscribed with a number, for example *Archway, Brussels* (figure 2.3, K366), is inscribed “No. 8, First state” which means the impression was the eighth to be pulled of that first state, a notably early impression. The collector also specifically points out the rare impressions in his collection. He notes of *La Vieille aux Logues* (figure 2.4, K21), 'Only two impressions known to H.M.', and of *The Scotch Widow* (figure 2.5, K142) he says, 'Very fine and of great rarity.' These examples show that Mansfield's collection, while rich in examples of artistic excellence, is also rich in rare impressions and early states, which leaves one to wonder, did this happen by default? If we were to take Mansfield's own advice for collectors strictly then it

---

15 See column 'NYPL Folder 20' on Appendix A: ‘DB1: Mansfield Collection.’
16 Folder 20, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
would seem so. However, the one hundred and seventy one rare and early impressions listed, (almost forty percent of Mansfield's collection) contributes to too large a portion of the collection for this argument to stand up. These rare and early etchings are not part of Mansfield's collection by accident and they are not there by default of a diligent collecting method. These examples have proven that while Mansfield maintained that he collected without regard to rarity, his collection tells us otherwise, and while he maintained that he collected for 'artistic merit,' the acquisition of the Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate, tells a different story.

At the time this etching was drawn it was considered scrap because of Whistler's embellishments, (Whistler was instructed to draw the topographical scenes on the lower part of the plate; the artist added the group of drawings on the upper left and hooded figure on the upper right). The plate was sold to John Ross Key (1837-1920), Whistler's colleague at the Coast Survey Office, for the price of the copper. Key chose not to reuse the copper but to preserve Whistler's first experiments in etching. It is not surprising, considering Whistler's growth as an artist and the parallel growth in his celebrity, that Key had impressions of the plate pulled. It is also unsurprising that Key offered the plate to Freer for purchase in 1896. Freer did not purchase the etching at this time and the plate was sold first to the dealer Frederick Keppel, and then later to another dealer, George S. Hellman (1829-1903). Impressions of the plate were pulled between the Key sale until the plate was finally purchased by Freer in 1913. The impressions that Mansfield and Freer owned must have been printed

after the plate was given to Key and before 1913, because Whistler printed only two impressions. These impressions will be discussed in more detail shortly.

Perhaps Key’s artistic nature (Key became a landscape painter studying art in Munich and Paris and he went on to establish a studio in Boston where he was a successful artist) was the motivation for his preservation of the copper plate. At this time Whistler was an unknown artist, thus Key must have judged these sketches on their aesthetic quality without consideration of their relationship to an eminent artist. Mansfield and Freer became aware of Whistler at a much later date, (1876 and 1887 respectively). As admirers of his work in the medium of etching, their interest in impressions from this plate would not have been as simple as Key’s; their interest would have been more informed by Whistler’s reputation as an etcher and their interest in the artist.

Mansfield in 1909 and Kennedy in 1910 are the first catalogue raisonné compilers to include this etching, and both entitled the etching Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate (M1, K1). The title of this etching makes an important qualification. It emphasises the “Sketches” encouraging the viewer to concentrate on the peripheral sketches and not on the topographical drawing, making a distinction between artistic sketch and technical draughtsmanship. While both drawings are on the same piece of copper, have the same date and are both by the artist’s hand, the fact that Whistler chose the subject matter of the sketches is perhaps the reason for the emphasis to be given to them. The sketches that were originally peripheral to the drawing have taken centre stage. Although the topographical drawing can reveal Whistler’s technique, it cannot reveal anything of the artist’s choices on composition, subject matter, handling etc.
The sketches are more easily and definitely related to Whistler’s future etchings and artistic career as evidence of influences on the artist, or as precursors to his later achievements.

Nancy Dorfman Pressly in her article “Whistler in America: An Album of Early Drawings,” writes about an album made for Thomas Winans (1820-1878). This album is particularly significant because of the way the etchings within it have been preserved. The two impressions Whistler pulled from the *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate* had been cut and pasted into the album. The sketches have been carefully and deliberately arranged, and Pressly suggests the scrapbook may have been the work of the artist himself. The main point to note is that it is the sketches from the etching that have been preserved, with only one small part of the topographical drawing. Here the selection of the sketches and the discarding of the majority of the topographical drawing physically manifest the distinction and emphasis of Kennedy and Mansfield’s title.

The uncertain nature of the artistic quality of this etching has been discussed. Despite this both collectors owned multiple copies of the etching. Mansfield owned two impressions of this etching, one full impression and another fragment. Freer owned three impressions of this work; each in a different shade of ink and colour of paper (figures 2.6, 2.7, 2.8). Freer eventually purchased the copper plate in 1913. It is now vanished and kept in a leather case complete with embossed Whistler Butterfly (figures 2.9, 2.10). Both of these men had collections that are not only famed for

---

23 The fact that the copper plate for this etching was once regarded as scrap, yet now is displayed in its own leather case, complete with replicated Whistler Butterfly is evidence of the changing interest in this etching which begins with the collecting of it by Mansfield and his contemporaries.

their scale and comprehensiveness, but also for their quality. So where does Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate fit in their collecting patterns?

The objects and prints that Whistler produced at the Coast Survey Office are of interest from a historical and biographical point of view because they are directly related to the beginning of Whistler's practices in etching. Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate is referred to in most Whistler literature for biographical reasons to do with how, when and where Whistler was first introduced to the medium. The way in which this etching has been written about is in fact reflective of this. For example, Katherine Lochnan discusses this etching and its interesting history at the beginning of her book The Etchings of James McNeill Whistler. Lochnan calls the plate 'experimental' and notes that, 'this plate appears to have been undertaken as a technical experiment.' Pressly, in the article mentioned earlier, also sees this etching as part of Whistler's introduction to the medium. Using the same language as Lochnan, Pressly calls the Winan's Album impressions, 'Whistler's first experimental plate.' She concludes that:

The album is a major addition to early Whistler scholarship, revealing the inventiveness and exuberance of the artist's early style, the range of his experimentation in an illustrative genre, and the extent of his knowledge of European art.

Here Pressly is considering the Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate as part of Whistler's legacy and valued particularly as an early achievement that represents the beginning of Whistler's career in printmaking. The etching is seen as the beginning of something significant, but not something significant in itself. At most the work is

---

admired for the technical skill involved in the biting of the plate, as the Pennells' observe:

The drawing is schoolboy-like, though it shows certain observation, but the biting is remarkable. The little figures are bitten as well and in the same way as in *La Vieille aux Logues*, etched three or four years afterwards: to look at it then is to know that Whistler was a consummate etcher technically before he left the coast survey. There is no advance in the biting of the French series.\(^{27}\)

Pressly, Lochnan and the Pennell's, despite being separated by many years, all see this etching as significant because it represents the beginning of the artist's etching career. The Pennells relate an anecdote in their biography of Whistler's life that suggests how Whistler understood the place of this etching:

Not so many years ago, talking to him about this subject, we said that the Venetian plates seemed to be executed in an absolute new and original technique. It so happened that the *Adam and Eve, Old Chelsea*, and *The Traghetto* were, as they are now, hanging almost side by side on our walls. In a five minute demonstration he proved one to be but the outgrowth of the other, [had] he carried the demonstration further back, he could have proved that both, as we can now see, grew out of *The Coast Survey* plate, and that there was a natural and logical growth all the way through.\(^{28}\)

Whistler saw not difference but development in his etching style, and if Whistler included *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate*, as part of this development, then Freer and Mansfield, who knew Whistler personally, would have appreciated it for the same reason. Physical evidence that Whistler saw this etching as a part of his development can be found in Mansfield's collection. The card catalogue that Mansfield made when his collection of Whistler etchings was sold gives information on the two impressions of the etching. One of the impressions is particularly significant; Mansfield catalogues it as follows:

M001 Sketches on Coast Survey Plate

\(^{27}\) Pennell, *Life*, pp. 44-47.

\(^{28}\) Ibid, pp. 279-280.

An impression from the upper part of the plate signed in ink with Whistler’s butterfly by Whistler.\textsuperscript{29}

The description suggests that the top sketches have been printed and preserved, supporting the earlier argument that it is in these sketches that the collector or connoisseur’s interest lies. More importantly, Whistler has signed this etching and in doing so has given his approval of the etching. Mansfield himself noted that Whistler’s signature expressed the artist’s approval of the print upon which it was written, for example Mansfield wrote of the signature upon his impression of *Eagle Wharf* (K41, Appendix A number K04101) that ‘a signature standing alone means that Whistler approves [...]’\textsuperscript{30} The signature upon Mansfield fragment of the Coast Survey Plate is further evidence that Whistler recognised that this etching plays a role in the development and history of his work in the medium.

It has been established that the motivation for collecting *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate* goes beyond purely that of artistic merit. In collecting this etching Freer and Mansfield display an interest in the history and development of Whistler’s etching achievements. But why are these collectors interested in the history and development of Whistler’s etchings? One possible reason is that these collectors are aiming to create a complete collection. This was most definitely the case for Freer as he was in the process of creating ‘The’ collection of Whistler’s art and his collection is minus very few of the artist’s etchings. Aline Saarinen, in her article about Freer gives a useful, albeit subjective and slightly glamorised, comments on the scale of Freer’s patronage of Whistler:

> It is a world famous name, because it is attached [...] to a representation of James McNeill Whistler that is complete almost to the point of monopoly.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{29} Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

\textsuperscript{30} Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

Part of Freer’s “monopoly” of Whistler’s art included a complete collection of etchings. Mansfield’s motivations are not so easily understood. In his catalogue raisonné Mansfield writes a particularly revealing statement about his aims, when he says that his collection:

 [...] has not been formed with the purpose of comprising examples of all obtainable states, but such states have been sought as seemed to be of special artistic interest; nor has an attempt been made to add impressions from as many plates as possible, but the constant endeavour has been to secure fine impressions.  

Mansfield is maintaining that the quality and artistic merit of an impression is the primary reason for his collecting activities, dismissing the idea of collecting ‘as many plates as possible.’ Jean Baudrillard theorised that:

What makes a collection transcend mere accumulation is not only the fact of its being culturally complex, but the fact that it lacks something. By lacking impressions Mansfield’s collection reveals the discriminating taste of its collector, fulfilling Baudrillard’s condition for transcending ‘mere accumulation,’ but what of the condition of cultural complexity? This condition has a much larger explanation and, in a sense, the purpose of this entire thesis is to investigate and reveal the cultural complexities of Mansfield’s collection. This chapter and the preceding one have already shown a range of activities and instances involving Mansfield that point strongly towards his collection displaying a complexity in terms of motivation and accumulation. The following chapters will reveal and explain more cultural complexities contained with Mansfield’s collection and collecting activities.

---

32 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p. lv.
Mansfield makes another interesting statement when considering Whistler's destruction of plates and unsparing self-criticism. The collector comments that there is:

Such a consequent rarity of impressions from certain plates, that any attempt at a complete collection is foredoomed to failure. No such collection exists, and none can possibly be brought together; therefore one bane of collecting is, in this special field, happily removed.34

This statement suggests that Mansfield never aimed for a complete collection. He describes the impulse to create a complete collection as a 'bane', and in describing it as such suggests that aiming for a complete collection is a determining activity of a collector.

One need also consider whether or not a complete collection and a representative collection are different. In their aims they are remarkably similar: both attempt to consider the works of the artist on multiple levels - chronologically, stylistically, aesthetically and historically. Chapter one established the fact that Mansfield's collection was representative and as such can be understood as functioning in the same way a complete collection does, or rather, because the collection is vast and its range represents Whistler's oeuvre considerably, it is as near complete as any collection of the time was. At this point it is important to remember that no complete collection of Whistler's etchings existed in America at the time.

An analysis of the Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate has pointed out the way in which chronology and an interest in the artist's development can supersede the need to purchase only those etchings considered to be superb artistic examples. Mansfield and Freer, in their collecting of this etching, displayed an interest in the chronology

34 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p. ldxiv-lxv.
and art history of Whistler's etchings as well as an urge to create a complete and/or representative collection.

Comparing Collecting: Methods

This section will compare the acquisition methods of Freer and Mansfield. It will look at where they were buying Whistler's etchings from and their acquisition methods.

In Mansfield's catalogue raisonné he comments upon his own and Freer's acquisition methods. Of his methods he writes decisively:

[... ] all the prints having been brought together by the purchase of one at a time.  

Mansfield is not the only collector to maintain that he purchased 'one at a time'. It was shown in chapter one that Samuel P. Avery chose to maintain the façade of collecting, 'one by one,' rather than acknowledge that it was Mansfield who had assembled Turner's Liber Studiorum. In asserting that he collected 'one at a time' Mansfield implies that each etching has been contemplated individually. This method of acquisition can be related to methods discussed in chapter one, where it was shown that the collector would consider impressions individually before exchanging or retaining prints. With this in mind it is reasonable to assume that Mansfield purchased impressions 'one at a time,' but one should remember that this might have had as much to do with Mansfield's finances as it did with his aesthetic standards.

---

35 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p. Iv.
36 Howard Mansfield to Frank Weitzenkampf, January 6th, 1931, Print Department, NYPL.
37 See Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell: 16 August 1929, [3013-3014], Pennell Collection, LoC. In this letter Mansfield mentions that he sold his Whistler collection because his family simply could not afford not to.
Mansfield's description of his collecting methods comes after his description of the way in which Freer's collection was assembled; he describes one of Freer's methods as follows:

Through the addition of other collections, as well as separate acquisitions, the Freer Collection has been enlarged, [...] 38

This gives the impression that Freer consumed previous collections in their entirety. By placing the description of his own collecting methods after Freer's Mansfield encourages the reader to compare the methods. This comparison shows that the two collectors had very different methods and is evidence of two different agendas. Freer is shown as aiming for quantity while Mansfield shows himself as aiming for quality. Freer is not painted in as favourable a light as Mansfield, and is portrayed by Mansfield as a bulk buying machine, with less discrimination. However, one must be cautious. While Mansfield's own statements concerning his collection and collecting methods are valuable they cannot be considered to be completely objective. It has already been shown that Mansfield's opinions about his collection and what his actual collection reveals do not necessarily correspond.

If one considers this method of Freer's in light of the reputation of the collections he is "buying over" we gain a different view. Francis Seymour Haden's collection of Whistler's etchings passed through H. Wunderlich & Co. and then onto Freer. Haden, as mentioned in chapter one, was Whistler's brother-in-law, an esteemed etcher and etching revivalist. He became president of the Society of Painter Etchers and published *The Etched Work of Rembrandt* in 1879, as well as *The Royal Society of Painter-Etchers* in 1891. 39 In 1894 Haden was awarded a knighthood. Given his

---


Prestigious reputation and his close relationship with Whistler during the early years of his career (resulting in Haden's collection being rich in rare earlier works), the reputation and lineage of Haden's collection could not be greater thus it would have been easy for Freer to trust in Haden's acquisition practices and the quality of Haden's collection. As discussed in chapter one, Mansfield acknowledged many of the finest Whistlerian etching collections in the provenance of his collection, in an effort both to reference the collectors' efforts and to bolster the reputation of his own collection. (Haden was one of the collectors that Mansfield listed in the provenance of his collection.) Considered in this way, we can understand that Freer was purchasing in a manner akin to Mansfield, the difference being that Freer's wealth allowed him to do so on a much larger scale.

Purchasing entire collections was not the only method that Freer used in the creation of his etching collection. As part of Freer's continued patronage of Whistler he asked the artist to provide him with prints directly:

During our recent conversation you will perhaps remember that I expressed a desire hereafter to purchase your work direct from yourself - To this you kindly assented - Such an arrangement should be mutually advantageous — [...]"\(^6\)

Freer reiterated this proposition four years later, this time guaranteeing to purchase Whistler's graphic work:

As I told you in London I have so much trouble to get satisfactory proofs from the dealers, I would greatly prefer to purchase direct from you, and you can depend upon my taking at least one impression of each of your etchings, dry points and lithographs - Will it trouble you too much to select and forward to me accordingly?\(^4\)

\(^6\) Charles Lang Freer to Whistler, 28 April 1890, GUL MS Whistler F433, GUL 01501, accessed 2006-02.
To acquire directly from the artist allowed Freer access to some of the finest of Whistler prints. Freer promises his acquisition of one of each of Whistler’s etchings, before they are printed and before he has laid eyes upon them. This shows a remarkable amount of faith in the artist’s ability yet it also displays Freer’s admiration of the artist and his commitment to creating ‘The’ collection. By cutting out the middleman, Freer changes the relationship from artist-print dealer-patron to artist-patron, a more direct relationship, a consequence of which saw their great friendship develop.

