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THOMAS EAKINS

A dominant artistic trend of the second half of the nineteenth century, in both Europe and America, was naturalism. From classical or romantic subject matter, artists turned to contemporary life. The leader of the movement in France was Gustave Courbet, but it had its representatives in every country. In the United States the two chief figures of naturalism were Thomas Eakins and Winslow Homer.

American painting up to the Civil War had been predominantly romantic. The Hudson River school had portrayed the spectacular features of the American landscape in a style at once panoramic and minute. The genre painters had pictured daily life with pleasing sentiment and innocent humor, focusing particularly on the rural scene. Few painters had attempted to represent the city or the lives of city dwellers. Even Homer, who gave the genre tradition a new depth and maturity, avoided the city, and in his later years became the pictorial poet of the sea and the forest.

A more drastic, thorough-going realism was that of Thomas Eakins, who built his art out of the urban life of his place and time—Philadelphia in the last third of the century. Born in that city on July 25, 1844, he came of lower middle-class stock, his immediate forebears on both sides being craftsmen. His father, Benjamin Eakins, of Scotch-Irish descent, was a writing master, who taught the young ladies of Philadelphia the copperplate hand of the old school. In The Writing Master his son has recorded his strong, kindly face, and his hands used to years of fine, precise work. The relationship between them was unusually close, and played an important part in the artist’s life. Thomas was the eldest of four, his three sisters being five, ten, and fifteen years younger, so that there was always a child in the family. When he was about two they moved to a house at 1729 Mount Vernon Street, which was to be his home for the rest of his life.

His boyhood was normal and healthy, filled with outdoor activities in the country around Philadelphia, and he grew up to be a strong youth,
decidedly Irish in his features, with dark complexion, eyes, and hair. Independent and strong-willed, he was somewhat silent, but always spoke to the point. He attended the Central High School of Philadelphia (practically a junior college), and was an exceptional student, particularly in science, mathematics and languages. In drawing he rated 100 in all four years; his existing perspective and mechanical drawings show unusual sureness. His regular study of art began about 1861 at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, where in those days the student had to go through months or even years of drawing from casts before being allowed to look at the living model—a routine which gave Eakins a lifelong hatred of copying the antique. Life classes were irregular, and in them only drawing was taught, not painting. The female models wore masks, to hide their identity; and Rule Number 5 was, “No conversation is permitted between the model and any member of the class.” But Eakins supplemented this meagre education in his own way, by entering the Jefferson Medical College and taking the regular courses in anatomy, witnessing dissections and operations, and doing dissecting himself. With characteristic thoroughness he continued this for several years, so that before he was twenty his anatomical knowledge was as great as that of most physicians, and much greater than that of most artists. Indeed, he grew so interested that at one point he thought of becoming a surgeon.

But after five years of half artistic, half scientific study, he realized that for more complete art training he must go abroad. In September 1866, at the age of twenty-two, he sailed for France. In going there instead of to Rome, Düsseldorf, or Munich, he was a pioneer of his generation, for the large-scale influx of American students had not yet started. In these final years of the Second Empire, the Parisian art world was overwhelmingly conservative. Eakins entered the official Ecole des Beaux-Arts, choosing for his master the foremost academic teacher, Jean Léon Gérôme, for whom he developed an admiration that lasted all his life. For a while he was the only American, which gave him a chance to improve his French. “There is no one in all the school who knows English,” he wrote home, “and I am glad of it.”
In the Beaux-Arts, unlike the Pennsylvania Academy, everything was founded on study of the nude. It was a narrow discipline, but the most thorough of the day. Its chief limitations were that it was based on drawing rather than painting, and that the painting method it did teach was the tight, dry style of the Salon, as exemplified in Gérôme’s own work. But soon after entering the school, Eakins was allowed to paint—practically the first time he had handled a brush, at the age of twenty-three. Soon he rented a studio, to work out for himself the unfamiliar problems of color, light, and the handling of pigment. His next two years of intense application, of discouragements and hopes, were fully recorded in his letters home. “For a long time I did not hardly sleep at nights, but dreamed all the time about color and forms,” he wrote. But he could report, “I am learning to make solid, heavy work.”

To purely aesthetic matters he gave little thought. His viewpoint was strictly naturalistic; the painter must be faithful to nature, but nature seen in the largest way, not slavishly imitated but re-created. “The big artist,” he wrote, “does not sit down monkey-like and copy, . . . but he keeps a sharp eye on Nature and steals her tools. He learns what she does with light, the big tool, and then color, then form, and appropriates them to his own use. . . . But if ever he thinks he can sail another fashion from Nature or make a better-shaped boat, he’ll capsize.”

His letters displayed less interest in the art of others than in his own painting problems. His visits to the Louvre were infrequent. On the other hand, he attended the Salons regularly, making notes in French on the painters he liked, almost all académie: Fortuny, Regnault, Bonnat, and above all Gérôme. But for the typical Salon nude à la Cabanel and Bouguereau he had a fine scorn—“pictures of naked women, standing, sitting, lying down, flying, dancing, doing nothing. . . . I hate affectation.” Of contemporary art outside the academy he showed little awareness. One would expect him to be attracted to the leader of naturalism, Courbet, but we have no record of his seeing the latter’s work. Even when Courbet and Manet, rejected at the Universal Exposition of 1867, exhibited in a shed outside the grounds, Eakins’ letters about the exposition did not mention them, devoting most space to the machinery, particularly the big American locomotive.

The summer of 1868 was spent travelling with his father and a sister to Italy—Florence, Rome, and Naples—and briefly to Germany.
Eakins knew Italian (some of his letters to Philadelphia friends were in that language), and he formed a lasting fondness for the Italian people. But what art he saw, or what he thought of it, we do not know.

After three years of study, in the fall of 1869, he wrote his father: “I feel now that my school days are at last over... What I have come to France for is accomplished... What I have learned I could not have learned at home.” But before returning, he visited Spain, arriving in Madrid in December, spending a few days there, mostly in the Prado, then continuing south to Seville for the winter. From Madrid he wrote: “I have seen big painting here. When I had looked at all the paintings by all the masters I had known I could not help saying to myself all the time, it’s very pretty but it’s not all yet. It ought to be better, but now I have seen what I always thought ought to have been done and what did not seem to me impossible. O what a satisfaction it gave me to see the good Spanish work so good so strong so reasonable so free from every affectation. It stands out like nature itself... I have seen the big work every day and I will never forget it.”