It will not seem surprising that Whistler used “guaranteed” patrons to his advantage. Katherine Lochnan in her article “The Gentle Art of Marketing Whistler Prints,” writes about Whistler’s canny use of marketing techniques, she states:

> It was his genius for marketing that enabled him to convince enough people to covet prints [...] so that he was able to realize a healthy income from printmaking, retain his aesthetic integrity and fulfill his aesthetic goals.42

Part of Whistler’s marketing genius saw him use the dedication of Freer and Mansfield as a guarantee to others. The following example shows Whistler easing the worries of Marcus B. Huish (1843-1904), director of the Fine Art Society:43

> Be in no hurry - and I will really have given you a fortune - All collectors will be obliged to have these proofs - this is what you & Mr Browne had no idea of - but look at Mr Mansfield-

> He said to me directly he saw them - "Of course I will have to have these! - notwithstanding that I have already [the] collection!" -

> Also Mr Freer of Detroit and others . . they will all require them - [...]44

---

43 The Fine Art Society had commissioned Whistler to go to Venice and create a series of twelve etchings; Whistler remained in Venice for over a year making 50 etchings and over 90 pastels.
This is yet another u-turn in Whistler’s opinion of American patrons. Here he is depending upon the devotion of his American patrons. Yet, as discussed in chapter one, the artist had previously felt no need or desire to promote himself on the American side of the Atlantic. This letter is also an example of Freer and Mansfield being considered together; here Whistler sees these collectors as performing the same function - that of promised purchaser.

Conclusion

An interesting example of these two collections overlapping can be found in the Freer Gallery of Art. *Little Smithfield* (figure 2.11) in this collection has Mansfield’s collector’s stamp (Lugt No. 1342) on the verso of the tab (figure 2.12). This small royal blue M within a circle can be found on the verso of all etchings once in Mansfield’s collection. Freer stamped his etchings in a similar fashion, in red ink with an F (figure 2.13, 2.14, 2.15). *Little Smithfield* entered Freer’s collection in 1901 (as shown by the acquisition number: F1901.19). Mansfield had exhibited *Little Smithfield* in 1900 at the Caxton Club in Chicago. The etching was then exchanged or sold to Freer. However, Mansfield’s 1919 card catalogue has an entry for this etching, therefore Mansfield either owned more than one impression of this etching around 1900-1901, or purchased another impression after he sold one to Freer. This example not only evinces the consistently upgrading approach that Mansfield took to collecting, but also shows the way in which the collector interacted with fellow collectors in his pursuit of a high-quality and distinguished collection.

45 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.
What comes across clearly in this comparative analysis of Mansfield and Freer's methods and motivations is that both collectors are keen, informed and assiduous. In his article Mansfield describes Freer as 'the most assiduous of the collectors of Whistler's etchings.' Part of this assiduousness saw Freer assemble scrapbooks of press cuttings about the artist and his prints. Mansfield also assembled similar sorts of information into four volumes that can now be found at the New York Public Library. These volumes are evidence of a type of connoisseurship in which the collectors invest more time, interest and scholarship in the artist that is over and above appreciating and collecting his art. The following two chapters will look into Mansfield's extended interest in Whistler's etchings and how he used his collection to aid Whistler's career.

47 The Freer scrap and press cutting books can be found at the FGA, the Mansfield scrapbooks are housed in the NYPL.
Chapter Three: Mansfield and Kennedy

The previous chapter concluded with the idea that Mansfield's interest in Whistler's prints went beyond the acquisition of a collection. This point shall be extended in this chapter through the example of Mansfield's writings on Whistler. The most significant of these is the collector's descriptive catalogue raisonné of the artist's etchings, published in 1909 by the Caxton Club. Entitled *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings and Dry-Points of James Abbott McNeill Whistler* this catalogue is the most revealing resource for understanding Mansfield's collection, his opinions and the relationship he had with the artist and because of such has been used regularly throughout this thesis. However this chapter shall look at the catalogue in much more depth and consider articles that Mansfield wrote for *The Print-Collector's Quarterly*.¹

I will use a comparative method for the second time; the comparison will be made between Mansfield's own catalogue and the catalogue raisonné that researchers, dealers and institutions use today, Edward G. Kennedy's *The Etched Work of Whistler*, published by the Grolier Club,² New York, in 1910, one year after Mansfield's catalogue.

E. G. Kennedy represented the Paris and New York company H. Wunderlich & Co in their dealings with Whistler from 1885. The relationship between the artist and dealer grew beyond the purely professional, and Kennedy accompanied Whistler on a trip

² The Grolier Club was founded in New York in 1884 and is America's oldest and largest society for bibliophiles and those interested in the graphic arts. The club's objective is to promote 'the literary study and promotion of the arts pertaining to the production of books.' [www.grolierclub.org](http://www.grolierclub.org) accessed 2007-08-15.
through France after the death of the artist's wife's. This catalogue was not the first time that Kennedy had catalogued Whistler's etchings; in 1902 he compiled a supplement to the most recent catalogue raisonné by Frederick Wedmore. Kennedy's interest in cataloguing Whistler's prints extended to the artist's work in lithography, editing and republishing T. R. Way's catalogue of Whistler's lithographs in 1914.3

This chapter will consider the purpose of the catalogues, considering questions such as: why were they suggested? What need did they fulfil? How they are different from each other and what had gone before and why? Following this will be an analysis of the resources and methods that the compilers use, examining how they impact upon the content of the catalogues and the way the information is presented to the reader/viewer. Finally, contemporary theories that define collector and connoisseur activities shall be compared to Mansfield's activities.

The Catalogues Raisonné

Both catalogues are straightforward in their format. An introduction is given by the compiler - addressing issues of methodology, previous catalogues, publications of etchings and resources. Mansfield's introduction is notably longer than Kennedy's; while addressing the same points Mansfield tends to greater explanation and gives a brief biography of the artist's life with reference to significant exhibitions. Kennedy explains the reason for the shorter length of his notes, citing Schreiber he states:

---

3 Kennedy also annotated and presented his correspondence with Whistler to the New York Public Library in 1927. This correspondence is accessible as part of the online edition of Whistler's correspondence available at www.whistler.arts.pla.ac.uk.
[...] that few of those who consult a catalogue ever pause to read the notes by which it is introduced. In general, this view is probably correct, and these prefatory notes are therefore made as brief as possible.\(^4\)

Both Schreiber and Kennedy fail to realise the importance of the information set down in the introductions. The information contained in the introductions to the catalogues raisonné is essential as it explains the methodology of the compiler and the decisions that he makes, both of which have implications for what is presented and how it is presented to the reader/viewer. For the purposes of this chapter the introductory notes have proved to reveal more than the main body of the catalogues. One reason for this could be the fact that they provide information concerning the motivations and impulses that enabled the catalogues to come into being; because of this, examples taken from the introductory notes will be used throughout this chapter.

The main body of the catalogue follows the prefaces. Each compiler gives the etchings a title and notes the number of states known to them. Mansfield's catalogue describes a total of 443 plates, (370 of which he personally owned); Kennedy lists a total of 448. It is in the way that each compiler has presented the information that the key difference between these catalogues lies. Mansfield’s catalogue is descriptive, while Kennedy’s is illustrated with reproductions. More shall be made of this difference shortly.

Mansfield was not the first to catalogue Whistler’s etchings. There had been two previous catalogues, both descriptive and published during Whistler’s lifetime. The first was prepared by Ralph Thomas; entitled *A catalogue of the etchings and drypoints of James Abbott McNeil Whistler*, this catalogue was privately printed by

\(^4\) Kennedy, *The Etched Work of Whistler*, p. xix
John Russell Smith of London in 1874. The compiler states that this catalogue was for his use and for that of his friends, implying that this catalogue was geared towards a specific and elite market, evinced further by the small (50) number of copies produced. Thomas’s catalogue lists 85 subjects, five of them without titles and several others, which Kennedy describes as ‘vaguely determined or quite erroneous.’ Thomas did not give references to states and can be accused of being subjective in his descriptions; for example he describes the etching *Liverdun*, (figure 3.1, K16) as ‘delicious’ and *The Forge* (figure 1.3, K68) as a ‘magnificent drypoint.’

Unlike Thomas, the Kennedy and Mansfield catalogues refrain from commenting upon the quality of the impression; in fact they refrain from giving any critical comment. Instead they describe the subject matter, compositional arrangement and the differences between states in a mainly objective manner. However, the card catalogue that Mansfield made of his collection at the New York Public Library does contain critical comment about the etchings. In these cards Mansfield uses specific language to describe certain prints that he sees of value. He uses terms such as ‘rich’ and ‘fine’ consistently to describe impressions he sees of exceptional quality. For example Mansfield describes the tenth state of *The Balcony* (figure 3.2, K207) as ‘[v]ery fine impression,’ and he describes the fifth state of *Ponte del Piovan* (figure 3.3, K209) as ‘[w]onderfully rich.’ Mansfield does not use this same subjective language in his catalogue, which is logical as it is not the job of the catalogue compiler to express critical opinions. The fact that Mansfield uses different language to describe his own

---

1 Kennedy, *The Etched Work of Whistler*, p. xx
3 Folder 4c, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL

personal collection suggests that he was aware of the different functions a collector and a cataloguer have.

Twelve years after Thomas's catalogue, in 1886, the dealer A. W. Thibaudeau published Frederick Wedmore's catalogue, *Whistler's Etchings: A Study and a Catalogue*. This catalogue described two hundred and fourteen plates and gave descriptions of different states. One hundred and twenty-nine copies were issued. This catalogue was primarily aimed at collectors and dealers. During the years 1887 and 1888 Whistler was at his most productive (see Appendix C). Because of this a second edition of Wedmore's catalogue was issued in 1899 in order to satisfy collectors' and dealers' needs. 54 additional etchings were described and 135 copies of the catalogue were issued. In 1902 E. G. Kennedy produced a supplement to Wedmore's catalogue listing a further 99 plates. While Kennedy's supplement took the number of etchings described to three hundred and sixty-seven, there were discrepancies between his catalogue and Wedmore's, which Kennedy details in his 1910 catalogue.²

It is important to keep in mind the purpose of the previous catalogues raisonnés. While these catalogues are valuable resources for art historians, curators, and researchers, at the time they were important mainly for collectors and dealers. They proved especially important to the two compilers themselves. Mansfield and Kennedy were revising and building upon the work of the early cataloguers. It would be impossible to think that Mansfield was not familiar with Wedmore's catalogue, as not only would it have been essential resource material for his own catalogue, it was easily available to him. The stock books of the company H. Wunderlich and Co. show

² Please see Kennedy, *The Etched Work of Whistler*, p. xxi, for a list of the discrepancies.
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us that Wedmore’s catalogue was sold there during the 1880s. For example in 1888, six copies of Wedmore’s catalogue are listed for the price of £2.8.0, concurrent with the time Mansfield was buying Whistler’s prints from this dealer. A list of Mansfield’s library, made by the collector, is at the New York Public Library. This list shows that Mansfield did own a copy of Wedmore’s catalogue as well as many other Whistler related books including Kennedy’s supplement to Wedmore. Despite this, Mansfield writes that:

Only to a limited extent has the arrangement of earlier catalogues been followed. The inclusion of plates not described in those catalogues has inevitably disarranged the numbering, and the fact that in different parts of those catalogues there are descriptions of plates of avowedly the same period, has relieved the compiler of any necessity of trying to adhere to any earlier order.

This statement shows that while Mansfield was familiar with the work of earlier compilers, he did not feel the need to adhere strictly to their chronologies and conclusions. In fact, Mansfield’s chronology is believed by Katherine Lochnan to be more precise than Kennedy’s. Due to Mansfield’s research methods, where he contacted Whistler’s friends and relatives to establish the chronological order of the early etchings, Lochnan chose to concur with Mansfield’s research in regards to the dating of the early etchings.

With the purposes and uses of the previous catalogues raisonné established, it is now time to consider the beginnings of Kennedy and Mansfield’s endeavours. The Kennedy and Mansfield catalogues came into being around the same time. The Wedmore and Kennedy supplement contained inconsistencies that had to be remedied

---

8 H. Wunderlich & Co. Stock books, 1888, transcribed for WEP, GU by Dr. Grischka Petri.
9 Mansfield gifted the majority of his library to Yale University in December 1931 he retained certain books. He had books about Whistler by notable names such as Keppel, Laver, Pennell, Way, Wedmore and Weltenkampf.
10 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p. lx.
in order to satisfy collectors and dealers. On top of this there remained a significant number of etchings that had been omitted and that needed to be catalogued. This fact is evidence of the need for a revised and updated catalogue raisonné of Whistler's etchings at the time.

Kennedy began discussions with E. B. Holden, a member of the Grolier Club prior to 1901, in relation to his catalogue being published by the Grolier Club. In the year 1901 Kennedy:

[... ] acquired the remarkable collection of Whistler's etchings and dry-points belonging to Mr. B. B. Macgeorge of Glasgow, one containing many rarities, and I decided that before it was dispersed the prints in it should be reproduced. Forthwith all the etchings were photographed, and, in a way, the catalogue was begun.  

The MacGeorge collection was one of the collections mentioned in the provenance of Mansfield's collection. It is probable and in fact very likely that Mansfield purchased his MacGeorge etchings from Kennedy's workplace. After reproducing the MacGeorge collection Kennedy's project lay dormant between 1901 and 1904 while the Grolier Club authorized the catalogue's publication.

Mansfield relates the beginnings of his catalogue as follows:

The publication by the Caxton Club of a Catalogue of Whistler's Etchings and Dry-points was at first proposed in connection with the exhibition arranged by the club in 1900. In deference to Mr. Whistler's wishes, the original plan of illustrating the catalogue by reproductions of the prints, in the form of small photogravures of uniform size, was abandoned. The publication of a full descriptive catalogue, however, subsequently received Mr. Whistler's complete approval. Its preparation by the present compiler was equally approved by Mr. Whistler. The compilation was readily undertaken, at the request of the club, but without an adequate appreciation of the research and labor and time involved in the undertaking.  

While Mansfield relates the genesis of his undertaking in a very fact based manner, the last sentence has the tone of a complaint. Perhaps Mansfield felt that he did not receive enough support from the club, or perhaps he wanted to emphasize the effort and time that he put into creating the catalogue. There are many possible reasons behind this comment by Mansfield but what is important to note is that the sentence has a much more personal tone.

In March 1907 notices announcing Mansfield’s catalogue were sent out by the Caxton Club to its members. The price for the catalogue was set at fifteen dollars. The number of subscribers for the catalogue totalled 262. This number was mainly made up by 129 members of the Caxton Club; in addition 50 subscriptions came from the Grolier Club, and six copies of the catalogue were presented to The Grolier Club, New York Public Library, Mrs. Ironside, Charles L. Freer, the Smithsonian Institution, and the print department of the British Museum. Five of the catalogues were printed on Japanese paper; 257 copies were issued on French paper, with the edition being limited to 300. After being impressed by an edition of New York as I Saw It, by Wm. L. Andrews, Mansfield decided on the printer The Gilliss Press, on account of the type and paper of the book printed.