Spanish art, then as now, was impossible to know fully outside of the peninsula. To Eakins, one of the first American painters of his generation to have this experience, it must have come with an unexpectedness impossible today. The profound impression it made on him is recorded in a notebook he kept (in French) of his visits to the Prado. His great discovery was of course Velázquez. Of a figure in Las Hilanderas he wrote: “Le plus beau morceau de peinture que j’ai vu de ma vie.” Of all the great masters, the Spaniard, with his naturalism, complete objectivity, and love of character more than ideal beauty, was closest to his temperament. Velázquez’ mastery of light and its effects on color, his miraculous command of the brush, and the depth and richness of his technique, must have seemed the answer to the problems with which the young artist had been struggling. At the same time, there was a fundamental austerity in him—his suppression of detail, the deliberate restriction of his palette, his consummate use of blacks and silvery grays and earth tones—that corresponded with Eakins’ own bent. The latter’s work throughout his
life was to reveal an affinity for Velázquez: *The Thinker*, for example, has not only the general concept but the very color harmony of several of the Spaniard's full-length standing portraits. But his relationship differed from that of Whistler, who adopted the master's purely decorative qualities; Eakins' was more fundamental—a similar direct contact with realities.

His second discovery was the sombre, ferocious naturalist Ribera. In certain respects Eakins' style was to be even closer to that of Ribera, with its stark realism, solid substance, stress on anatomy, and dark color. It is typical of Eakins' lack of aesthetic sophistication that he seemed unaware of the Spaniard's prototype and the great pioneer of naturalism, Caravaggio.

To the other schools so richly represented in the Prado he paid less attention. Titian's *Danae* was mentioned, but only its condition. The third great figure of the Prado, Rubens, he detested. Comparing him to Velázquez, he wrote: "Rubens is the nastiest most vulgar noisy painter that ever lived." It is significant that between Rubens, the master of the baroque and of plastic movement, and Velázquez, the austere, monumental naturalist, he chose the latter. He was apparently unaware of El Greco, not yet fully represented in the Prado, and who in any case would have been antipathetic. His comments on Goya were critical; he acutely noted a technical similarity to Gilbert Stuart.

Most of his notes were on technique. Close study of Velázquez and Ribera made him realize the limitations of the Beaux-Arts. While retaining his respect for Gérôme, he now saw how restricted his methods were. "Il faut me décider de ne jamais peindre de la façon du patron," he wrote. "On ne peut guère espérer être plus fort que lui et il est loin de peindre comme les Ribera et les Velasquez." He commented frequently on the defects of direct, opaque painting, "au premier coup," which to his mind resulted in "faiblesse d'aspect." Study of the old masters showed him the richer traditional technique of successive paintings and glazes—"la seule manière à mon avis qui puisse donner la delicatesse et la force en même temps. . . . C'est là toujours que m'ont portés mes propres instincts." His independent efforts, now thus confirmed, were to result in technical processes more complex than most of his time.

He settled for the winter in Seville, where he was joined by two young Philadelphia painter friends. Eakins loved the Spanish people; he spoke Spanish easily, and with his dark coloring was often taken for a
Spaniard. “I know ever so many gypsies, men and women, circus people, street dancers, theatre dancers and bullfighters,” he reported. “The bullfighters are quiet, gentle-looking men.” Here he started his first original composition, of a troupe of street entertainers: *A Street Scene in Seville*. It caused him infinite trouble, and in the end he said that it was “an ordinary sort of picture, with good things here and there, so that a painter can see it is at least earnest clumsiness”—too modest an estimate, for it reveals a strong personal vision. After six months he returned to Paris, and sailed for home in time to arrive for the Fourth of July, 1870. Hardly had he left when the Franco-Prussian War broke out, destroying the world he had known. He was never to leave America again.

A **studio had been prepared on the top floor of his father’s house**; and in this house he was to live and work thenceforth. Most young American artists returning from abroad in those years found the native scene ugly and unsympathetic after Europe. But Eakins was of tougher fibre. He immediately began painting subjects from the life around him. He took the ordinary middle-class world of his community, and with uncompromising realism built his art out of this intractable material. He concentrated on certain basic realities: on men and women, their faces and bodies, their clothes and houses and furniture, their work and recreations. His art was centered on the individual human being. Nature to him was a setting for man; among all his finished paintings there is only one pure landscape.

From childhood he had enjoyed outdoor activities—rowing, skating, hunting and sailing—and they supplied themes for his first pictures. Rowing was a popular Philadelphia sport, to which he was devoted, and which furnished opportunities to observe the human body in action. In *Max Schmitt in a Single Scull* we see a boyhood friend on the Schuylkill River, and in the distance the artist in his own shell. The picture is something seen firsthand, with no trace of a derived style; recorded with utter fidelity to facts—even to the American climate, the high remote sky, the strong sunlight, the clear air. The vision is of almost photographic preciseness,
and a crystalline clarity. Here was a strong, original mind dealing directly with actualities.

Many of his early paintings were of his family and friends, seen in the settings of their homes, engaged in everyday occupations. *The Chess Players* shows two old friends of his father's playing, while the latter looks on. In *Home Scene* his sister Margaret, at the piano, turns to look down at their youngest sister Caroline, who lies on the floor drawing on a slate. These early genre paintings reveal an exact sense of individual character, a loving care in representing familiar rooms and objects, and a reserved but deep feeling for home and family. With all their naturalism, they are pervaded with the quiet, grave poetry of everyday life.

Few painters have been more complete realists. Every figure was a portrait, every scene an actual one, every object real. His viewpoint seemed completely objective, with no attempt to express his own emotions. His purpose was to paint the world he knew best, with all possible truth and strength. Beauty as an end in itself was not aimed at. And yet from the beginning his work was filled with emotion—not expressed directly, but arising out of intense feeling for his subjects, and the depth and power of his re-creation of them. The austere beauty that his work achieved was a by-product of his search for essential realities.

Eakins' mind was an unusual combination of artistic and scientific qualities. Next to painting, science was his chief interest. We have already seen his medical and anatomical bent. He loved mathematics, and used to relax his mind after painting by reading logarithms and doing problems in calculus. When he came to teach, he would advise students to study higher mathematics, which he said were "so much like painting." "In mathematics the complicated things are reduced to simple things," he said. "So it is in painting." In his early pictures the perspective was worked out in preliminary drawings as exact as those of an architect, using logarithms. He wrote a treatise on perspective, and even prepared a lecture on the mathematical problems involved in reflections in water.

The processes of human and animal locomotion always interested him. He was an expert photographer, in the days before this was common, and in 1884 he carried on, under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, a series of experiments in photographing horses in motion, and nude athletes walking, running, jumping, swinging weights, and throwing baseballs. These experiments were started in collaboration with the pioneer
photographer Eadweard Muybridge, but Eakins felt that the latter’s method, that of a battery of twenty-four cameras set off in sequence, was not accurate, so he devised a single camera with two revolving disks pierced with openings—essentially the principle of the modern motion picture camera. Since the viewpoint remained the same and the time intervals were exactly regulated, the successive images, taken on one plate, could be compared with mathematical accuracy. These photographs form a fascinating chapter in the development of motion photography. In 1894 he wrote a paper, “The Differential Action of Certain Muscles Passing More than one Joint,” which the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences published in its Proceedings. His conclusion brought the subject back into his own field: “On the lines of the mighty and simple strains dominating the movement, and felt intuitively and studied out by him, the master artist groups, with full intention, his muscular forms. No detail contradicts. His men and animals live. Such is the work of three or four modern artists. Such was the work of many an old Greek sculptor.”

Soon after his return from abroad began his long career as a portrait painter. His first subjects were his sisters and their friends. Then he branched out, asking well-known Philadelphians to pose for him—people he knew, and who interested him, such as his former chemistry teacher, Benjamin H. Rand, now a professor at Jefferson Medical College. These were not commissions; he presented his portraits to the sitters, doubtless hoping in this way to launch himself as a portraitist.

He had resumed his anatomical studies at the College. At this time the leading figure there was Dr. Samuel D. Gross, a famous surgeon and a man of impressive appearance. Watching him in the operating amphitheatre, Eakins conceived the most important composition of his early years, The Gross Clinic, painted when he was thirty-one. The subject was one seldom attempted in modern art, yet of central importance in our age—the drama of science and its battle against disease. For anything approaching its unveiled realism one would have to go back to Rembrandt’s two Anatomy Lessons. Its command of character, with the magnificent head of Dr. Gross
dominating the whole design, and its completeness and power of realization, were qualities new in American painting of the time.

So far Eakins had exhibited little. When the picture was submitted to the historic Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, it was rejected by the art jury, but he finally succeeded in having it hung in the medical section. Three years later it was shown by the Society of American Artists in New York, and later, after an attempt to suppress it, at the Pennsylvania Academy. A few critics recognized its quality, but the common reaction was genteel horror. "A picture of heroic size," wrote one critic, "that a society thinks it proper to hang in a room where ladies, young and old, young girls and boys and little children, are expected to be visitors. It is a picture which even strong men find it difficult to look at long, if they can look at it at all." Another said: "As to the propriety of introducing into our art a class of subjects hitherto confined to a few of the more brutal artists and races of the old world, the question may well be left to the decision of the public. If they demand such pictures, they will be painted, but if the innate delicacy of our people continues to assert itself there is no fear that it can be injured by an occasional display of the horrible in art, or that our painters will create many such works." The painting had not been commissioned, and when it was finally purchased, the price was two hundred dollars.

With all his scientific interests, Eakins' science remained the servant of his art. His studies were devoted to understanding the principles of nature's forms: the anatomical structure of the body, the dynamics of motion, the space relationships of objects. He reminds us of those early Renaissance masters to whom science and art were one and the same, since both were engaged in discovering fundamental truths. Like Paolo Uccello, he might have said, "What a delightful thing is this perspective!" Beneath his scientific methods lay the sensuous apprehension of reality that is the basis of art. His painting speaks to us in the direct physical language of form, color, pigment and texture. It has tremendous substance—the greatest of any American of his time. His forms are absolutely solid, round and weighty. This sense of substance was an innate gift, like the much commoner
sense of color; it had showed even in his life drawings as a student. His pictures were conceived in completely three-dimensional terms, as solid forms in deep space. Their space relationships, arrived at by scientific perspective, were exactly understood; one of his first paintings, Max Schmitt, owes much of its strength to the justness of these relations. Even the signatures in his more important pictures were usually inscribed on the floor or on objects, in perspective; a drawing for the portrait of Professor Miller demonstrates how he first drew the signature flat, then constructed it in perspective and transferred it to the canvas. To such lengths would he go to insure that every detail was three-dimensional.

But his work differed fundamentally from the photographic imitation of natural appearances that was the aim of most academic painting of the period. While his whole generation was becoming absorbed in light and atmosphere and such visual phenomena, he saw nature as the tangible reality of forms in space. He felt things in completely physical terms, rather than in merely visual terms. To him a painting was a physical creation with an independent life of its own. Every element in it had plastic value, and was part of an ordered design. His forms were always related to the physical surface of the painting, which determines what nowadays we call the picture plane—the pictorial space in which the forms are contained, and beyond which they must not project or recede. There were no holes in his compositions, any more than there were flat passages.

From the first his color was inclined to be dark and restricted in range, with pervading grays and browns and blacks, as in the Spanish masters he admired. Earthy colors predominated; flesh tones tended to be swarthy, almost Latin. Unaffected by impressionism, he did not attempt to rival the brilliancy of nature, but to create an equivalent to her tonal relations within a lower key. To him the essential thing was not the key but the justness of relations. The decorative properties of color concerned him less than its coordination with form. This conception of its role resulted in depth and a sober mellowness. At the same time, in itself his color had a strong sensuous appeal—warm, full-blooded, resonant. Some of his paintings contain passages which in sensuous richness equal Courbet or early Renoir: for example, the still life, rug and shawl in the Rand portrait. With all his deliberate limitation of range, he was one of the most genuine colorists of his time in this country.

While he often made oil sketches outdoors, his finished paintings
were done in his studio. Sometimes small wax models were made of figures, such as the horses in *The Fairman Rogers Four-in-hand*. Although a strong draftsman, he drew little, aside from his perspective diagrams. Instead of preliminary drawings, small oil studies in full color captured the main masses; these were squared off and enlarged on to the canvas. Even for watercolors, of which he painted several in early years, the sketches were in oil—a curious reversal of the usual procedure. Through independent thought, assisted by study of the old masters, he had evolved a technique more complex than that of most of his contemporaries. After laying the picture in broadly with thin color, he built it in successive overpaintings and glazes, the solid forms painted most heavily, the recessions more transparently. The result was greater solidity and depth than could be achieved by the direct opaque painting common in his day.