It is interesting to consider that Mansfield originally intended to have illustrations accompanying his catalogue, as Kennedy does. Mansfield had to abandon the idea in

---

15 Printed Caxton Club Publication Notice, 31 May 1907, Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
16 Caxton Club Committee of Publications to its Members, May 1907, Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
17 Millard to Howard Mansfield, 18 March 1909, Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
18 "THE CAXTON CLUB WHISTLER CATALOGUE," Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
19 Howard Mansfield to Mr. Parsons, March 23 1909, Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

accordance with Whistler’s wishes. Rosalind Birnie Philip, Whistler’s sister-in-law and his executrix, had come to hear of Mansfield’s venture by the way of Freer. She wrote seriously to Mansfield:

Before helping you with information I would feel grateful if you can assure me that there is no risk of the catalogue ever being illustrated with reproductions of the etchings. Mr. Whistler expressed himself very strongly in this point, and only gave his consent to the proposed catalogue on condition that it should not be illustrated.20

One cannot help but wonder, given Whistler’s wishes and Birnie Philip’s serious and determined position to have them upheld, why Kennedy’s catalogue included illustrations? This issue is discussed by the dealer in his introduction; Kennedy explains how he met with an ‘unfavourable’ response from Whistler when he first mentioned compiling an illustrated catalogue. However, Kennedy overcame the artist’s disapproval by showing him Rovinski’s Rembrandt catalogue,21 the very catalogue that had inspired the dealer to begin cataloguing Whistler’s etchings. After viewing the Rembrandt catalogue Whistler changed his mind and ‘cheerfully consented’22 to Kennedy’s proposal. The fact that Whistler approved of both catalogues, both conceived around the same time could point to there being differing aims in mind for each catalogue, or it could have something to do with the fact that Kennedy’s method of presentation was not as tried and tested as Mansfield’s. Whistler may have wanted both, in case Kennedy failed in his task and did not present the etchings in the manner agreed. An analysis of the compilers’ methods and resources should reveal more concerning the implications of the different formats of these catalogues.

20 Rosalind Birnie Philip to Howard Mansfield, 11 October 1904, Folder 1, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
21 Dmitri Rovinski, L’Oeuvre gravé de Rembrandt reproduction des planches originales dans tous leurs états successifs ... 1000 phototypies sans retouches. Avec un catalogue raisonné par Dmitri Rovinski, (imprimerie de l’académie impériale des sciences, Saint-Pétersbourg, 1890).
22 Kennedy, The Etched Work of Whistler, p. xxiv.
Methods

The resources and methods used by the authors have an obvious impact upon the shape of the catalogue. Appendix D is a list of collections, institutions and dealers that Mansfield and Kennedy used in their research for their catalogues. Significantly Kennedy cites Mansfield as a source and if one examines Kennedy's catalogue we find that many of the etchings he has reproduced were in fact reproduced from examples in Mansfield's collection. For example in the note to accompany the second state of *Thames Police* (figure 1.6, K44) Kennedy has in italics, 'H. Mansfield', and he tells us in his introduction that this means the reproduction of this particular etching was taken from an impression in the stated collection. Kennedy also thanks Mansfield directly:

> The readiness of Mr. Howard Mansfield to place at my disposal, at any time, such impressions of his remarkably fine collection as I required, for the purpose of reproduction or comparison, helped to facilitate the work in that direction, and it is with pleasure that I thank him.  

Mansfield thanks Kennedy and the Grolier Club in his preface, he writes:

> To the Grolier Club of the City of New York the compiler is indebted for invaluable aid in the classification of states, through access to the photographic reproductions, in full size, of different states of etchings and dry-points, by Whistler, prepared for future publication by that club. From Mr. Edward G. Kennedy, of New York, much special information has been received concerning Whistler's etched work, besides great assistance in the identification of states and in the final verifications.

It has been assumed that the reproductions mentioned above were those that Kennedy had made in preparation for his own catalogue from the MacGeorge collection. This assumption was made due to the fact that Kennedy was working on his catalogue raisonné with the Grolier Club where Mansfield accessed these reproductions.

---

These compilers are not only using many of the same resources (see Appendix D), they are using each other's personal resources and research, suggesting that they, in their similar endeavours, were helping rather than competing with one another. This fact points to the compilers having differing aims, which is physically manifest in the format the catalogues take. Accompanying Kennedy's illustrations is a short direct description highlighting the changes between the states; Kennedy comments that his descriptions are 'sufficiently precise, and full enough practically to stand by themselves.\(^{25}\) On occasion the dealer does not accompany the reproductions with a description. For example for *La Mère Gérard, Stooping* (figure 3.4, K13,) Kennedy gives no description. Mansfield describes this etching as follows:

A quaint elderly Frenchwoman wearing an apron, a cape and a pointed hood - the woman pictured in the etching last described - is walking toward the front, slightly stooping and with head bent forward. In her right hand she carries a satchel. Her figure casts a shadow to the left. The plate is unsigned. Etching. Height, 4 inches; width, 2 1/2 inches. Avery Collection. On the impression, perhaps unique, in this collection Whistler wrote: "La Mère Gérard." \(^{26}\)

This description does illustrate the etching well. The stance, the attributes and the clothing of Mère Gérard are all noted; however the descriptive word 'quaint' implies a judgement on Mansfield's part rather than a description. Almost by default Mansfield gives his own opinion on the etching. The very order that Mansfield chooses to list certain objects or areas in the etching implies an emphasis that is not necessarily universally perceived. For example Mansfield chooses to describe the clothing that Mère Gérard is wearing before he describes her stance, yet the title (which may not have been given to the etching by Whistler) emphasizes Mère Gérard's stance. It is not being argued that it is impossible to produce a completely

\(^{26}\) Mansfield, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, M014.
objective catalogue raisonné. However I am suggesting that there is an inherent element of subjective comment in a descriptive method, as it is Mansfield's opinion that dictates what is described and in what order it is listed. The Kennedy catalogue does not face the same challenge. Mansfield states that:

There will not be found throughout the catalogue any attempt at a critical estimate of any print recorded. In this regard Mr. Whistler's own view, as stated to the compiler: "It is the business of the catalogue to describe and not to comment," has been readily accepted. Indeed, the value of a catalogue should lie in the fullness and accuracy of its facts and not in the personal opinions of the compiler, which, if thought worthy of expression, should be expressed elsewhere, and not forced on print-lovers seeking information, who are apt to have opinions of their own.25

Mansfield on the whole has successfully managed to avoid subjective and critical comment, and when he can be accused of being subjective it should be taken into consideration that it was not Mansfield's intention to give his opinion and has more to do with difficulties inherent in a descriptive method rather than his own critical opinions.

The difference in presenting the information was preceded by a different way of obtaining it. Kennedy writes that:

Wherever I sought a print, I carried with me such reproductions of it as I had already had made from other impressions, so that the identification of variations was facilitated.26

In researching his catalogue, Kennedy's method of visual comparison is the same method his readers will use when using the completed catalogue. Mansfield does not mention using a stock of reproductions as an aid. Despite a visual comparison of impressions being the obvious way of determining different states, Mansfield mentions one specific example where he differs from this method of researching. He

25 ibid, p. lxxiii.
thanks Mr. H. S. Theobald "for a complete description of the admirable collection which was once in his possession." As has been established, description is not the best method of recording the nuances of a visual image. This statement implies that Mansfield is relying on Theobald's description, which Mansfield interpreted and used in his research. Therefore the reader is presented with the description of a description. This would have impacted upon the information that Mansfield provides, and may account for an anomaly encountered when the etchings and states of the two catalogues are compared. Kennedy's catalogue is the latest in date, and as mentioned earlier is the catalogue used by historians and researchers today, because it was that expected Kennedy would list more etchings than Mansfield (which he does) but also that he would list an updated version of states. Etchings, such as *Finette* (figure 3.5, K58), is noted by Mansfield as being available in nine states while it is noted by Kennedy as being available in ten states. Some etchings are given the same number of states by both compilers such as *Maud Standing* (figure 3.6, K114), listed by both Mansfield and Kennedy as having twelve states. However, what was not expected was for Mansfield to list more states than Kennedy. An example of this is *Maud, Seated* (figure 3.7, K115) which is listed by Mansfield as being available in four states and by Kennedy as being available in three. Current research at the Whistler Etchings Project, based at Glasgow University, has shown that an impression between the second and third state listed by Kennedy, can be found at the Freer Gallery of Art. This evidence suggests that Mansfield has listed the correct number of states.

The titles, chronology, number of states and order of states are all points of similarity and difference between the two catalogues. The similarities and differences are

---

essentially bound to the method of research and method of presentation. Mansfield’s descriptive method, despite its practical shortcomings, has revealed much about Mansfield’s own personal collection. Mansfield’s catalogue is especially interesting for what it tells about his collecting motivations, methods and specific impressions that belonged to him. There are many instances when the collector’s catalogue raisonné reveals something of Mansfield as collector and more specifically about certain examples in his collection. Two examples have been chosen. The first looks at the description of an individual etching. The next example is taken from the introduction, and shows the sort of relationship that existed between the collector and the artist.

Mansfield’s catalogue, like Kennedy’s, gives the name of the owner of the etching after he describes it. Both compilers used Mansfield’s collection and both noted when they were describing etchings from his collection; thus both catalogues raisonné give conclusive evidence that Mansfield owned a certain etching. In addition to this information certain descriptions gave evidence of when Mansfield purchased an etching. For example Mansfield’s writes in his description of *Fitzroy Square* (figure 3.8, KappIII01):

> The drawing on the plate was done by Whistler, possibly as early as 1886, but the biting was done, after Whistler’s death, by Frank Short, by whom the impression in the Mansfield collection was printed.11

The information given here shows that Mansfield’s impression of *Fitzroy Square* must have entered his collection after 1903. The massive eighteen-year gap between drawing and purchase is an example of the problem of dating etchings and establishing when exactly they entered the collection. Many impressions of etchings

---

10 Please see Bibliography column of Appendix A: DBl Mansfield Collection.
11 Mansfield, *A Descriptive catalogue*, MappIV.
were printed from a plate that had been drawn many years before - *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate*, (figure 2.1, K1) is another notable example, (see chapter two). It is useful to know when an impression entered a collection, as it allows may give a clue as to when the impression was printed. This is especially important in the case of Whistler, as his printing habits were not reliable, for example when the artist returned from his Venice trip it was, as Margaret F. MacDonald aptly notes 'like drawing teeth to get him to print a few impressions.'\(^{32}\) It is also interesting to note when an etching enters Mansfield’s collection as it could point to a trend or preference the collector had for a certain sort of etching at a specific time.

The following example from Mansfield’s introduction shows not only a method of acquisition but also the relationship between the artist and collector at work. While commenting on Whistler’s self criticism Mansfield uses one of his interactions with the artist as an example:

> Once, when an impression from a plate “important in size,” and then unknown to the compiler, was discovered by him in one of Mr. Whistler’s portfolios in Paris, and laid aside for purchase, it was withdrawn by the artist with the remark: “That one is not altogether to my liking and I don’t think it is good enough for your collection, and I had rather you wouldn’t take it.”\(^{33}\)

This anecdote brings into relief the relationship between the artist and Mansfield, and makes one consider how much control Whistler exercised over his patron’s collections. Mansfield relates this anecdote for a second time in his article “Whistler as a Critic of his own prints”:

> [...] a certain print discovered by me in one of his portfolios in Paris in 1892, and until then unknown to me, which was laid aside for purchase at what was at that time a very good price. He finally refused to let the etching

\(^{32}\) MacDonald, *Palaces in the Night: Whistler in Venice*, p.96; MacDonald also gives an analysis of the time Whistler spent printing the “Venice Sets.”
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...go, saying, “That one is not altogether to my liking, and I don’t think it is good enough for your collection, and I had rather you wouldn’t take it.”

In this article Mansfield implies that Whistler’s refusal to sell the print to Mansfield is part of the artist’s self criticism; however, it can also be easily seen as a way in which the artist could control the collector’s collection, ultimately impacting on its shape and emphasis (this idea shall be extended in chapter four). This anecdote also serves to elevate the quality of Mansfield’s collection in the eyes of the public and other collectors.

The H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books contain evidence of a similar episode - in the 1889 stock book the etching Wood’s Fruit Shop, (figure 3.9, K265) is annotated ‘Not for Mansfield,’ probably at the artist’s request, as the dealer would not have been in the business of withholding etchings from potential customers. This episode is ambiguous as it is difficult to determine why Whistler would want to withhold an etching from an important and avid collector; however, this example does suggest that Whistler is exercising a sort of control over Mansfield’s collection, thus shaping what it contains. Despite the etching being withheld from Mansfield on this occasion, an example did manage to make its way into his collection by way of Wunderlich later in 1889, and is referenced by both Mansfield and Kennedy in their catalogues raisonné.

One cannot fail to notice that Mansfield’s writings were written after Whistler’s death. If Mansfield had produced his essays and catalogue during Whistler’s lifetime, they would have had an impact on the artist’s visibility and an influence on the promotion of Whistler’s work. The collector’s writings preserve the legacy and fame of Whistler.

---

26 Ibid.
of Whistler rather than productively create it. However during 1892 Mansfield proposed a book to be titled "Original Etching".\textsuperscript{37} Mansfield contacted Whistler proposing the artist create an etching for the book. By 1894 the book had not emerged, and Mansfield wrote disconcertingly to Whistler:

Mr. Kennedy tells me that you made inquiries of him about my proposed book on "Original Etching", having heard nothing from the probable publishers with regard to the etching you promised to make for it. Neither have I heard anything from them on the subject for about a year. Then it was arranged that I should have till this summer to complete my manuscript. Meanwhile Mr. Mead, the member of the firm of Dodd, Mead & Co., who had suggested the publication and taken the matter in charge, has died. I have not since spoken to any other member of the firm on the subject, because since last September I have not found time to do but two hours' work on the book, which is barely half written.

I doubt if it will ever be finished. If it is and the publishers are still willing to bring it out, they may and may not be willing to incur the expense of an etching for it. To judge from the last calculations made by Mr. Mead, I fear they will not.

I appreciate your continued interest in the matter, and am grateful for your willingness to give the book an illustration which would make it live. Perhaps I may yet find the leisure to complete my work, and possibly it may be issued with an etching from your hand. It will have that or none.\textsuperscript{38}

While this book was never completed, the plans for it are evidence of Mansfield's admiration for Whistler's etchings, interest in modern etchings and developing scholarly activities, all of which were essential for creating a catalogue raisonné.

Collector or Connoisseur?

Hamilton's\textit{ Etching and Etchers} was mentioned previously; it was noted that Mansfield owned three copies of this book, one from each of the editions published in

\textsuperscript{37} Howard Mansfield to Whistler, 29 July 1892, GUL MS Whistler M269, GUW 03998, accessed 2007-05-29.

\textsuperscript{38} Howard Mansfield to Whistler, 1 August 1894, GUL MS Whistler M277, GUW 04006, accessed 2007-05-29.

1868, 1876 and 1880. Hamerton writes some interesting definitions of the 'amateur' and the 'connoisseur' of prints:

Amateurship, in the highest sense, means the state in which the love of art is chief, and everything else subordinate. In connoisseurship, knowledge is chief, and the pride of knowledge, love being subordinate or non-existent. The glory of connoisseurship is to have ascertained and to possess in perfect readiness many facts relating to work done by famous men; and these facts have very often no connection whatever with artistic quality or natural truth. It is a great thing for a connoisseur, for instance, to know whether a plate is rare or common, a matter which artistically, is of absolutely indifference. Another great point in connoisseurship is to be aware of the indications by which different states are determined; for instance, if it is the first state of a certain plate by Rembrandt the end hair in a dog's tail has a burr, and if in the second state this burr has been removed with the scraper, a professed connoisseur could scarcely avow his ignorance of the fact; whilst from the artistic point of view ignorance of such details is perfectly avowable, and is of no importance unless they seriously affect the artistic quality of the work. No amateur need be ashamed of not having the peculiar kind of knowledge which belongs to connoisseurs.\(^{39}\)

Considering Hamerton's definitions one would place Mansfield under the title of connoisseur as his work on the catalogue raisonné, necessitates that he behave in the manner of Hamerton's pedantic and determined 'connoisseur.' If one considers Mansfield's own admission that artistic merit was his primary reason for collecting prints (as discussed in chapter two), we find that he is aligning himself with the figure of the amateur. In fact Mansfield's description of his own collecting methods has something of the same tone as Hamerton's definition of the amateur:

> A genuine amateur is a person who values art because it is good as art, and not because it is dear and rare. A genuine amateur looks for artistic merits alone, and is so entirely free from the passion of curiosity-hunting, that he guards himself against the curiosity-madness as a man with a great moral ideal guards himself against dipsomania.\(^{40}\)

What makes a person a print lover, connoisseur or collector seems to be a matter of for debate. J. R. W. Hitchcock writes his own definitions:

---

\(^{39}\) Hamerton, Etching and Etchers, p. 33-34.