To Eakins, as to most of the old masters, the human figure was the foundation of art. With all his anatomical knowledge, there was nothing coldly academic in his attitude. His figures had an energy, a vitality, and a largeness of form, that made him the most powerful figure painter of his time in America. As both student and teacher, his whole system was founded on the nude. And yet he seldom painted it. There was a deep conflict between his interest in the nude and his realism. As an artist, the figure and its plastic possibilities were fundamental to him. But as a realist, he felt constrained to paint only what he saw in the life around him; and America of the late nineteenth century was not Greece. The human form was effectively concealed beneath voluminous skirts, bustles, leg-of-mutton sleeves, and high collars. Only the male bodies of athletes were on public view, in sports like rowing and prizefighting. Eakins was incapable of giving free rein to fancy; like Courbet, who said he would paint angels if anybody showed him one, Eakins would paint the unclothed figure only if he saw it in the real world. He even objected to professional models, finding a lack of reality in them, while on the other hand, he sometimes asked women sitting for portraits if they would pose for him nude—a habit that caused considerable scandal in the Philadelphia of those days.

Among his few paintings of the female nude were his various versions of the William Rush story. Rush, one of the earliest native American sculptors, and a Philadelphian, about 1809 had carved an allegorical figure of the Schuylkill River for the old city water-works. As his model, a young Philadelphia belle had consented to pose nude, which had also scandalized
the citizens of that day, in spite of the presence of a chaperon. This theme, so close to Eakins' own problems, appealed to him so strongly that he painted it no less than four times; early in his career, in the charming picture dated 1877, now owned by the Philadelphia Museum, and three times in his old age, in 1908. That he came to consciously identify himself with Rush is shown by the fact that in one of the late versions he substituted for Rush's figure his own, handing the model down from the stand as if she were a queen. A strange and revealing obsession! His deep and healthy paganism, repressed by the prudery of his environment combined with his own strict realism, was expressing itself in this peculiarly round-about manner.

Eakins was a born teacher. He felt strongly the inadequacy of his own training in America, and when the Pennsylvania Academy opened its new building on North Broad Street in 1876, he volunteered to take over the life classes. In 1879 he became virtual head of the school (he was appointed director in 1882), and proceeded to reorganize it on radical lines. American art education (with the honorable exception of the new Art Students League of New York) was still as backward as in his student days: everything based on the antique, with little use of the living model. Eakins reversed this. Not that he objected to Greek sculpture itself—on the contrary he admired it—but to drawing from casts as a way of learning to paint. As he put it: "The Greeks did not study the antique; the Theseus and Illyssus and the draped figures in the Parthenon pediment were modeled from life undoubtedly. And nature is just as varied and just as beautiful in our day as she was in the time of Phidias. . . . Our business is distinctly to do something for ourselves, not to copy Phidias."

The nude was made the basis of his whole system. Anatomy was stressed, with a dissecting-room in the school, and lectures by a surgeon. Animal anatomy was also studied; live horses were used as models, and even cows. Eakins gave a course of lectures on perspective. In the life classes, he started students painting from the first, without preliminary drawing; since their aim was to paint, the sooner they began, the better. "A student should learn to draw with color," he said. "There are no lines in nature; . . . there are only form and color. The least important, the most
changeable, the most difficult thing to catch about a figure is the outline.” Students should think always of the third dimension, and of the roundness, solidity and weight of the figure. Even the painters were supposed to give some time to sculpture; if they began to paint flat, they were sent to the modeling class.

He talked little about more purely artistic principles. While recognizing their importance, he did not believe they could be taught; the most that a teacher could do was to furnish a thorough naturalistic training; the rest was up to the student. But actually his teaching had deep if not consciously expressed artistic content; in its insistence on form, so unusual in America at this time. Within a few years he had effected a revolution in American art education, which still benefits from his reforms; and the Academy school had become the most popular in the country.

Sculpture was a particular interest throughout his career. He had studied it briefly at the Beaux-Arts, and it was essential in the Academy system. In a lecture by him on relief, the principles governing projection and recession were analyzed as logically as in his perspective lectures. He himself executed about ten pieces at various times, aside from his small models for paintings. To the early 1880’s belong several reliefs which are among his few idyllic subjects. Ten years later a renewed interest in the medium, stimulated by his favorite pupil, the sculptor Samuel Murray, resulted in the two life-sized horses for the equestrian figures of Lincoln and Grant on the Memorial Arch in Prospect Park, Brooklyn. Their vitality and largeness of form make them his most successful pieces, unfortunately subordinate to the over-literal figures of the riders by his friend William R. O’Donovan. All Eakins’ sculptures were in relief, but sometimes, as in the horses, almost in the round. Although he never found the opportunity to express himself fully in sculpture, his few works suggest that he might have achieved results as substantial as in painting.

By the late 1870’s many of his younger fellow artists had returned from study in Paris or Munich. To them the older native art, such as the Hudson River school, seemed provincial and passé; while to their elders their new-fangled foreign notions were revolutionary. The younger men,
together with a few older independents such as La Farge, Ryder and Eakins, were labelled "The New Movement"—the first such revolt in American art. In 1877, after a battle with the conservative National Academy of Design in New York, the newcomers formed the rival Society of American Artists, soon the most liberal artists' organization in the country. Eakins exhibited with the Society from the first, and in 1880 became a member—the only organization he was to join for many years. From the middle 1870's his work was shown fairly regularly in the large national exhibitions, and he was generally regarded as one of the leaders of "The New Movement," and its most prominent representative in Philadelphia. All this, however, did not mean financial success; at the age of thirty-six he had sold only eight paintings, for a total of slightly more than two thousand dollars. Fortunately he had his father's home to live in, and his father's small but steady income to fall back on, aside from his salary as a teacher.

In his fortieth year, in 1884, Eakins married Susan Hannah Macdowell, a painter and a former pupil, indeed one of his most talented pupils. Sharing completely in his interests, and believing wholeheartedly in his art, she gave him the constant support of her understanding and faith. Her cheerfulness and lively sense of humor furnished a foil to his temperament. Their home remained the house on Mount Vernon Street, which Benjamin Eakins shared with them until his death in 1899. Although they had no children of their own, the house was always full of nieces and nephews. They lived with the utmost simplicity. Eakins had no desire to go abroad again, saying that his favorite places in the world were Philadelphia and Spain, and he did little travelling, aside from excursions into the Pennsylvania country or south to Virginia, and a three-months' stay on a Dakota ranch in 1887.

There was nothing of the hermit in him, as in Homer and Ryder; he had a gift for friendship, and his circle of friends was wide. Some were artists and musicians, but others were outside the arts—scientists, physicians, professors of the University of Pennsylvania. While not a talker, Eakins spoke well when he did; if the occasion called for it, he could be devastatingly frank. With all his seriousness, he had a keen sense of humor, and his speech sometimes had an Elizabethan broadness. A hard worker, he went to bed early and was up often by four or five. He drank little except wine, and never smoked. His active outdoor life continued; he liked horses and riding (a preference that played a considerable role in his art); and
when the bicycle craze started, he became an inexhaustible cyclist. Although heavier, he remained a powerful figure. His personal appearance received little attention; in a day when men dressed with stiff formality, he preferred old, comfortable, unstarched clothes. Both he and Mrs. Eakins were fond of animals, and the house contained a small menagerie, even including for a time a pet monkey.

He loved music, and since Mrs. Eakins was a pianist (she appears in *The Pathetic Song*, painted before their marriage) and they had many musical friends, there were frequent evenings of music in their home. Eakins said that he liked to see musicians play and sing, and his pleasure in the visual side of music was embodied in many paintings: *The Concert Singer, The 'Cello Player, Music*, among others. He read comparatively little, and largely scientific works; but what reading he did was solid. Science remained his chief avocation, absorbing the outside interests which in most artists go into aesthetic fields.

His tastes in art were never very wide or sophisticated. In the past, the Greeks, Velázquez, Ribera, Rembrandt, Vermeer. He continued to call Gérôme the greatest painter of the nineteenth century; but he also admired Millet, Corot, Barye, Courbet, Manet, Degas and Sargent, and in his old age, Bellows. Among American contemporaries, he ranked Homer highest.

In the late 1890’s he became interested in prizefighting: like rowing, the male body in action. For a time he attended fights several nights a week, and would watch with such intensity that he would go through the motions. Three paintings resulted: *Taking the Count, Salutat, and Between Rounds*, among his most completely realized works in design. This was before pugilism had become a diversion for the four hundred, and he was one of the first painters to touch this unregenerate side of city life, anticipating Bellows and other moderns.

In religion he was an agnostic. His *Crucifixion* was exceptional, motivated partly by rivalry of the old masters (it has suggestive similarities to Ribera’s *Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew* in the Prado), but still more by scientific interest; he said that he wanted to show the figure really hanging, and in the open air. It reveals little religious feeling. And yet, paradoxically (since his own family background was Protestant), he had good friends among the high-ranking Catholic clergy, and some of his finest portraits were of them. His contacts with them were partly through Samuel Murray. Their scholarship, the splendor of their vestments, and the fact that several
were Italians—all attracted him. He had kept up his Latin, and delighted in composing Latin inscriptions for his portraits of clerics and scientists.

At forty, Eakins occupied a peculiar position in American art. Some of his work had met with hostility, and none of it had been popular; but the novelty of his subjects, and his realistic power, which could not be disregarded, had forced the recognition of him as a leader of naturalism. As a teacher, on the other hand, and as head of the Pennsylvania Academy school, he was at the height of his influence.

Beneath the surface, however, opposition was growing. To the conservative directors of the Academy he was still a radical. Half of the students were women, of whom a conventional minority disapproved of his methods, especially his emphasis on the nude. The crisis came in 1886, when he insisted on the nude male model without a loin cloth, in a women’s class. As he said in a letter to another school: “I am sure that the study of anatomy is not going to benefit any grown person who is not willing to see or be seen seeing the naked figure, and my lectures are only for serious students wishing to become painters or sculptors.” The Academy directors told him that he must be more modest, or resign. He replied that he would remain only on condition that he was not hampered in his teaching, and the directors accepted his resignation.

But most of the students, including practically all the men, sided with him. A protest meeting was held, and a petition was signed by almost the entire school. When the directors rejected it, a majority of the male students seceded, and founded the Art Students’ League of Philadelphia, with Eakins as its head. Like its predecessor in New York, the League was a cooperative body run entirely by the students. Eakins did all the teaching, refusing to accept any salary. His relations to his pupils were close, like those of an old master and his apprentices, and some of his most sympathetic portraits were of them.

Recognized as the leading artist anatomist in the country, he was asked to lecture in other cities: at the National Academy of Design and the Art Students League in New York, and elsewhere. But on several occasions his insistence on the complete nude caused the same conflict, and his courses
were discontinued. His own League, without financial backing, lasted only six or seven years; so his teaching career ended when he was about fifty. He had given it much time and energy; but it evidently answered a fundamental need. One could no more think of him as not a teacher—studying natural laws and communicating them, surrounded by young men and women—than of Homer not a solitary on a stormy coast, or Ryder not a hermit in the midst of crowds.

In spite of his students’ loyalty, the break with the Pennsylvania Academy had been a severe blow. It injured him as a teacher, as a portrait painter, as a member of society. Thereafter he was always to some extent a rebel against the ruling forces of his community. And there had been other discouragements: lack of portrait commissions, and of sales for his other pictures, even his genre subjects.

His early work had shown an extroverted interest in the contemporary scene, outdoor activities, and the life of his community. But when he was about forty he abandoned these broader subjects, except occasionally, and devoted himself almost entirely to portraiture. Turning away from the outside world, he concentrated on the individual. Not that he withdrew from society, like Homer and Ryder; he continued to lead a normal social life, with many friends and devoted students. And in his painting, humanity remained the center of interest. But his field of vision was restricted to a narrower focus.

In this more limited field he attained an increasing mastery. He was never successful in a worldly way, and his subjects were mostly friends or pupils. Many were scientists, doctors, or other professional workers like himself—musicians, teachers, fellow artists—or men eminent in the church. They were people who attracted him by their qualities of mind and character; as he said of the brilliant physicist Henry A. Rowland, “he ought to be painted.” The wealthy and fashionable were conspicuous by their absence. To him, a man’s work was essential, and he liked to show him engaged in it. Dr. Gross and Dr. Agnew were not pictured, as in Sargent’s *Four Doctors*, in the elegance of academic robes, but in the operating theatre, scalpel in hand, talking to their students. The apparatus of the sitter’s profession often played
an important role; Professor Rowland is in his laboratory, his assistant working in the background, he himself holding one of his diffraction gratings reflecting the spectrum, while the frame, built and carved by the painter, is in his words “ornamented with lines of the spectrum and with coefficients and mathematical formulae relating to light and electricity, all original with Professor Rowland and selected by himself.” In his portraits such relevant objects add not only to the interest of the presentation, but to the complexity and richness of the design. This was a more masculine kind of portraiture than the conspicuous leisure favored by fashionable painters.