\(^{40}\) Ibid, p.31.
The connoisseur can consult Bartsch, Dumesnil, Passavant, Wiegal, Thausing, Dutuit, and the whole army of continental writers of general works or of critical biographies and catalogues. For the ordinary print-lover, there are Hamerton's "Etching and Etchers," Maberly's "Print Collector," and Bryan's "Dictionary of Painters and Engravers." * By these standards Mansfield fits the category of print lover. He owned copies of Hamerton's book and his collecting methods had much in common with the advice set out by Maberly as illustrated in chapter two. By Hamerton's standards Mansfield is a connoisseur; by Hitchcock's definition Mansfield was a print lover because of where he received his education about prints. If Mansfield's actions fit him with many different categories of collector, then one should and indeed must understand Mansfield's collection on many levels. This idea is was evinced earlier in chapter two where the language Mansfield used to describe his personal etching collection was compared to the language he used when cataloguing, this comparison showed that Mansfield was aware of the different roles required of him. To understand Mansfield's catalogue raisonné one must recognise that Mansfield had to have acted as a connoisseur in order to create it.

**Conclusion**

The fact that Mansfield compiled this catalogue is testament to his scholarly interest in the etchings of Whistler and proves that the collector's interest in Whistler went beyond the accumulation of a collection to what Hamerton describes as connoisseurship. While Mansfield's writings served to enhance and preserve Whistler's reputation after he died, he was involved in exhibiting Whistler's art both during and after Whistler's lifetime. These exhibitions and what they tell about the collector and his collection will be examined in the following chapter.

Chapter Four: Mansfield as Exhibitor

Arguments from the previous three chapters have shown that Mansfield's interest in Whistler extended beyond collecting the artist's etchings. The collector showed an interest in the history and development of the artist through the comprehensiveness of his collection, and in specific examples from it (such as *Sketches on the Coast Survey Plate*, figure 2.1, K1). The immediately preceding chapter, using Mansfield's catalogue raisonné as its main example, showed that the collector had a scholarly interest in Whistler. This chapter will expand the idea that Mansfield's attention extended beyond the accumulation of an etching collection and will argue that the collector was involved in promoting Whistler's etchings to American audiences through his involvement in loaning to and arranging Whistler etching exhibitions.

The literature on the print market, the Etching Revival, 19th century collectors and Whistler is extensive but no author has attempted to consider the impact of collector-organised exhibitions on the promotion of a single artist. Lee Wiehl has made some contribution with the exhibition catalogue *A Cultivated Taste: Whistler and American Print Collectors*. Wiehl notes Mansfield's involvement with exhibiting Whistler's art:

To enlighten both the public and collectors about Whistler's graphic work, Mansfield persuaded owners in the United States to send Whistler prints to American exhibitions in the 1890s and early 1900s. He himself lent etchings to five major exhibitions before 1903.

The reasons behind promoting the artist and the techniques used to exhibit him need further investigation. Mansfield's exhibition techniques will be compared to those of Whistler in an effort to establish how far the collector was aware of the artist's

---

exhibition designs, including if and how he used them. Firstly Whistler’s exhibition techniques will be outlined; instances where Mansfield could have come into contact with Whistler’s installation techniques will be established, setting a context for comparison. Secondly Mansfield-organised Whistler exhibitions will be analysed, considering the collector’s level of involvement and the impact these exhibitions had. Possible reasons why Mansfield took the time and effort to exhibit his collection will be discussed.

**Whistler’s Exhibition Techniques**

Whistler was an innovative exhibition designer; his installation ideas and designs altered ways of viewing art in an exhibition context and arguably are crucial in the evolution of exhibition design. It was the exhibition techniques that Whistler developed during the 1870s and 1880s that proved him an innovator. David Park Curry lists these techniques as follows:

> [...] indirect lighting, color coordinated walls, uniform framing, elegant spacing, large banners outside the exhibition space, the sale of specially designed catalogues and photoreproductions of art, elaborate evening openings, and admissions charges for temporary exhibitions [...]\(^2\)

The installation techniques listed here are those that Mansfield-organised exhibitions will be compared, on the understanding that these techniques are the preferred conditions under which Whistler wanted his art to be viewed.

In order to consider Mansfield’s exhibition methods in relation to Whistler’s one must first establish how well Mansfield knew Whistler’s designs, and when and where he came into contact with them. One specific exhibition that possibly influenced

---

\(^2\) Curry, “Total Control: Whistler at an Exhibition,” p.67.
Mansfield was Whistler’s *Arrangement in White and Yellow*, originally held at the Fine Art Society in London in February 1883. The exhibition displayed 51 etchings (the “Second Venice Set,” K183-189, 191-195). Kenneth Myers sees this exhibition as:

[...] the first of his [Whistler’s] shows to incorporate all his mature ideas about what an exhibition could and should be.\(^3\)

Significantly this exhibition was taken across the Atlantic and reconstructed in the gallery of H. Wunderlich & Co. at 808 Broadway, New York as arranged with the artist by E. G. Kennedy. The reconstruction of this exhibition on American soil is crucial as it was most likely here that Mansfield was first exposed to Whistlerian installation design.

The New York showing of *Arrangement in White and Yellow*\(^4\) included the exact same number of etchings as the London show, plus one important addition, the notorious painting *Nocturne in Black and Gold: The Falling Rocket* (YMSM 170). This painting would have enhanced the publicity that the exhibition received, due to its connection with the Ruskin libel trial of 1878.\(^5\) Apart from the addition of the painting, the New York version of *Arrangement in White and Yellow* was akin to the London show in every way. This show had caused a sensation in London because of the particular colour harmonies that Whistler had chosen, the sparse (in comparison to the convention of the time) hanging of the etchings at eye level, the yellow flowers

\(^3\) Ibid, p.10.

\(^4\) Unlike the London showing of *Arrangement in White and Yellow*, the New York installation travelled. The exhibition travelled to Baltimore in December of the same year and was displayed at the Bendann’s Gallery; in January 1884 it was displayed at the Noyes & Blakeslee Gallery in Boston, then on to Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia for March-April 1884; Thurber’s Gallery in Chicago saw the exhibition in March 1885 and finally Angell’s gallery in Detroit displayed the exhibition in April 1885.

and furniture, the brown paper catalogue, the yellow matting and the white felt walls, the carefully controlled lighting and the specially designed white frames.\textsuperscript{6}

It is highly unlikely that Mansfield missed the H. Wunderlich & Co. showing of this exhibition since, as stated in chapter three, he was buying etchings from the dealers throughout the 1880s and early 1890s. If Mansfield had been unable to attend the exhibition, there were numerous reviews in the periodical press containing descriptions of the installation. Reviews appeared in New York periodicals such as \textit{The Critic}, \textit{New York Daily Graphic}, \textit{New York Herald} and the \textit{New York Times}.\textsuperscript{7} One New York reviewer described the exhibition as follows:

When the first visitors passed through the yellow portiers into a well-lighted back room there was a universal call for quinine, for the effect was positively malarial. Every detail was white and yellow, even the coat tails of a dress suit which the attendant wore. The etchings and drypoints covered the walls and were each framed with a large white mat. The tiles and back of the fireplace were yellow, as was also the mantel-board. The matting on the floor had a yellowish-tinge; the ottoman in the centre of the room was upholstered in yellow plush; vases of yellow crackle-ware stood upon the mantelpiece and on what-not tables here and there, and in them were white and yellow roses.\textsuperscript{8}

The American reviews took the same structure and attitude as the English, which Lynn Bell examines in her thesis, \textit{Fact and Fiction: Whistler's Critical Reputation in England, 1880-1892}.\textsuperscript{9} Bell sees the structure of the English reviews as dividing into three sections: the etchings, the decoration and the catalogue. The American reviews follow the same structure. However it should be noted that these sections were not

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Curry, "Total Control: Whistler at an Exhibition" and MacDonald, \textit{Palaces in the Night: Whistler in Venice}, pp. 93-98.
\item See GUL. Whistler: PCB3, PCB4, PCB6 for reviews of the H. Wunderlich & Co., New York, showing of \textit{Arrangement in White and Yellow}.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
equal, the etchings on display were given less consideration than the decoration or the catalogue. Bell gives a reason for this, arguing that:

Faced with the problem of promoting the Venice etchings for a second time, Whistler and the Fine Art Society devised a strategy through an astute mixture of art and provocation that gave a high profile to an exhibition that might otherwise have been ignored. Significantly, this strategy focused attention upon the gallery decoration and the catalogue rather than upon the etchings, a number of which had already been seen.10

If we are to take Bell’s argument - that the decoration was part of Whistler’s promotional strategy - as correct, then the contemporary reviews reflected Whistler’s strategy. However, some reviewers were negative about the display and found the motivations behind such decoration to be unprofessional and detrimental to the artist’s career. For example a reviewer for The Critic writes:

Such expedients as this may be forgiven in the case of a somewhat vain man of talents, anxious to sell his wares, and therefore desirous of calling attention to them cheaply; but Mr. Whistler and other artists who, like him, are not above advertising themselves in strange and original ways, would do well to consider that their inventions of this sort, as soon as they are successful, will be taken up by the dealers, who alone will profit by them, while to their inventors will accrue only the ridicule and discredit that must follow from them.11

Some reviewers took the stance that the decoration served a more artistic purpose. For example the following New York reviewer has a more complimentary view of Whistler’s design:

Yet, curiously enough the material surroundings did not seem inappropriate to their purpose. There was a severe simplicity about them in excellent keeping with the etchings, mounted on their wide white cards and framed in white painted wood, scarcely relieved by slender stripes of black. It is easy to say that a man or an object is eccentric. But there are eccentricities which find themselves an excuse for being, and the Whistler gallery is one of them. When you look into the work it serves as a back-ground, for you find this bizarre

contrast of pallid tints singularly aggressive. You forget what it is which lends this room its excessive yet temperate light. You only note that the light is there and that it is applied to the illumination of pictures which demand it. These pictures, from which your attention is distracted by no irrelevant or discordant accessories show for all they are worth, and they are worth a great deal indeed.\(^{12}\)

The reviewer for the *New York Daily News* maintains that the decoration emphasises and complements the etchings and therefore enhances the viewer's experience of them. The different opinions these reviewers have of the exhibitions' decoration is a consequence of the multiple functions the installation was perceived as having—Bell and the reviewer for *The Critic* see part of the London exhibition design as a promotional strategy, whereas the reviewer for the *New York Daily News* sees the New York design as integral to the effective display of the etchings, both opinions are valid. One way of discovering what view Mansfield had of Whistler's design will be demonstrated in the following analysis of elements of Whistlerian design Mansfield adopted into exhibitions he organised.

Having established Whistler's techniques and a specific exhibition where Mansfield could have came into contact with them, it is now useful to consider the ways in which Whistler allowed others to exhibit his art. At the Paris Exposition in 1867 the placing of Whistler's works had displeased the artist. In correspondence with George A. Lucas, Whistler makes clear his annoyance at the way in which his work was hung:

\[I\ shall\ have\ had\ all\ the\ expense\ of\ sending\ my\ pictures\ to\ a\ corridor\ where\ they\ have\ been\ more\ or\ less\ damned\ by\ everybody.\]^{13}

He even goes so far as to threaten the removal of his works from the exposition:


'Have the pictures all taken away if you can – I won’t have them hung where they are – How did it come about?"'\(^{14}\)

This episode shows that Whistler did not tolerate his works being shown somewhere he considered to do them an injustice, a condition that Mansfield would have to consider when organising exhibitions. Despite this Whistler was aware that a level of compromise was required when exhibiting in certain spaces. The Pennells' observe:

> When he sent to the Academy and other exhibitions over which he had not control, he had to accept the conditions, but in exhibitions over which he had control, he could impose them.\(^{15}\)

Whistler was aware that compromise was required when exhibiting at events such as the Paris Exposition, however while Whistler was willing to relinquish some of the control over the display of his works at expositions, he was not willing to accept a "bad" hang. While the artist was unable to alter his surroundings at expositions, he was able to control what frames surrounded his works. Whistler framed his etchings in a very particular and distinctive way. The etchings were shown within thin white frames with two brown veneered lines around the edges (see figure 4.1). It was this style of frame that Whistler used for the *Arrangement in White and Yellow* exhibition.

D. P. Curry in his article, "Total Control: Whistler at an Exhibition," explains the reason why Whistler was so particular about the presentation of his art:

> Whistler’s concern with the presentation of his work to achieve the artistic effect he desired was a logical extension of his desire to control visual perception through the manipulation of his chosen medium. Once created, the work of art became for Whistler a sacred object, not to be defiled by an uncongenial display, let alone an unsuitable frame, an unconscionable photoreproduction, an uninformed critic, or an unscrupulous dealer.\(^{16}\)


\(^{15}\) Pennell, *Life*, p.304.

\(^{16}\) Curry, "Total Control: Whistler at an Exhibition," p. 68.
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Whistler's high exhibition standards could easily be followed in Britain and France, where the artist was working, but what of America? Whistler would have had significantly less control over how he was presented over the Atlantic, having to rely upon devoted collectors, such as Mansfield, and dealers, like H. Wunderlich & Co., to exhibit his works appropriately.

Mansfield-Organised Exhibitions

In the introduction to Mansfield's catalogue raisonné the collector lists eight exhibitions that were "designed to be representative of Whistler's etched work." He lists the following:

*World's Columbian Exposition*, Chicago, 1893;
*Etchings from the Collection of Howard Mansfield*, St. Botolph Club, Boston, 1894;
*Exhibition of the Etchings and Lithographs of James McNeill Whistler*, The Caxton Club, Chicago, 1900;
*71st Annual Exhibition*, Pennsylvania Academy of Arts, Philadelphia, 1902;
*Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, The Copley Society, Boston, 1904;
*Etchings and Dry-points by James McNeill Whistler*, The Grolier Club, New York, 1904;

Significantly Mansfield loaned etchings to six of these 'representative' exhibitions. Mansfield was particularly involved with four of these. The *World's Columbian Exposition* held in Chicago in 1893, the St Botolph Club show held in Boston in 1894, the Pennsylvania Academy of Arts show in 1902, and the *Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, held in Boston in 1904. These exhibitions have

---

17 Mansfield, A Descriptive Catalogue, p. ivi.
18 Ibid, p. ivi.
been used as the primary examples. A further two exhibitions not mentioned in Mansfield's list will be examined because of the collector's significant input into them; the *Pan American Exposition* of 1901 and the *Exhibition of Etchings and Dry-Points by James Abbott McNeill Whistler*, held at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston in 1910. These exhibitions will be used as examples in my argument that Mansfield was not only a collector of Whistler's work but through his involvement in organising, selecting, arranging and loaning to exhibitions, a promoter of Whistler's art. The exhibitions will be discussed roughly chronologically; however, some examples diverge from this in an effort to avoid repetition while showing trends and revealing connections between the exhibitions.

One of the earliest known exhibitions in which Mansfield was involved was the *World's Columbian Exposition* held in Chicago in 1893 to celebrate the 400th anniversary of Columbus's landfall in the new world. Fifty-nine Whistler etchings were on display in the Fine Arts Building at the north end of the site (Figure 4.2). The etchings were situated on the north side at screen G. Of the etchings exhibited at this exposition, Mansfield loaned over one third, evidence that he was more involved than any other collector in furnishing this display with prints. Appendix A 'DB2: Chicago, 1893' includes details of who loaned the prints and what specifically they lent. Mansfield's loan was almost twice that of the dealer E. G. Kennedy and three times that of the collector Charles L. Freer, both men whose impact on Whistler's career has been well established and previously discussed.