Eakins’ interest was above all in character. The architecture of the head, its bone structure, the individuality shown in hands, the forms of the body beneath the clothes—all these he grasped with unerring sureness. In this relentless search he disregarded the charms of youth and fashion, and conventional ideas of beauty. He was incapable of flattery; no one ever emerged from under his brush handsomer than he or she was. Like Rembrandt, he loved old age, the marks of years and experience, the essential character that youth conceals but age reveals. Sometimes he made his sitters older and less attractive than they were. His devotion to character made him give them more than they actually possessed. The ordinary requirements of portraiture gave way to a passion for plastic form—an urge of which he was probably not conscious. Doubtless he believed he was simply putting down the facts; when criticized he would say, “That’s the way it was.” But in fact, like all creative artists, even the most realistic, he made free use of actualities in his concentration on the character of forms.

Though sitters and their families sometimes complained of his lack of “sympathy,” he was neither unsympathetic or sentimental. Consciously he was absorbed in grasping the physical reality of the individual, but his realization went deeper, capturing that essential element that can only be described as life. His men and women are alive; beautiful or ugly, they exist. They are pictured with a humanity, a depth of insight, an inner life, that make most portraitists of the time seem superficial. His women, while never glamourized, have a flesh-and-blood vitality and a sense of sex quite different from the idealism with which his American contemporaries pictured women. This was the period when our artists were most preoccupied with womanhood, and most unrealistic about it. By contrast, Eakins’ portraits of women have an intimacy, intensity and psychological penetration that place them among his finest works. In a way quite different from Gilbert
Stuart’s charm or Sargent’s sense of fashion, he can be called particularly an interpreter of women. At the same time, no portraitist has been more masculine in presenting the male and his world. Taken as a whole, Eakins’ portraiture is the most mature pictorial record of the American people of his time—equal to Copley’s record of Colonial America.

But none of these qualities were calculated to make him popular. The average sitter does not care for too much character. The common viewpoint was humorously expressed by Edwin A. Abbey, when asked why he would not sit for Eakins: “Because he would bring out all the traits of my character that I have been trying to hide from the public for years.” The conventional function of the portrait is to please the sitter when he is alive and remind his family agreeably of him after he is gone; but Eakins’ portraits were not intended to please anybody, nor were they necessarily nice for the family to have around. They were something much more important—works of art, meant primarily to satisfy the artist, but satisfying also to those who appreciate deep human feeling and superb painting.

Commissions were rare. Almost all his portraits were labors of love; he asked the sitters to pose, and gave them the pictures. Even so, they often did not bother to take the portraits from his studio, or sometimes destroyed or conveniently lost them. His canvases accumulated until he had a studio full of them.

A different kind of sitter was Walt Whitman, then living in Camden across the Delaware River. There was mutual respect between the poet and the painter, and Whitman preferred the Eakins portrait to any other. “I never knew of but one artist, and that’s Tom Eakins,” he said, “who could resist the temptation to see what they thought ought to be rather than what is.” Again, comparing the picture to John W. Alexander’s skillful idealization: “Eakins is not a painter, he is a force.”

The most ambitious work of Eakins’ middle years was The Agnew Clinic. Dr. Agnew, leading surgeon and teacher at the University of Pennsylvania, was about to retire in 1889, and his students commissioned the portrait, for seven hundred and fifty dollars. Instead of a conventional single figure, the artist’s admiration for the doctor led him to paint his largest composition. The general conception is like that of The Gross Clinic, but the pictures represent different ages; instead of Dr. Gross’ dark frock coat, we now have the immaculate white of modern surgery. The composition is more complex, and less formal, yet with an equally fine balance in its asymmetrical
arrangement. Although Agnew is far from the geometrical center, his fine head (one of Eakins’ strongest characterizations) dominates the whole space. The public reception of the picture was like that of its predecessor; in polite society it aroused a scandal, and when the artists’ jury of the Pennsylvania Academy invited it for the 1891 annual exhibition, the directors refused to let them hang it.

Eakins’ only art organization, the Society of American Artists, since its liberal beginnings had grown more and more respectable. For several years they rejected his entries, the last straw being when they refused The Agnew Clinic in 1892. Eakins wrote them: “I desire to sever all connection with the Society of American Artists... For the last three years my paintings have been rejected by you, one of them the Agnew portrait, a composition more important than any I have ever seen upon your walls... While in my opinion there are qualities in my work which entitle it to rank with the best in your Society, your Society’s opinion must be that it ranks below much that I consider frivolous and superficial. These opinions are irreconcilable.”

In the American art world, from the late 1880’s Eakins fell into increasing obscurity. The prevailing tendencies—impressionist absorption in outdoor light and color, the brilliant visual naturalism of the Sargent school, Whistler’s decorative aestheticism—were against everything he stood for. Whereas in youth he had faced hostility, he now suffered the worse fate of neglect—a neglect more complete than any major artist in our history. A hundred painters were more in the public eye. The critics paid him little attention; not a single article was published on his work in his lifetime. His pictures were exhibited less widely than in his youth; chiefly at the Pennsylvania Academy. Having no dealer in New York, he never had a one-man show there; and only one even in Philadelphia, at the Earle Galleries about 1896. He received only two unimportant prizes until he was almost sixty, and was given none of the many mural commissions of the time, although a far-sighted committee might have recognized him as one of the few genuinely monumental painters. The few sales during his life were for low figures, usually a few hundred dollars; only two or three times did he receive over a thousand. In later years he seems to have abandoned any hope of making a
living by painting. After his father's death, however, he had a small independent income.

But he never lost his faith in his own work, or his enjoyment of painting. He was strong enough not only to keep on working in the same uncompromisingly realistic style, but to gain steadily in mastery. In the last decade of his active career he painted twice as many pictures as in any corresponding period, including some of his finest works, such as The Thinker, Mrs. Frishmuth, Professor Miller, Professor Forbes, the later versions of the William Rush theme, and most of his portraits of Catholic prelates. Yet there can be no doubt that the wall of indifference that surrounded him had its effect; those who knew him best in later years spoke of sadness and disillusionment. One can see this in his self-portrait, painted when he was approaching sixty. But one can also see courage and equanimity, and ironic humor.

There can also be no doubt that his art was affected by lack of recognition. Any artist, no matter how strong, is in some degree dependent on a sense of solidarity with the society of which he is a part. If he is a realist, drawing the material for his art from that society, the lack of such solidarity can be injurious. Eakins' early work had been that of an artist who felt himself part of his community, and was portraying it from many aspects; but the response had been hostility or indifference. One cannot but regret his giving up the broader subject matter of his early years, and in particular, his virtual abandonment of figure painting. Portraiture, fine as he made it, did not offer the sensuous and plastic possibilities of the figure. In his few paintings in which the nude or semi-nude had played a part, he had created his freest and richest design. Such a painting as The Swimming Hole had been among his most fully developed designs, with qualities of form and movement suggesting a work of the early Renaissance. Had he attempted more such themes, he might have achieved, in addition to the concentrated power of his portraits, a plastic completeness beyond any American contemporary's except Ryder. As it was, the fundamental sensuousness of his art never reached full expression. The limitations of the world in which he lived, together with his own realistic limitations, prevented full realization of his potentialities.

But with all these reservations, Eakins' art is a monumental fact in the history of American painting. He was our first major painter of the post-Civil War period to accept completely the realities of American life, and to
create out of them a strong and profound art. He brought to maturity the native realistic tradition which had begun with the Colonial limners, and was continued by Copley, the Peales, Neagle, Mount, Bingham, Eastman Johnson, and the young Winslow Homer.

With the opening of the new century, as Eakins was approaching his sixties, he began to receive a measure of recognition. In 1902 the National Academy of Design, somewhat tardily, elected him an associate, and two months later, a full academician. The Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh invited him to show in all their international exhibitions from 1896 on, and from 1899 asked him to serve on the jury of awards for five consecutive shows. There was a flurry of awards. A unique recognition was the purchase in 1914 by Dr. Albert C. Barnes of a study for the Agnew portrait, for about four thousand dollars—three times as much as he had ever been paid. This was news, and reporters hurried to the quiet house on Mount Vernon Street to interview “the dean of American painters.” To a request for his opinion as to “the present and future of American art,” he said: “If America is to produce great painters and if young art students wish to assume a place in the history of the art of their country, their first desire should be to remain in America, to peer deeper into the heart of American life, rather than to spend their time abroad obtaining a superficial view of the art of the Old World. In the days when I studied abroad conditions were entirely different. The facilities for study in this country were meagre. . . . Of course, it is well to go abroad and see the works of the old masters, but Americans must branch out into their own field, as they are doing. They must strike out for themselves, and only by doing this will we create a great and distinctly American art.”

In 1910 his robust health had begun to decline, and after this he painted hardly at all. On June 25, 1916, he died in the house in which he had lived almost all his life.
Though Eakins had hundreds of pupils, he founded no school in the usual sense; his teaching was impersonal and not concerned with any particular artistic viewpoint. But his work and his example had a definite influence on American painting of our century. It was first evident in the group of five young realists who revolutionized the art world in the first decade of the century—Henri, Luks, Glackens, Sloan and Shinn. All Philadelphians and pupils of the Pennsylvania Academy, they had a link with Eakins in the teacher under whom they all studied, Thomas Anshutz, who had been Eakins’ chief assistant at the Academy and was steeped in his ideas. When all Sloan’s entries were rejected by an Academy jury in 1909, he noted in his diary: “Thomas Eakins’ opinion is the only one on the jury that’s worthwhile. I would like to know how he voted.” After Eakins’ death, Henri, now one of the most influential teachers of his time, urged his students to visit the memorial exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum: “Look at these portraits well. Forget for a moment your school, forget the fashion. . . . You will find yourself, through the works, in close contact with a man who was a man, strong, profound, and honest, and above all, one who had attained the reality of beauty in matter as it is; who was in love with the great mysterious nature as manifested in man and things, who had no need to falsify to make romantic, or to sentimentalize to make beautiful. Look, if you will, at the great Gross Clinic picture for the real stupendous romance in real life, and at the portrait of Miller for a man’s feeling for a man.”

Like Eakins, the Philadelphia realists turned from academic idealism to the life around them, particularly city life. Their revolution in subject matter was the beginning of one of the main trends in American art of our time—the rediscovery of the American scene. Leaders of this trend have recorded their respect for Eakins: among others, Hopper, Marsh, Curry, Raphael Soyer. To such painters, Eakins was an ancestor, an artist whose strength and integrity formed a solid heritage from the usable past.

Eakins’ art, like Ryder’s and to some extent Homer’s, existed independently of contemporary European movements, and indeed in opposition to their surface currents. In a sense all three were anachronisms in relation to international trends, which were evolving from impressionism through post-impressionism to fauvism and the other modern movements. It seems paradoxical that these three, who to us seem more contemporary than any other Americans of their time, were so little involved in world tendencies. But this has been true of some of the strongest American artists, even up to our
day. In a nation so relatively young, our artists had to assimilate a new world which had been little used as the raw material for art. Hence many of our most original creators, while strong in individual character, have played little part in the innovating movements of their time. Such innovations have come mostly from abroad, transmitted by more impressionable personalities. Through the interaction of these two types, the pioneer creator and the sophisticated world citizen, American art has grown toward maturity. The qualities that endure are not necessarily in accord with the surface currents of a period, but rather with the deeper currents of individual and national character.
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1. STUDY OF A GIRL'S HEAD
Unsigned, undated.
17¾ x 14½ in. G-25.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
2. **LEGS OF A SEATED MODEL**

This and Cat. No. 3 were probably student drawings done in 1866-1867. Unsigned, undated. Inscribed l.l.: "Drawing by Thomas Eakins". Charcoal drawing on paper, 22½ x 16¾ in. G-11.

*Lent by The Newark Museum.*
3. NUDE WOMAN RECLINING, BACK TURNED
This and Cat. No. 2 were probably student drawings done in 1866-1867.
Unsigned, undated.
Charcoal drawing on paper, 18 3/8 x 24 in. G-5.
*Philadelphia Museum of Art.*
CARMALITA REQUENA  1869-1870
In a letter written from Seville to his little sister, at Christmas, 1869, Eakins said: “Some candy given me, I ate a little and then gave the rest to a dear little girl, Carmalita, whom I am painting. . . . She is only seven years old and has to dance in the street every day. But she likes better to stand still and be painted.” Carmalita was one of the models for A Street Scene in Seville (G-33) painted in the spring of 1870.
Unsigned, undated.
21 x 17 in.  G-32.
Lent by Mr. T. Edward Hanley.
5. HOME SCENE

Probable late 1870 or 1871

Two of Eakins' three sisters are portrayed here, Margaret at the piano and Caroline on the floor. Margaret was also the model for Cat. No. 41.

Signed l.r.: "Eakins", and on back: "EAKINS".