As mentioned, this exposition was included in Mansfield's 'representative' exhibition list. The collector also refers to this exposition as representative in his article.
"Whistler as a Critic of his own Prints." Why Mansfield considers this exhibition as representative is not entirely clear; there had been exhibitions of Whistler’s etchings that had included a greater number of etchings; for example, a show at The Union League Club in New York displayed 167 of Whistler’s etchings in 1881. This was an early and large-scale exhibition, yet it is not included in Mansfield’s list; suggesting that Mansfield’s list of exhibitions is subjective. The ‘representative’ tag that Mansfield gives this exposition seems to have more in common with the exposition’s success and the careful selection of works, than the amount of etchings on show. Admissions to the exposition totalled 27,529,400 adults and children, this success would have served to champion Whistler’s career and expose his art to a considerable portion of American society.

Mansfield was also involved in the selection of works to be displayed. The collector was in contact with Halsey Coats Ives (1847-1944) (the chief of the Fine Arts Division at the exposition) in relation to the selection of etchings. Mansfield did not make the selection on his own; in a letter to Whistler, the collector states:

Mr. Ives thought that space for about fifty of your etchings could be had, and Mr. Freer and I hope to obtain a positive assignment as much as that.

This correspondence proves that there was some sort of interrelationship between Whistlerian collectors and dealers with an interest in exhibiting the artist’s work in the US. Further evidence to suggest this lies in the fact that H. Wunderlich & Co.

---

19 Mansfield, “Whistler as a Critic of his Own Prints,” p. 22.
21 It should be noted that not all of the audience would have seen Whistler’s etchings. Despite this, the exhibition potentially exposed Whistler’s etchings to millions of Americans.
covered the costs of framing and mounting the etchings for exhibit at the exposition and, when in correspondence with Ives, Whistler writes that Kennedy will ‘attend to all details of collecting – arranging etc.’

Despite networking with other collectors it was Mansfield who took on the responsibility of contacting Whistler. The collector wrote to Whistler in January 1893 seeking approval for the final selection of etchings. Whistler replied and in his letter included amendments to the list Mansfield had made. The collector uses this correspondence with Whistler and the example of the changes the artist made to illustrate his argument in his article “Whistler as a Critic of his own Prints”. Mansfield sees the amendments that Whistler made to his initial list as evidence of the artist’s ‘approval or disapproval of those tentatively selected.’ Whistler’s amendments are as follows: in place of ‘Arthur Seymour’ (Arthur Haden, K61) Whistler wanted Cameo No. 1 (K347); in place of The Riva No. 2 (The Riva, K192), was The Mast (K195), Speke Hall (Speke Hall, No. 1, K96), was excluded for ‘Barber Shop, Chelsea’ (The Barber’s Shop, K271); Fanny Leyland (K108) was substituted for Finette (K58); ‘Maude’ (Maud Standing, K114) for Annie Haden (K62) and The Smithy (K240) in place of Steamboat Fleet (K156). Whistler annotated these amendments with a short reason. Cameo No. 1 was ‘much finer’ and The Barber’s Shop ‘One of the finest of all.’ All of the amendments were not possible due to the practicalities of exhibiting. In a letter to Whistler, Mansfield explains why all of the artist’s changes could not be made:

I received your letter as I was on the point of sending the list to Chicago for use in preparing the catalogue. Of course I made what changes I could in accordance with your suggestions. They could not all be made, because the frames had already gone to Chicago, and there was not time to make more. Fortunately an extra frame had gone large enough for "Annie Haden", and by leaving out "Maude" and "Spoke Hall", it became possible to include "The Smithy" and "The Barber's Shop". But there were no frames of the right size for "Finette" or "The Mast", or "Cameo No. 1". I will send you a list of the fifty-nine prints which now represent you. They are chosen impressions, and make a brave show.²⁶

Despite the relatively small number of etchings on display the exhibition was considered to be representative by fellow collectors. For example Freer wrote to Mansfield commenting that:

The list you have prepared seems to me very excellent and thoroughly representative of Whistler's etched work.²⁷

This was not the only display in which Mansfield was involved that was considered 'representative.' William A. Coffin also praised Mansfield for his selection of works to be displayed at the Pan American Exposition in 1901; Coffin commented:

The list as you have made out seems to me remarkably interesting and I am, as I have said before, delighted to know that we shall have a thoroughly representative display of Whistler's etchings.²⁸

By displaying a 'representative' arrangement Mansfield was showing the full diversity of Whistler's work in the medium and therefore educating the audience and promoting the artist.

As I discussed in chapter one, while Mansfield's collection was not complete, it can and should be considered a representative collection of Whistler's etchings as it included impressions from the full range of Whistler's etching oeuvre. For this same

²⁷ C. L. Freer to Howard Mansfield, April 8 1893, folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
²⁸ William A. Coffin to Howard Mansfield, April 30 1901, Folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
reason the *World’s Columbian Exposition* can be considered representative. The etchings exhibited included examples from the “French Set”, “Thames Set”, “First Venice Set” and “Second Venice Set;” etchings ranging in date from 1858 through to 1889; multiple subject matters, differing compositions, techniques and styles are all displayed. These facts lead one to assume that the works were carefully selected with the aim of showing the range of Whistler’s achievements. Mansfield states this clearly, again in his article “Whistler as a Critic of his own Prints”:

> Since [...] the active period in the career of Whistler as an etcher had then virtually ceased, the etchings thus selected, with such others as he [Whistler] specifically indicated in his revision of the list, would still furnish a representative survey of the etched work of the master.29

Interestingly, the idea of displaying a range of Whistler’s etched work is, as Getscher argues, what Whistler was aiming for with the selection and arrangement of works for the original *Arrangement in White and Yellow*30 show. Getscher argues that:

> Whistler’s purpose in this exhibition was to suggest the complete range of his etchings. There is no sense of completeness, of tidy sets, as in the first exhibition of Venice prints. Nor was this merely an attempt to bring in new orders for prints. Some would never be sold in any quantity. Several of the prints were drypoints, taken from plates that had been pulled. Others had no popular appeal. But all of these impressions were important in an exhibition that presented the complete scope of Whistler’s Venetian prints.31

While Whistler was selecting from his Venetian etchings, which had been executed during an eighteen-month stay in Venice between 1879 and 1880, Mansfield had a considerably larger amount of etchings from which to select, ranging in date from 1855 to 1893. Yet their aims are similar – to show the complexity and entirety of Whistler’s work in the medium.

29 Mansfield, “Whistler as a Critic of his Own Prints,” p.24
30 Getscher gives an analysis of the hanging method in his thesis *Whistler and Venice*, (Case Western Reserve University Ph.D, 1970; University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1983) The author gives an in depth consideration to the groupings that make up the complete hanging, see chapter IV, pp. 35-47
31 Getscher, *Whistler and Venice*, p. 35
The small space afforded to Whistler at the *World's Columbian Exposition*, did not allow Mansfield to exhibit all of the etchings he would have wished. As the collector states:

> From lack of space the display at Chicago was very considerably less than those who contributed the prints would have liked to make it, and considerations of effect in a large space kept out some of the exquisite small etchings, […]\(^{32}\)

The physical practicalities of the exhibition space impacted upon Mansfield’s decision of what to display. For the *Arrangement in White and Yellow* show Whistler did not face the same problems. Firstly the etchings of which he was making a show were considerably smaller in number and secondly Whistler had the means to exert more control over the exhibition space – in terms of design and colour. The above quote is also interesting as it shows how more than one collector was involved. Mansfield writes that:

> Such impressions as were finally shown were sought from collectors all over the country and were of the highest quality, […]\(^{33}\)

While Mansfield was responsible for organising and arranging the display, other collectors had an interest because part of their collection was being displayed. For example George Bramhall, a fellow Whistler collector, who exhibited three etchings at the show, wrote to Mansfield to give his opinion on what should be displayed:

> If object of the list is comprehensiveness (which seems evident in selecting “The Unsafe Tenement”, “The Storm”, “Longshoremen”, “The Velvet Dress” and “Fumette Standing”) it occurs to me that the “Wine Glass” should not be left out, and a fine impression of “Hungerford Bridge”, (which

\(^{32}\) Mansfield, “Whistler as a Critic of his Own Prints,” p. 28.

\(^{33}\) Ibid. p. 24.
I believe you have) I regard as having strong claims to a place in the proposed exhibit.  

It is interesting that Bramhall had seen Mansfield’s collection; as stated in chapter two it was after viewing Mansfield’s collection that Freer became enamoured with Whistler’s etchings. This points to a personal level of promotion on the part of Mansfield. The above episode is also further evidence that Mansfield was not only organising exhibitions but also co-ordinating loans from fellow collectors and dealers. One possible reason Mansfield had for going to such lengths (for he could have exhibited more easily available impressions from his own collection) was to give Whistler the best possible display that American collectors had to offer, thereby encouraging the artist to invest time and effort in those who wanted to acquire his work in America.

Mansfield would go on to co-ordinate loans from collectors and dealers at future exhibitions such as the Whistler memorial show held by the Copley Society in Boston, 1904. The collector would also organise exhibitions made up entirely from his own collection, such as the St. Botolph Club show held in 1894 and a later show held in Boston in 1910.

Returning to the example of the World’s Columbian Exposition, Whistler exhibited as an American artist. This is significant as the artist used his expatriate status at international exhibitions (where artists and the arts were grouped according to nationality) to manoeuvre himself between countries in order to secure the best possible display for his works. For example at the 1889 Universal exposition held in

---

11 George W. Bramhall to Howard Mansfield, March 17 1893, folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

Paris Whistler submitted paintings and etchings to the American section, but when the American section rejected some of the etchings Whistler moved his entries to the British section. In 1892, probably in acknowledgment of the flexible nature of Whistler's nationality, Halsey C. Ives wrote to Whistler eager to secure the artist for the American section:

> It is the desire of every person connected with the American Section of the Department of Fine Arts of the World's Columbian Exposition that it should take a place among the various sections of the Exposition, that may entitle it to the respect of competent judges.

> In this direction, we are exceedingly anxious to have a group of your works placed in our section.

He continues this in another letter:

> We are exceedingly anxious to bring together the works of the best Americans, in the United States section, no matter where the artist may reside.

Furthermore, in an effort to coax Whistler over to the American section Ives writes:

> Should you consent to exhibit a group of your pictures in the American Section, I shall be pleased to do everything in my power to place them in a manner in keeping with the dignity, knowledge and artistic feeling which they possess.

Figure 4.3 shows the display of Whistler's etchings that Ives secured and Mansfield designed for Whistler. The etchings are hung three deep, which may seem crowded, but when considered in terms of the Royal Academy or Paris salon exhibitions is relatively luxurious. The etchings shown as part of the *Arrangement in White and Yellow*, exhibited in 1883 were double hung and therefore it is safe to assume that Mansfield had attempted to adopt Whistler's more spacious hanging technique. The

---

35 Lori K. Okerstrom, *The American Exhibitions of James McNeill Whistler*, p.120.
38 Halsey Coats Ives to Whistler, [October 1892], LoC, MD PWC 12/14, GUW 11502, accessed 2007-09-19.
etchings are also hung with ample space surrounding each one; a technique adopted from Whistlerian exhibition design. As one can see the display is separated into three sections over three screens. When planning this display Mansfield wrote to Ives to comment upon the effect the screens would have on the overall display:

It would be best I think to hang them altogether on the wall space between [small diagram] two screens. They would just about fill one each space, with a little to spare for some of the new French Etchings. Otherwise they should be divided into three groups, one for the left hand screen, one for the wall space, to the right of it and one for the right hand screen as indicated on the plan, the group in every case to be in the middle of the space. But they will not hold together nearly so well as if all are put on the wall space. For they have been arranged after much study, and careful measurements.^^

A display in which Mansfield received a wall space as opposed to the separate screens was at the Pan American Exposition of 1901 (see figure 4.4 and 4.5). Figure 4.4 shows Mansfield’s sketch for the hanging arrangement at the Pan American Exposition held in Buffalo (evidence that Mansfield was able to visualise the exhibition space, much in the way a curator would do). The etchings are hung three deep, like those at Chicago; ample room is left around the etchings so that they are not crowded, in fact the displays at Buffalo and Chicago are very similar. Mansfield sent a photograph of the Buffalo display (figure 4.5) to Whistler in an effort to gain the artist’s approval. Whistler commented on the display in a letter of September 1901:

The charming arrangement of the prints is due, I know, to your own perfect taste – and I thank you for making such a brave show for me!^^

[^^]: Howard Mansfield to Halsey Coats Ives, April 6 1893, folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
[^^]: Mansfield himself noted this, he wrote: “Mr. Whistler was consulted with regard to the exhibition of his etchings at Buffalo in 1901, when many fewer plates were represented, impressions from all of which had been included in the exhibition at Chicago, and all of which were exhibited to his satisfaction.” “Whistler as a Critic of his own Prints,” p.28.

The display at the *Pan American Exposition* was successful because the proportions of the etchings on display were balanced well and symmetrical, with the central focus of Whistler’s largest etching *The Palaces* (K187) pulling the group together. With this well-balanced arrangement Mansfield has managed to exhibit diverse works, showing examples from the “French Set” and later Venetian etchings.⁴²

At the *World’s Columbian Exposition* Mansfield had the challenge of maintaining the cohesiveness of the selected works while displaying them on three separate screens. Looking at figure 4.3 and considering the aforementioned letter to Ives, we can see that Mansfield has opted to display the etchings in three smaller groups because of the divisions the screens impose. In a letter to Whistler Mansfield writes his plans for the display:

“I have arranged the etchings for the most part in chronological order, but so that the Venice etchings will be grouped in the centre. There, too, they will be hung in three lines.”⁴³

One could infer that Mansfield had a preference for the Venice etchings since the centre screen is the one that pulls the display together and as such would possibly receive the most attention. However if one considers this arrangement more carefully we see that it does indeed make sense to have the Venice etchings at the centre if the works are to be displayed chronologically. Further evidence to suggest Mansfield’s preference for the Venice etchings comes in the fact that the collector had planned to create a display of only the Venice etchings at the *Pan American Exposition*. William

---

⁴² See Appendix A: ‘D15: Buffalo, 1901’ for details of what was displayed.
A. Coffin insisted that this display be extended to include more examples of Whistler's etched work.\footnote{William A. Coffin to Howard Mansfield, April 26 1901, Folder 15 no. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.}

Mansfield went on to expose 55,000 Americans\footnote{Harrison Smith to Charles Lang Freer, 2 March 1903, GUL MS Whistler P271, GUW 04631, accessed 2007-08-15} to Whistler's etchings when he organised them at the 71st Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in 1902. This show had much in common with the Pan American Exposition, as it was the Pan American Exposition that had inspired the gallery executives to contact Mansfield and make a show. The Pennsylvania Academy show was on a much larger scale and is most significant for the fact that Whistler's exhibit won a gold medal (figure 4.6), which Mansfield secured on The Palaces. While no photograph or description of this hang survives, the strong links to the Buffalo show allows one to assume that a similarly balanced and symmetrical hang would have been in place, with The Palaces taking centre stage and displaying the gold medal proudly. Mansfield wrote to the gallery organisers at the Pennsylvania Academy of Arts revealing the clear connection between the Pan American Exposition and the Pennsylvania show.

I have now completed a representative list of Whistler etchings, all of which I am willing to lend for the coming exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, or so many as the space at command will allow. My list embraces sixty-seven prints, which could be arranged in three rows in fashion similar to that of the arrangement at the Pan-American Exposition. This arrangement would require a line of space of about 36 feet. It will, of course, require forty-five more frames, for which separate mounts will have to be made. These mounts I shall have to furnish myself, in order to have them uniform with the mounts already used. The frames will have to be made by Messrs. Wunderlich & Company of 220 Fifth Avenue. The cost of the mounts will be $0.40 a piece, and the cost of the frames and fittings with boxing and expressage, will be from $3.00 to $3.50 for each frame.\footnote{Howard Mansfield to Harris S. Morris, December 6 1901, Folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.}
As mentioned previously Whistler was very specific in the framing of his etchings and at the *Arrangement in White and Yellow* show displayed the prints in thin white frames decorated with either two painted brown lines or veneered brown lines (figure 4.1). If one looks closely at figure 4.3 and 4.5 we can see that Mansfield is using Whistlerian designed frames. In fact he is not only using them but also, as the above quote reveals, commissioning them to be made specifically for shows in which he is involved. This is further evidence that Mansfield was not only aware of Whistler's exhibition techniques but was actively employing them.

Whistler relied upon the correspondence of his American dealers and collectors for information on the display and success of his US exhibitions. In the case of the *World's Columbian Exposition* Whistler seems to have been kept in the dark. He writes to E. G. Kennedy expressing concern over the lack of information he had been given about the show:

> You say *nothing at all* about the etchings — and their placing, from which I judge that they are badly hung — and no award! — I must say I really do hope this is the case: -after reading the list of English awards!!!

However, news whatever it may be, we think you ought to send us — So don’t try to wriggle out of anything — but write out the exact list, or send the official statement of the American awards — Tell us exactly how the paintings are hung — Where is the communication whatever on the matter of my exhibition over there at any time — since the first letter requesting the loan of works? I mean no card of invitation — no catalogue — no amenities of any sort.  

Whistler’s worries for the *World’s Columbian Exposition* were eased by Freer, who wrote to the artist in January 1894, commenting that:

---

47 Whistler to Edward Guthrie Kennedy, 10 November 1893, GUL MS Whistler W121, GUW 07223, accessed 2007-08-15.
Of the etchings and dry points and their selection, arrangement and location too much favourably cannot be said.\(^{43}\)

With the *World's Columbian Exposition* a success, the next major exhibition that Mansfield organised was the St Botolph Club show of 1894. This show displayed 154 etchings, all of which came from Mansfield's collection. This was the first show that exclusively displayed Mansfield's collection. The Pennsylvania and the Buffalo shows mentioned earlier were made up entirely of Mansfield's Whistler etching collection but are later in date.

At all of the exhibitions discussed Mansfield loaned to and curated the display. The fact that it was his own personal collection that was shown in the majority is one reason for Mansfield taking an interest in arranging these exhibitions. However, one cannot deny that these exhibitions played a part in promoting Whistler's art to an audience with whom the artist had no direct contact. Collectors like Mansfield, who where willing to loan their collection and display it on Whistler's terms, played an integral and vital role.

So far we have seen Mansfield involved in four successful exhibitions, two from the early to mid 1890s and two from the turn of the century just before the artist's death. These exhibitions, as I have shown, promoted Whistler's art during Whistler's lifetime. After the artist's death the promotional motivation altered to one of preserving the artist's status as a master. Mansfield was involved with this also as he was one of the men responsible for the design and hanging at the *Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, held in February 1904 (see Appendix A


‘DB7: Boston, 1904’). A section of this exhibition displayed etchings, dry points and lithographs. Mansfield loaned one hundred and eighty of the two hundred and thirty-five etchings on show. Other lenders include Freer, Francis Bullard, Albert W. Scholle, T Jefferson Coolidge Jr., and Whistler’s sister-in-law Rosalind Birnie-Philip. Not one of these lenders contributed on the same scale as Mansfield. The collector is listed as one of the 41 members of the “Honorary committee” for the exhibition, alongside Halsey C. Ives (with whom Mansfield was in contact regarding the World’s Columbian Exposition), Avery, Birnie-Philip, Freer and the Pennells.

There is also a “Committee in charge” listed at the back of the catalogue; it lists 19 people, although Mansfield is not mentioned here. In correspondence with Birnie Philip, Freer advised the committee of this exhibition:

[...] that the general arrangement for hanging the etchings and lithographs be delegated to a special committee of which Mr. Mansfield shall be Chairman. He is experienced, competent and energetic - he also is reasonable and open to suggestions.49

Photographs of the etching display at this memorial exhibition exist (see figures 4.7 and 4.8). The eye level, “sparse” hanging, seating, and balanced arrangement are all elements adopted from Whistler’s exhibiting methods. The hanging arrangement and design for this exhibition has something in common with those previously discussed. Looking at figure 4.7 and 4.8 we can see that Mansfield has again used the Whistlerian frame he commissioned for use at the World’s Columbian Exposition, Pan American Exposition and the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art shows.

When in correspondence with Birnie-Philip over the decoration of the memorial show, Freer writes something very revealing:

49 Charles Lang Freer to Rosalind Birnie Philip, September 16th 1903, Box 19 Folder 3, FGA.
About the colour of the rooms, I will let you know all. Would not a pale yellowish white do nicely as a background for the etchings? Such as Mr. Whistler authorized Wunderlich of New York to use for the early exhibitions of his etchings and something like that used in the Knightsbridge International room of 1899, in which were hung Mr. Whistler’s prints, only better colour of course? Mansfield too, at Chicago during the World’s Fair used a white or yellowish white, creamish white perhaps, background, upon which the prints in frames hung.  

This quote suggests that the Whistler memorial exhibition and the *World Columbian Exposition* adopted their colour scheme from the 1883 *Arrangement in White and Yellow* show. The memorial exhibition is an example of the way in which Mansfield’s collection and Mansfield the collector played an important role in promoting Whistler’s art while using the design techniques the artist had developed in the early eighties as a model.

If we compare the *World’s Columbian Exposition* with the Boston memorial show, we can see that in this eleven year period one row of etchings has been dropped, and the move toward a more modern method of displaying art quite evident. Mansfield was not the only person who appreciated and used newer methods of displaying art works. Emil H. Richter, the gallery co-ordinator for the *Exhibition of Etchings and Dry-Points by James Abbott McNeill Whistler* held in Boston in 1910, wrote to Mansfield concerning the show:

*In planning our new exhibition rooms for prints, I purposely restricted the exhibition space. After seeing many exhibitions here & abroad, and after devoting a good deal of thought to this subject, I am convinced that the most satisfying exhibition - for the average art loving visitor - is that restricted in*

---

50 Charles L. Freer to Rosalind B. Philip, 16 September 1903, Folder 3, Box 19, FGA.
51 *Exhibition of Etchings and Dry-Points by James Abbott McNeill Whistler*, held at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston in 1910, is an important exhibition to consider because Mansfield contributed to it in every way. The catalogue for this 1910 exhibition lists the etchings in order of their display cases; over fifty cases are listed with between eight and twelve etchings shown inside them in roughly chronological order. The collector selected and loaned all of the etchings on display, curated the exhibition, designed the hanging arrangement and wrote the catalogue.
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number, not crowded, showing each print under good conditions of light and in an inconspicuous setting.\(^2\)

Mansfield replies, acknowledging and agreeing with Richter’s commitment to an uncon­
crowded design. Mansfield writes:

I fully appreciate the necessity of giving each print due spacing and avoiding the crowding of the prints, and while naturally I would like to see my entire
collection arrayed in a large exhibition room, I would not care to hang too many at the expense of a proper showing. […]

I should, of course, wish to make the selection of the prints to be exhibited and should wish a statement in the catalogue to the effect that those which are shown are selected from my entire collection, the number of which should be stated, and that the entire collection is not shown simply for the reason of lack of space for their suitable display. In other words, I naturally wish to avoid the impression that the prints which are not shown are withheld because of inferiority to those which are exhibited.\(^3\)

The fact that Mansfield is concerned that impressions from his collection may be considered inferior because they are not exhibited has financial implications. If Mansfield planned to sell his collection he had to preserve and enhance its reputation, in order to do this the collector had to make clear that the collection was of a certain quality and that any impressions not exhibited were neglected for reasons other than quality. This example will be returned to shortly as the reasons behind Mansfield displaying his collection and organising exhibitions shall be discussed.

Mansfield-organised exhibitions won medals, memorialised the artist and were possibly seen by millions of people. The promotional effect of these facts cannot be denied. It is now time to consider the reasons why Mansfield was involved in these exhibitions.

\(^{2}\) Emil H. Richter to Howard Mansfield, July 16 1909, folder 8, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.

\(^{3}\) Howard Mansfield to Emil H. Richter, July 24 1909, folder 8, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.
In all probability the collector’s motivations in arranging Whistler exhibitions lay, as Lee Wiehl argues, in the promotion of an American artist to an American audience, thus raising the status of US print collectors and collections to the same level as those of European.  

Many of the collectors and dealers with whom Mansfield was in contact concerning exhibitions commented upon Mansfield’s ‘public spirit.’ For example William A. Coffin, the man Mansfield was in contact with about the Pan American Exposition noted Mansfield’s ‘kindness and public spirit in lending your etchings,’ Francis Bullard noted this same ‘public spirit’:

You are really very public spirited to be so willing to help the Print Department in the Boston Museum — and I cannot say half enough how much I appreciate your kindness, speaking for those of the public who love prints, [...]

Harris S. Morris of the Pennsylvania Academy of Arts also thanked Mansfield for his generosity to the Pennsylvania Academy show by commenting on the public’s interest in it:

Trust that you may be inclined to accord us this coveted favour, which is also a favour to a very large public, [...]

All of these examples point to Mansfield as being generous and thinking of the American public. This is not a selfless motivation as Mansfield did gain from

---

54 Wiehl argues that ‘Encouraged, enthralled, and provoked by Whistler, they established the idea that print collections on this side of the Atlantic might rival in quality those in Europe.’ p. 3
55 William A. Coffin to Howard Mansfield, April 26 1901, Folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.
56 Francis Bullard to Howard Mansfield, July 6th 1909, Folder 8, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.
57 Harrison S. Morris to Howard Mansfield September 29 1901, Folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

exhibiting his collection. For example Harris S. Morris continues with the statement that:

The etchings have met with many critical acknowledgments in the press of New York and this city and I trust you will feel this is in some degree a return for lending the works.58

The above quote implies a sort of promotion of Mansfield as a collector and his collection through the ‘critical acknowledgments’ of the press. This acknowledgment would not only enhance Mansfield’s reputation as a munificent collector but would serve to enhance the reputation of his collection. When considered in relation to arguments put forward in chapter one – that the lineage of a print, or the fact that it belonged to a prestigious collection, enhanced its interest and value – one can reasonably assume that Mansfield’s motivation was that of enhancing his own collection’s reputation.

Conclusion

When the Pennells declared that:

In America, we regret, the art of picture hanging is hardly known and has hardly been practised save two or three Whistler exhibitions held since Whistler’s death, and then not altogether successfully.39

They neglected to realise the impact that Whistler’s exhibition designs had in America, and they underestimated those involved in exhibiting Whistler’s art to the US public. The examples provided have shown that when Whistler’s etchings were exhibited, they were displayed in a fashion in keeping with the artist’s own exhibition designs. It is in part a triumph of Whistler’s installation ideas that they managed to

58 Harris S. Morris to Howard Mansfield January 21 1902, Folder 15 No. 2, Howard Mansfield Papers, MAD, NYPL.

39 Pennells, Life, p.304

travel and be influential despite the artist remaining in Europe. The collectors and dealers involved, especially Mansfield, deserve credit also, as without them, Whistler etchings and exhibitions would not have been possible in the US.
Conclusion

When one begins research into Whistler certain names will stand out in relation to the artist, these names include Kennedy, Freer, Huish, Menpes, Avery, Wilde and of course the Pennells. Certain institutions will be referenced frequently, such as the Fine Art Society, Grosvenor Gallery, Freer Gallery, Glasgow University and H Wunderlich & Co. If one decides to narrow their focus, as I have done to America, collectors and etchings; the names Kennedy, Freer, Avery and H. Wunderlich & Co. take on more significance; not at one point during the beginning of ones introduction to the study of Whistler will Mansfield’s name be highlighted in any significant way. One of the chief aims of this thesis was to place Mansfield alongside the figures of Avery and Freer and to make a case for the recognition of Mansfield in Whistler scholarship.

The reason why Mansfield’s collection and activities are rarely discussed and relegated to footnotes is because his collection dispersed. There was no physical body of Mansfield’s collecting activities to be studied. Despite this Mansfield’s collection makes one notable appearance in the Pennells biography of Whistler. The Pennells’ state that Mansfield was:

[...] furnished with some of his most interesting prints, aided and directed in their collection, hoping, of course, that they would be left to a museum. But Mr. Mansfield sold his collection for an enormous price, altogether out of proportion to what Whistler received.¹

This statement is extremely interesting as it is evidence of Whistler’s wish that Mansfield’s collection should become part of a public institution. With this intention of Whistler’s in mind one can see that many of the examples given throughout this

thesis point to Whistler taking a special interest in Mansfield's collection. For example, the 'Not for Mansfield' inscription in the H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books as well as the anecdote Mansfield relates about Whistler refusing him an etching (see chapter three) and the inscriptions Whistler wrote upon the impressions (see chapter one) show Whistler exerting control over what entered Mansfield's collection. Despite an earlier anti-American attitude from Whistler (as discussed in chapter one) his US patrons became of increasing importance to him. Whistler's motivations for manipulating Mansfield's collection are reasonable and in a way necessary because Mansfield was responsible for promoting Whistler to an American audience with which the artist had no direct contact (as argued in chapter four). Part of Whistler's interest in Mansfield's collection must have been his intention for the collector's prints to eventually become part of a permanent collection.

Why Whistler wanted Mansfield's collection to become part of a permanent collection is obvious, his motivation was that of immortality, a way to establish and maintain his legacy after his death. The notion of immortality achieved through a collection is not only applicable to Whistler; Susan M. Pearce lists this as one of the motivations for collecting. If immortality had been one of Mansfield's motivations then why did he sell his collection? The answer to this question is revealed in a letter the collector sent to Joseph Pennell in defence of his decision to sell his collection. Mansfield explained that:

You speak of approval of the sale of my Meryon's to the Chicago Art Institute, and add that you hoped that I could make the same disposition of my Whistlers. Well, I would have been only too happy to have done that; but the Art Institute had acquired through the Bryan Lathrop bequest, a very

---

2 This is exemplified by the fact that it was Whistler's American collectors that he called upon to provide him with the prints he wanted for the Paris Exposition of 1900. See Mansfield, "Whistler as a Critic of His Own Prints," p.29-20 and Lochnan, The Etchings of James McNeill Whistler, p. 269

3 For an analysis of Pearce's list please see Russell W. Belt, Collecting in a Consumer Society, p.103
fine collection of Whistler's etchings and an almost complete collection of
his lithographs, and there was no other art institution [...] prepared to
purchase my collection. [...] since there was so much of my money in it that
neither I nor my family could possibly afford to give it to an institution, my
only chance of having the collection kept intact after my death lay in
acceptance of the unexpected offer to buy it with that assurance.*

Mansfield sold his collection for financial reasons. His collection was sold through
the dealers A. H. Hahlo & Co. to the collector Harris Whittemore of Connecticut.
The price that Mansfield received for his collection was over three hundred thousand
dollars. Lugt states that the collection was bought for three hundred and fifty
thousand; a newspaper report of the sale has the price at the impressive figure of five
hundred thousand dollars, with the comment that a collection of the same quality
could not be purchased for less then one million†. Whatever the exact monetary value
of Mansfield's collection, the fact that the figure stands as high as the hundred
thousands marks the collection out as one of great quality and of an exceedingly high
standard. The selling of his collection does not exclude Mansfield completely from
the motivation of immortality. Consider his other activities – he gifted his Japanese
collection to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, his Meryon collection went to the Art
Institute of Chicago and he strongly defended his acquisition of Turner's Liber
Studiorum when he wasn't acknowledged.

While this thesis has established Mansfield's collection and activities as important,
and in on the same scale (contemporarily) with Avery and Freer's, it has also realised
many idiosyncrasies. For example, Mansfield maintained that he collected for
aesthetic reasons, yet his collection shows us that rarity was an important factor;

* Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell, 1920, Pennell Collection, LoC
† Frits Lugt, Les Marques de Collections de Sessins & d'Estampes, p.240
‡ "Mansfield Sells Whistlers," American Art News, New York City, 8 February 1919, Whistler
Scrapbook II p.34, FGA.

Mansfield sold his Whistler collection, yet he gifted his Japanese collection. Mansfield acted as a connoisseur when he created his catalogue raisonné, yet a more personal print lover approach was applied to his personal collection. These idiosyncrasies find their best explanation in Walter Benjamin's theory that:

There are many kinds of collector, and in any one there is a host of impulses at work.®

In the figure of Howard Mansfield we can see proof of Benjamin’s assumption, since Mansfield is - at once - a private collector, connoisseur, exhibition organiser and designer, a promoter and perhaps most of all, admirer of Whistler's graphic art. It is because of the complexity of Mansfield’s collection and collecting activities that he is a significant figure in the history of print collecting.

---

Bibliography

Books


Black, Peter: *Copper into Gold; Whistler and 19th century Printmaking*, (Hunterian Art Gallery, 2003)


Purchasing, Praising and Promoting Whistler's Etchings
The American Collector Howard Mansfield, (1849- 1938).


Getscher; Robert H.: *Whistler and Venice*, (Case Western Reserve University Ph.D, 1970; University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1983)


Hamerton, Philip Gilbert: *Etching and Etchers*, (Macmillan and Co., London, 1876)


Hitchcock, J. R. W: *Etching in America, with lists of American Etchers and Notable Collections of Prints*, (White, Stokes & Allen, New York, 1886)


MacDonald, Margaret F.: *Palaces in the Night: Whistler in Venice*, (Lund Humphries, Hampshire, 2001)

McNamara, Carole and Stewart, John: *Whistler: Prosaic Views, Poetic vision: Works on paper from the University of Michigan Museum of Art*, (Thames and Hudson, the university of Michigan Museum of Art, 1994.)
Maberly, Joseph: *The Print Collector: An introduction to the Knowledge necessary for forming A Collection of Ancient Prints, with an introduction containing Fielding's treatise on the practice of Engraving.* (Dodd, Mead & Company, New York, 1880)

Merrill, Linda: *A pot of paint: aesthetics on trial in Whistler v. Ruskin,* (Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institute, Washington D.C., 1992)


Meyer, Agnes E.: *Charles Lang Freer and His Gallery,* (Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1970) pp.3-23


Wedmore, Frederick: *Etching In England*, (George Bell and Sons, London, 1895)


**Catalogue Raisonnés.**

Delteil, Loys: *Catalogue raisonné of the etchings of Charles Meryon*, (Colnaghi, London, 1924)


Kennedy, Edward Guthrie: *Catalogue of etchings by J. McN. Whistler, compiled by an amateur. Supplementary to that compiled by F. Wedmore*. (Wunderlich, New York, 1902)


Rovinski, Dmitri: *L'Oeuvre gravé de Rembrandt reproduction des planches originales dans tous leurs états successifs ... 1000 phototypies sans retouches. Avec un catalogue raisonné par Dmitri Rovinski*, (imprimerie de l'académie impériale des sciences, Saint-Pétersbourg, 1890)


Wedmore, Frederick: *Whistler's Etchings: A Study and a Catalogue*, (A. W. Thibaudeau, 18 Green Street, St. Martin's Place, London, 1886)

Exhibition/Sale Catalogues

Mr. Whistler's etchings of Venice, (The Fine Art Society, London, 1880)


"Notes" - "Harmonies" - "Nocturnes" (H. Wunderlich & Co., New York, 1889)

Revised catalogue, with index of exhibitors, edited by the Department of Fine Arts, World's Columbian Exposition, (Conkey, Chicago, 1893)

Exhibition of Etchings from the Collection of Howard Mansfield, (Boston, 1894)

Etchings, Drypoints and Lithographs, (H. Wunderlich & Co., New York, 1898)

A catalogue of the pictures, drawings, prints and sculptures at the second exhibition of the International Society of Sculptors, Painters & Gravers held at Knightsbridge, May-July 1899, (Ward, London, [1899?])

Catalogue of an Exhibition of the Etchings of James McNeill Whistler, January Thirty First to February Twenty Second, 1900, (Caxton Club, Chicago, 1900)

Catalogue of the exhibition of fine arts, (Pan American Exposition, Buffalo, 1901)
Catalogue of a collection of etchings and dry points by Whistler recently acquired, (H Wunderlich & Co., New York, 1903)

Exhibition of etchings by J. McNeill Whistler, (Obach & Co., London, 1903.)


Etchings, Dry Points & Lithographs. Memorial Exhibition of the works of J. McNeill Whistler, (Copley Society, Boston, 1904)

Paintings, Drawings, Etchings and Lithographs: Memorial Exhibition of the works of J. McNeill Whistler organized by the International Society of Sculptors and Gravers, (ISSPG, London, 1905)

A Catalogue of Etchings and Drawings by Charles Meryon and Portraits of Meryon in the Howard Mansfield Collection, (The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, 1911)

A Whistler Centenary, with an Introduction by Howard Mansfield, October 16th to November 17th 1934, (M. Knoedler & Co. Inc, New York, 1934)

Etchings and Drawings by Charles Meryon in the Howard Mansfield Collection, (The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, 1911)


Tedeschi, Martha: Under pressure: Western Printmaking from the 15th Century to the Present, (Exh Cat. Sept23-Nov 12, 1989, Centre for the Arts, 3001 Riverside Park Dr, Vero Beach, Florida, 32963.)


Journals.


Purchasing, Praising and Promoting Whistler's Etchings:
The American Collector Howard Mansfield, (1849-1938).


Archives

Freer Gallery of Art Archives, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.

Whistler Press Cutting Books 1-24, Glasgow University Library, Glasgow University

Howard Mansfield Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library

Pennell Collection, Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Web Addresses

www.whistler.arts.gla.ac.uk/correspondence

www.grolierclub.org accessed 2007-08-15

www.huntsearch.gla.ac.uk
Figures

Figure 1.1: James McNeill Whistler: *The Pool*, 1859, etching on paper, fourth state, K43
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, Whistler Etching’s Project, Glasgow University

Figure 1.2: Frederick Keppel Sales Figures

Keppel Modern Etching Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1.3A: James McNeill Whistler: *The Forge*, 1860, etching on paper, first state, K68
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 1.3B: James McNeill Whistler: *The Forge*, 1860, etching on paper, third state, K68
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 1.4: James McNeill Whistler: *Weary*, 1863, etching on paper, first state, K92
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 1.5A: James McNeill Whistler: *Zaandam*, 1889, etching on paper, first state, K416
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 1.5B: James McNeill Whistler: *Zaandam*, 1889, etching on paper, second state, K416
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 1.6 James McNeill Whistler: *Thames Police*, 1859, etching on paper, K044
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 1.7: James McNeill Whistler: *Turret Ships*, 1887, etching on paper, K321
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 1.8: James McNeill Whistler: *Nocturne: Shipping*, 1879/1880, etching on paper, K223
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 1.9: James McNeill Whistler: *Battersea Reach*, 1860, etching on paper, K090,
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 2.1: James McNeill Whistler: *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, etching on paper, K1
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 2.2: James McNeill Whistler: *Nocturne: Salute*, first state, 1879/1880, etching on paper, K226
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 2.3: James McNeill Whistler: *Archway, Brussels*, 1887, etching on paper, first state, K366
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 2.4: James McNeill Whistler: *La Vielle aux Loques*, 1858, etching on paper, K21
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 2.5: James McNeill Whistler: *The Scotch Widow*, 1872/1874, etching on paper, K142
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 2.6: James McNeill Whistler: *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, etching on paper, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1898.411, K1

Figure 2.7: James McNeill Whistler: *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, etching on paper, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1913.198, K1
Image: http://www.asia.si.edu/collections/zoomObject.cfm?ObjectId=7282 accessed 2007-05-09
Figure 2.8: James McNeill Whistler: *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, etching on paper, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. F1897.17, K1
Reproduction courtesy of FGA

Figure 2.9: Leather case containing copper plate of *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., K1
Photographed by Natalie Reid at the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.

Figure 2.10: Copper Plate for *Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate*, 1854-1855, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., K1
Photographed by Natalie Reid at the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
Figure 2.11: James McNeill Whistler: *Little Smithfield*, 1875-1876, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1901.19, K160
Reproduction courtesy of FGA

Figure 2.12: James McNeill Whistler: *Little Smithfield*, reverse of tab showing Mansfield’s Collector’s mark, 1875-1876, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1901.19, K160
Photographed by Natalie Reid at the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
Figure 2.13 & 2.14: Freer’s collector’s stamp, made by Theodore B. Starr, 206 Fifth Ave. Madison Square, New York, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1906.311
Photographed by Natalie Reid at the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.

Figure 2.15: James McNeill Whistler: *Long House-Dyer's-Amsterdam*, reverse showing Freer’s collector’s mark, K406, 1889, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., F1906.118
Photographed by Natalie Reid at the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
Figure 3.1: James McNeill Whistler: *Liverdun*, 1858, etching on paper, first state, K16
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 3.2: James McNeill Whistler: *The Balcony*, 1879/1880, etching on paper, tenth state, K207
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 3.3: James McNeill Whistler: *Ponte del Piovan*, 1879/1880, etching on paper, fifth state, K209
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU.

Figure 3.4: James McNeill Whistler: *La Mère Gérard, Stooping*, 1858, etching on paper, K12
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU.
Figure 3.5: James McNeill Whistler: Finette, 1859, etching on paper, second state, K58
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 3.6: James McNeill Whistler: Maude Standing, 1873/1878, etching on paper, first state, K114
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 3.7: James McNeill Whistler: *Maud, Seated*, 1873/1875, etching on paper, first state, K115
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU

Figure 3.8: James McNeill Whistler: *Fitzroy Square*, 1881/1883, etching on paper, first state, KapplII
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 3.9 James McNeill Whistler: *Wood’s Fruit Shop*, 1887, etching on paper, K265
Reproduction courtesy of Dr. G. Petri, WEP, GU
Figure 4.1 Whistlerian Etching Frame, Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow University
Reproduction courtesy of Sarah Parkerson, Ph. D. Student, Glasgow University
Figure 4.2: World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893, plan
Reproduced from: Revised catalogue, with index of exhibitors, edited by the Department of Fine Arts, World's Columbian Exposition, (Conkey, Chicago, 1893)
Figure 4.3 Whistler Etching Display at World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893
Photograph from Folder 25 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.
Figure 4.4 Ink sketch of hanging arrangement, *Pan American Exposition*, Buffalo, 1901
Photograph from Folder 25 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL

Figure 4.5 *Pan American Exposition*, Buffalo, 1901
Photograph from Folder 25 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL
Figure 4.6 Gold Medal Notice from 71st Annual Exhibition, Pennsylvania Academy of Arts, 1902.
Photograph from Folder 25 No. 2, Howard Mansfield papers, MAD, NYPL.
Figure 4.7: *Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, Copley Society, Boston, February 1904
Photograph courtesy of FGA

Figure 4.8: *Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, Copley Society, Boston, February 1904
Photograph courtesy of FGA
Appendix B: Database Methodology and Resources

Howard Mansfield's Whistler etching collection was dispersed after 1919, when it was sold to Harris G. Whittemore. Therefore in order to examine Mansfield's collection and collecting activities, a reconstruction of the collection was required. Throughout this thesis the database of Mansfield's Whistler etching collection (Appendix A: DB1 Mansfield's Collection) has been used to illustrate the arguments given and as a tool to understand the dynamics of Mansfield's collection. The database can be seen as a virtual record of Mansfield's collection, in the same way records and object files at Museums and Institutions are. It is the subject of this appendix to explain how the database was put together, what resources were used, what research was done and what decisions were made.

My research concentrated on finding recorded proof that Mansfield owned a certain etching; further information such as prices paid, date purchased, date sold etc were rarely mentioned but noted if found. Key to reconstructing the collection was a reference to the state of the etching. My research results took the form of an Access database; all of the information I gathered was entered into this database. An Access database was chosen to record this information because it is searchable, enabling cross-referencing and comparison easily and efficiently.

Research and Resources

In the reconstruction of Mansfield's collection seven different resources were used; they are as follows:
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The American Collector Howard Mansfield, (1849-1938).

- Mansfield’s correspondence with Whistler and Whistler’s associates
- Exhibition catalogues
- Catalogues raisonnés of Whistler’s etchings
- Provenance research using institutions
- Mansfield’s archive at the New York Public Library
- H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books
- The Whistler Etchings Project, Main Database, University of Glasgow

Each resource had a different success rate and provided different information; they will now be discussed in detail.

Using the resource of Whistler’s correspondence available at www.whistler.arts.gla.ac.uk. A total of seventy-eight letters were looked at; these letters were either written by, to or referenced Mansfield. Within these letters twenty-eight etchings were mentioned as either as being owned or in the process of being bought by Mansfield. Rarely was there a reference to the state of the etching, however the purchase price that Mansfield paid was occasionally given, and the price was noted and added to the database. Fifteen of the twenty-eight etchings referenced gave a purchase price. Using the letters as a source for Mansfield’s collection was not as successful as other sources since these twenty-eight entries make up approximately five percent of the database. However it was with the letters that the purchase price was referenced, and only one other source (The H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books) gave this information. The letters are referenced in the bibliography section of the database.

Exhibition catalogues proved to be one of the most successful resource materials because they often contained information regarding the owner of the etching on display. One problem with exhibition catalogues is the volume of them. It proved most effective to work systematically through the years, concentrating on exhibitions
that were held in Mansfield's native America; particularly in New York, Boston and Chicago where Whistler had contacts. Mansfield himself did leave clues as to where to begin. In 1909 the Caxton Club published Mansfield's descriptive catalogue on Whistler's etchings. In this catalogue he references seven etching exhibitions that he regarded as 'fairly representative', the exhibitions listed are:

- *World's Columbian Exposition*, Chicago, 1893
- *Etchings from the Collection of Howard Mansfield*, St. Botolph Club, Boston, 1894
- *Exhibition of the Etchings and Lithographs of James McNeill Whistler*, The Caxton Club, Chicago, 1900
- *71st Annual Exhibition*, Pennsylvania Academy of Arts, Philadelphia, 1902
- *Memorial Exhibition of the Works of Mr. J. McNeill Whistler*, The Copley Society, Boston, 1904
- *Etchings and Dry-points by James McNeill Whistler*, The Grolier Club, New York, 1904

The catalogues of the exhibitions mentioned were consulted except for the Philadelphia show as its catalogue could not be sourced, however a photograph of the display at the exhibition was sourced and the etchings exhibited deduced successfully from that. The catalogue for the Grolier Club show held in New York in 1904 did not give details of lenders, the others however did. For example the catalogue for the Copley Society Whistler memorial exhibition of 1904 listed one hundred and seventy one etchings as being loaned by Mansfield. The most useful exhibition catalogue consulted was published after the publication of Mansfield's catalogue raisonné. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts held an exhibition of Whistler's etchings and drypoints.

---

1 Mansfield: *A Descriptive Catalogue of James McNeill Whistler*, p. lvii
in 1910. At this exhibition every impression was loaned by Mansfield; a massive two hundred and seventy four impressions. Obviously certain etchings were displayed at more than one exhibition, therefore cross-referencing had to be done. The etchings were cross-referenced according to the state that was mentioned in the catalogue. The exhibition column of the database contains the details of which exhibition the said impression was shown in. Separate smaller databases were created which give further details of the exhibition catalogues. These accompany chapter four and are used as aids in understanding Mansfield’s involvement in exhibiting and promoting Whistler’s art in America.

Exhibition catalogues would, on occasion, mention the state of the etching on display, usually in reference to Frederick Wedmore or Mansfield’s catalogue raisonné. Each catalogue raisonné listed a different amount of states for the etchings, and matching the order of states in each exhibition catalogue was impossible because of the subjective nature of the descriptive method used in the catalogues (see chapter three). As a result, the state is more likely to be incorrect than any of the other information in the database. In order to combat this, frequent cross-referencing between the different resources was carried out, with the result that the state given in the database is as close to certain as possible.

A total of four catalogues have been made on Whistler’s etchings. First came Ralph Thomas’ in 1874, following that came Wedmore’s with the Kennedy supplement as mentioned above, thirdly came Mansfield’s own catalogue in 1909 and lastly came Kennedy’s catalogue in 1910 which is relied upon still. The Mansfield and Kennedy catalogues contained a considerable amount of provenance details making them useful
for tracing etchings Mansfield had previously owned. If an etching has been referenced by a catalogue raisonné it is shown in the bibliography section of the database. This was quite a successful method, as the catalogues raisonné not only referenced a considerable amount of etchings, they also gave the state of the etching.

Research on the collections of current institutions was carried out using online resources. For example the Hunterian Art Gallery’s collection can be accessed and searched using www.huntsearch.gla.ac.uk. A search using the Hunterian Art Gallery’s website showed that two etchings in its collection had previously belonged to Mansfield. Other institutions where etchings previously owned by Mansfield have been traced include the Library of Congress, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. and the Yale Centre for British Art, New Haven. Where the majority of Mansfield’s collection now resides is still unknown, however this research method gave the most in-depth information about the actual etching, often giving details of inscriptions, paper, ink, state and full provenance records. Etchings researched in this way are referenced so in the provenance section of the database.

The most useful resource for reconstructing Mansfield’s collection was the Howard Mansfield Papers in the Manuscripts and Archives Division of the New York Public Library. Within these papers the collector himself has catalogued his etching and lithography collection on a series of index cards. These cards catalogued the collection according to Mansfield’s catalogue raisonné, giving details of state, inscriptions, ink colour and paper. This was an excellent resource as it was a record of everything Mansfield owned and was selling on to Whitemore in 1919. There were
also many references to collecting methods and motivations contained within these cards; these are considered throughout the thesis. Due to the fact that this resource was extremely important and revealing it is referenced in full in the ‘NYPL Catalogues’ section of the database.

The H. Wunderlich & Co. stock books were transcribed by Dr. Grischka Petri as part of the Whistler Etchings Project at Glasgow University, and as this thesis is, in a way, an extension of the research happening as part of this project, these stock books were kindly made available. They contain details of when Mansfield purchased or exchanged etchings. This information was then added to the provenance section of the database. The main database at the Whistler Etchings Project was also used on occasions, primarily to correlate information but also on occasion leading to the discovery of new information.

Database Decisions

Using all of the research methods listed I created an Access database with over seven hundred entries. This database included information on the state, the title, the date and other significant information that could help identify the etching. The reason that the number of entries was so high was because certain etchings had been mentioned or exhibited more than once. While it is possible that Mansfield owed multiple copies of the same state of the same etching, it is likely that the same etching in Mansfield’s collection was exhibited and/or referenced multiple times, thus cross referencing was done in order to reduce the number of etchings, giving a clearer picture of Mansfield’s collection. Another reason that the database, which lists four hundred and ninety five
etchings after cross referencing - still relatively high -(Lugt states the collection to contain four hundred and twenty impressions from three hundred and seventy plates)\(^2\) is the fact that the database is a record of all the etchings that Mansfield owned, and therefore etchings which he exchanged are included (see chapter one). These etchings have been included as they are important to consider in the context of Mansfield's collecting methods.

Once the Access database was complete, it was decided that the database should be presented in a form as opposed to a list, making the information easily readable and searchable for those who are using it. Database sections were grouped under similar headings and given their own specific colour to highlight the similar nature of the information shown. For example the ‘Paper’ section is yellow and gives details on inscriptions, paper type and ink colour. An image was also included; these images are state specific and aid the user in visualising Mansfield’s collection\(^3\).

Smaller exhibition specific databases, again presented in form view, were created to be used as appendices to the larger database. These databases record the etchings shown in each of the exhibitions discussed in chapter four, and should be used for reference purposes when reading chapter four.

\(^2\) These numbers are taken from Frits Lugt: *Les Marques de Collections de Dessins & d’Estampes*, (1921) p.240. These calculations have been chosen over Mansfield's catalogue (see Mansfield: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings and Dry-Points of James McNeill Whistler*, (1909)) that states his collection to consist of four hundred and eleven impressions from three hundred and seventy one plates. The decision to choose the Lugt calculations over the Mansfield ones was made because the Lugt catalogue is the most recent in date.

\(^3\) These images were photographed and edited by Dr. Griselda Petri as part of the Whistler Etchings Project, Glasgow University.
Conclusion

The research and resources used can be considered successful because they not only managed to reconstruct Mansfield’s collection on a basic level, but they also gave more in-depth information on inscriptions and paper, thus revealing Mansfield’s relationship with the artist, collecting methods, motivations and preferences. Without this reconstructed database the accompanying thesis would not have been possible, leaving Mansfield’s collecting activities and impact on the American art scene undiscovered.
Appendix C: Howard Mansfield Biography

Howard Mansfield was a New York based lawyer born in Hamden, Connecticut on July 2nd 1849. He studied at Yale and Columbia Universities and was admitted to the bar in October 1874. He became a member of the firm Lord Day and Lord in 1901. The firm was established in 1848 and were based at 49 Wall Street while Mansfield worked for them. Mansfield married Nellie Coolidge Tuttle on September 12th 1895.

Mansfield was a keen collector of James McNeill Whistler’s etchings and lithographs. He began collecting Whistler’s etchings in 1876; his first purchase was the fourth state of The Pool (K43) from Samuel P. Avery’s (1822-1904) Fifth Avenue based print shop. His first meeting with Whistler occurred in London in the summer of 1884. He met Whistler a total of four times. His collection of the artists’ etchings numbered four hundred and twenty impressions from three hundred and seventy plates. Mansfield also had a large collection of the artist’s lithographs and owned Whistler’s drawings and pastels. He sold his collection of Whistler’s etchings and lithographs in 1919 to Harris G. Whittemore of Connecticut (Lugt Supp. 1384). Mansfield introduced a number of American collectors to Whistler’s etchings, in fact it was Mansfield who introduced Charles Lang Freer (1856-1919) to Whistler’s etchings in 1887 when the collectors met in Frederick Keppel’s print shop in New York.

In 1909 The Caxton Club published Mansfield’s descriptive catalogue of Whistler’s etchings; Mansfield had been compiling this catalogue since the turn of the century.

---

4 Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell, 16 August 1920, PWC, LoC
5 These numbers are taken from Frits Lugt, Les Marques des Collections de Dessins & d’Estampes, p. 240
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The catalogue had Whistler’s complete approval; however Freer and Rosalind Birnie Philip (1873-1958) did not approve of Mansfield wishing to retain the copyright. The collector also published to articles about Whistler in Print Collector’s Quarterly. The first article was entitled “Concerning a Whistler Portrait: ‘Mr. Mann’ or ‘Mr. Davis’” and published in 1914. In 1916 Mansfield published a further two articles in the journal entitled “Whistler as a Critic of His own Prints”, and “Whistler in Belgium and Holland.” These later articles were reissued by M. Knoedler & Company, Inc. New York in 1934.

Mansfield did not only collect Whistler’s etchings; he also amassed an impressive collection of Charles Meryon’s etchings. The collector sold his Meryon collection to the Art Institute of Chicago. Mansfield also had a collection of Japanese paintings, pottery, metalwork, sword furniture, prints, lacquer, printed books and textiles. This collection was gifted to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York in 1936. Mansfield was a trustee of at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and was the first acting curator of Asian art there. Mansfield also accumulated a virtually complete collection of Turner’s Liber Studiorum, between 1886 and 1898. This collection was sold by Mansfield to Avery and was subsequently part of Avery’s gift to the New York Public Library.

Howard Mansfield died on the 14th of August 1938. He left a series of documents and papers to the New York Public Library. These papers contain letters, exhibition catalogues, lists and a card catalogue to do with Mansfield’s Whistler collection only. These papers have helped to preserve information on Mansfield’s Whistler collection.

---

6 Howard Mansfield to Joseph Pennell, 16 August 1920, PWC, LoC
7 Howard Mansfield to John S. Billings, 4 August 1909, Print Department, NYPL
Appendix D: Chronology

The following chronology has been created in order to place Mansfield in the context of the American Etching Revival. This chronology was not intended to chart the American Etching Revival in its entirety, it was intended to be used in conjunction with the arguments given throughout the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>November 7: Whistler appointed to the drawing division of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>February: Whistler resigned from the Coast Survey Office, where he created his first etching, Sketches on a Coast Survey Plate, (figure 2.1, K1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Twelve Etchings from Nature, 1858 (the “French Set”, K.9-11, 13-17, 19, 21, 22, 24) privately printed by Whistler, dedicated to Francis Seymour Haden (1818-1910).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Samuel Putnam Avery (1822-1901) establishes his Art Rooms in New York, introducing the American public to modern British and French etchings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Alfred Cadart (1828-1875) visits America, establishing the American branch of the French Société des Aquafortistes. Cadart organised two exhibitions of French etchings and some paintings at the Derby Gallery, No. 625 Broadway, New York.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1867 | Samuel Putnam Avery as Fine Arts Commissioner at the Paris Exposition.

- 43rd Annual Exhibition, National Academy of Design, New York. Five etchings of Thames Views owned by S. P. Avery exhibited.8 |
| 1868 | P. G. Hamerton’s Etching and Etchers first edition. |
| 1870 | Frederick Keppel (1845-1912) opens print shop in New York. |
| 1871 | Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York founded. |
| 1872 | Museum of Fine Arts, Boston founded. |
| 1874 | Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, Cincinnati, Ohio. Three of Whistler’s prints were exhibited: Landscape (owned by John L. Stettinius) and Thames River Shore and Blacksmith’s Forge, (owned by Jos. Longworth).9 |
| 1876 | Frederick Keppel reported that modern etchings comprised 2% of his sales. |
| 1877 | Mansfield begins his Whistler etching collection with the fourth state of The Pool, (figure 1.2, K43) |

| 1877 | Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia founded. |

---

8 From Okerstrom, Appendix: Chronology of Whistler’s American Exhibitions, 1866-1890
9 Ibid
10 Ibid
1878  

1879  
- Exhibition of works loaned to the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia. Thirty-one of Whistler's etchings were exhibited, including both the "Thames Set" and "French Set" in their entirety and two additional etchings of the Thames.\(^1\)

1880 – 1881  
- Mr Whistler's Etchings of Venice, 1880 (the first 'Venice Set') (K. 183-189, 191-195) issued by the Fine Art Society, London.

1881  
- Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia. Twelve etchings of the first "Venice Set" exhibited.\(^2\)
- December: *Exhibition of Etching and Dry-Points*, Union League Club, New York. A total of one hundred and sixty seven of Whistler's etchings were exhibited ranging in date from the 1858 to the Venetian etchings of 1880.

1882  
- December: *International Exhibition of Etchings*, Philadelphia Society of Etchers, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia. Twenty of Whistler's etchings, owned by James L. Claghorn, president of the Pennsylvania Academy, were displayed.\(^3\)

1882-1883  
- F. S. Haden's Lecture Tour of America

1883  
- Frederick Keppel reported that modern etching comprised 73% of his sales.

1884  
- Mansfield meets Whistler for the first time. Whistler was in London at this time.

1886  
- Wedmore, Frederick: *Whistler's Etchings: A Study and a Catalogue*. (A. W. Thibaudeau, 18 Green Street, St. Martin's Place, London, 1886)
- *A Set of Twenty-Six Etchings of Venice, 1886* (the second 'Venice set') (K.196-216) issued by the Fine Art Society, London.

1887  
- F. S. Haden, Whistler as a critic of his own Prints," p. 23

1890  
- Mr. Seymour Haden's Etchings exhibited at H. Wunderlich & Co., New York. The dealer's had purchased all 130 etchings from Haden's private collection. C. L. Freer then bought the majority of this collection.

1892  
- Mansfield visit's Whistler's studio in Paris.\(^4\)

1893  

1894  

---

\(^1\) Ibid
\(^2\) Ibid
\(^3\) Ibid
\(^4\) Mansfield, Whistler as a critic of his own Prints," p. 23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Avery’s gift to the NYPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Catalogue of an Exhibition of the Etchings of James McNeill Whistler, January Thirty First to February Twenty Second. (Appendix A: DB4: Chicago, 1900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Mansfield and his wife visited Whistler in his London studio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>* Pan American Exposition, Buffalo.</td>
<td>(Appendix A: DB3: Buffalo, 1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>* Kennedy, Edward Guthrie: Catalogue of etchings by J.McN. Whistler, compiled by an amateur. Supplementary to that compiled by F. Wedmore. (Wunderlich, New York, 1902)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 71st Annual Exhibition, Pennsylvania Academy of Arts, Philadelphia. (Appendix A: DB5: Pennsylvania, 1902)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>* Memorial Exhibition of the works of J. McNeill Whistler, Copley Society, Boston. (Appendix A: DB7: Boston, 1904)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>* Howard Mansfield sells his Whistler Etching collection through A. H. Hahlo &amp; Co. to Harris G. Whitemore of Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Freer dies. Freer gift to the nation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>* Mansfield gifted his collection of Japanese art and artifacts to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Howard Mansfield to Whistler, 25 August 1901, GUL MS Whistler M270, GUW 04008, accessed 2007-09-12
Appendix F Part I: Resources for Howard Mansfield Catalogue

Listed within the text:
Charles Lang Freer
Samuel P. Avery Collection at NYPL
Grolier Club
E. G. Kennedy
Mr. & Mrs. J. Pennell

Listed separately:
Mr. Charles Buckingham
Mr. Bryan Lathrop
Mr. John H. Wrenn of Chicago
Mr. Henry Harper Benedict
Mr. Harris B. Dick
Mr. Watson B. Dickerman
Mrs. Henry O. Havemeyer
Mr. Albert W. Scholle
Mr. John W. Simpson of New York
Mr. Frank L. Babbott of Brooklyn
Mr. Francis Bullard of Boston
Mr. Fisher Howe of Boston
Mrs. Walter Robert Parker of Detroit
Mr. Judson s. Dutcher of Watertown, Connecticut
Mr. Arthur Jeffrey Parsons of Washington
Mr. John Caldwell of Pittsburg
Mr. George W. Vanderbilt of Baltimore

---

16 Mansfield, p. lixvi
17 The collections, dealers and persons shown are listed according to the order in which Mansfield's gives in his catalogue.
Appendix D Part 2: Resources for E. G. Kennedy Catalogue

Listed within the text:
H. S. Theobald of London
Frederick Keppel & Company
Messrs. M. Knoedler & Company
Messrs. H. Wunderlich & Company of New York
Mr. Albert Roullier of Chicago#
Messrs Ernest Brown & Phillips
Messrs Obach & Company
Fine Art Society, London
United States Coast and Geodetic Survey

Listed Separately
Miss Cora Barnes
Mrs. H. K. Bartow
Mrs. George T. Bliss
Mrs. Robert Bliss
Mrs. W. B. Cutting
Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer
Mrs. Miles Ilemenway
Mrs. E. B. Holden
Miss A. B. Jennings
Mrs. H. K. Knapp
Miss Faith Moore
Mrs. L. M. Touzalin
Miss L. Veltin
Mr. O. H. Bacher
Mr. H. H. Benedict
Mr. Theodore De Witt
Mr. H. B. Dick
Mr. W. B. Dickerman
Mr. W. R. O. Field
Mr. R. M. Hoe
Mr. F. Keppel
Mr. E. L. Knoedler
Mr. G. W. Kraushaar
Mr. H. B. Livingston
Mr. F. G. Lloyd
Mr. P. Lorillard
Mr. H. Mansfield
Dr. H. McN. Painter
Mr. A. W. Scholle
Mr. George W. Vanderbilt
Mr. J. Alden Weir
Messrs. H. Wunderlich & Co.
The authorities of the Lenox Library, of New York
Mr. F. L. Babbott

Kennedy, p.xxxvi-xxxvii
Mr. W. S. Carter
Mr. H. L. Quick
Mr. Hartsbome
Mr. J. S. Dutcher
Mr. J. P. Elton
Mr. Harris Whittemore
Mrs. O. H. Alford
Mr. F. Bullard
Mr. W. H. Bustin, Jr.
Mr. T. Jefferson Coolidge, Jr.
Mr. W. V. Kellea
Mr. F. G. Macomber
Mrs. Bayard Thayer
Mr. A. J. Parsons
Mr. John Caldwell
Mr. R. H. Booth
Mr. C. Buckingham
Mr. Bryan Lanthrop
Mr. J. H. Wrenn
Mr. Atheron Curtis
Mr. George Lucas
Mr. Alfred Stöllin
Messrs. P. & D. Colnaghi & Co.
Mr. Sidney Colvin
Director of the Print Room of the British Museum, the late Sir John C. Day
Mr. E. Deprez
Mr. Walter Dowdeswell
Mr. O. Gutekunst
Mr. R. Gutekunst
Mr. G. Mayer
Messrs. Obach & Co.
Mr. H. S. Theobald
Mr. H. J. J. Politt