21¾ x 18 in. G-37.

*In the Brooklyn Museum Collection.*
6. MAX SCHMITT IN A SINGLE SCULL 1871
Eakins' boyhood friend Max Schmitt, who also appears in Cat. No. 21, on the Schuylkill River above Girard Avenue Bridge. In the middle distance Eakins himself is rowing.
Signed on Eakins' shell: "EAKINS 1871".
32¼ x 46¼ in. G-44.
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Alfred N. Punnett Fund and gift of George D. Pratt, 1934.
JOHN BIGLEN IN A SINGLE SCULL 1874

Study for Cat. No. 10.
Signed on back: “Eakins 1874”.

Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Francis P. Garvan, Class of 1897.
THE BIGLEN BROTHERS TURNING THE STAKE 1873

Preliminary drawing for Cat. No. 9.
Unsigned, undated. Inscribed lr. in ink: "original drawing by Thomas Eakins for his picture 'Biglin Brothers turning the stake canvas 40 x 60 painted 1873, owned by the Cleveland Museum of Art. This drawing presented to Charles Bregler [one of Eakins' students]."

Pencil drawing with a little sepia wash, $13\frac{3}{8} \times 17$ in. Not in Goodrich.
Lent by The Cleveland Museum of Art, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Marlatt Fund.
9. THE BIGLEN BROTHERS TURNING THE STAKE 1873
The professional oarsmen Barney and John Biglen racing on the Schuylkill River. The Biglen brothers rowing was the subject for two other canvases, a water color and two drawings by Eakins. He also did five studies of John Biglen in a single scull.
Signed to L, on side of shell: “EAKINS 73”, and on back: “EAKINS”.
40\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 60\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. G-52.
Lent by The Cleveland Museum of Art, Hinman B. Hurlbut Collection.
10. JOHN BIGLEN IN A SINGLE SCULL  Probably 1873 or early 1874
Signed l.r.: “THOMAS EAKINS”.
Water color, 16⅞ x 23 in. (sight). G-57.
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1924.

FORTY-FOUR
11. JOHN BIGLEN IN A SINGLE SCULL  Probably 1873 or early 1874
Perspective drawing for Cat. No. 10.
Unsigned, undated. At top of sheet above central drawing there are pen
and pencil notes in French for calculating perspective; another such note
pasted to the right of the rower, and in pencil: "Eakins".
Drawing in pencil, pen and wash on two sheets of buff paper joined to-
gether, 27\(\frac{3}{8}\) x 45\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. (sight).  G-58.
*Lent by Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts.*
12. THE BIGLEN BROTHERS RACING  Probably 1873
Unsigned, undated.
24 x 36 in. G-61.
*National Gallery of Art, Presented by Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney.*
13. THE ARTIST AND HIS FATHER HUNTING REED-BIRDS  About 1874
This scene shows the artist and his father (with the gun) hunting reed-birds in the marshes on the Cohansie River across the Delaware from Philadelphia.
Inscribed on bow of boat: "BENJAMINI EAKINS FILIUS PINXIT"; signed on back: "EAKINS".
18 x 27 in.  G-68.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.

FORTY-SEVEN
14. STARTING OUT AFTER RAIL 1874
Unsigned, undated.
Water color, 25 x 20 in. G-79.
*Lent by Roland P. Murdock Collection, Wichita Art Museum.*
15. SAILING  About 1874
Inscribed l.r.: "To his friend William M. Chase. Eakins".
32 x 46\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. G-77.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
16. **SAILBOATS (HIKERS) RACING ON THE DELAWARE**

Signed on boat at r.: "EAKINS 74", and on back: "T. E."

24 x 36 in. G-76.

*Philadelphia Museum of Art.*

---

17. **SHIPS AND SAILBOATS ON THE DELAWARE**

Signed l.r.: "T. E.", and on back: "T. E. 1874".

10 x 17 in. G-80.

*Lent by Mr. Henry Schnakenberg.*
18. BASEBALL PLAYERS PRACTISING  1875
Signed on wall near batter's hand: "EAKINS 75".
Water color, 9¾ x 10½ in. G-86.
Lent by Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design.
19.  THE GROSS CLINIC  1875

The picture shows Dr. Samuel David Gross in his clinic at Jefferson Medical College. Dr. Gross was one of the greatest surgeons, teachers and writers on surgery that this country has produced. He is shown with scalpel in hand, talking to his pupils, in a pause during an operation. Dr. James H. Barton probes the incision which is being held open with a tenaculum by Dr. Daniel Apple; Dr. Charles S. Briggs holds the patient’s leg, and the anesthetist is Dr. W. Joseph Hearn, later professor of clinical surgery at the college. The patient’s mother, seated behind Dr. Gross, hides her eyes, and behind her the clinic clerk, Dr. Franklin West, is writing down the surgeon’s remarks. The latter’s son, Dr. Samuel W. Gross, later to occupy his father’s chair of surgery, stands in the entrance to the amphitheater, and behind him appears “Hughie,” the janitor. Signed on operating table, l.r.: “EAKINS 1875”.

96 x 78 in.  G-88.

Lent by The Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.
21. ZITHER PLAYER 1876

The zither player is Max Schmitt, who also appears in Cat. No. 6, and the listener William Sartain, the painter, both boyhood friends of Eakins.

Signed l.r.: "Eakins 76".
Water color, 11 3/4 x 9 1/2 in. G-94.
The Art Institute of Chicago, Olivia Shaler Swan Collection.
22. BABY AT PLAY 1876
Ella Crowell, child of Eakins' sister Frances (Mrs. William J. Crowell) playing in the back yard of the Eakins house at 1729 Mount Vernon Street, Philadelphia.
Signed on brick pavement, l.r.: “Eakins 76”.
32\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 48 in. G-99.
Lent by The Honorable and Mrs. John Hay Whitney.
23. THE CHESS PLAYERS  1876

Benjamin Eakins, the artist’s father, stands watching, while two old friends, Mr. Gardel, teacher of French (to the left), and George W. Holmes, painter and teacher, play a game of chess.

Inscribed on drawer of table: “BENJAMIN EAKINS. FILIUS. PINXIT. 76”.

On wood, 11⅜ x 16⅝ in.  G-96.

Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of the artist, 1881.
24. THE CHESS PLAYERS 1876
Perspective drawing for Cat. No. 23.
Unsigned, undated. Inscribed on note pasted to sheet, u.l.: "Perspective drawing for the painting of the ‘Chess players’ by Thomas Eakins 1876 painting is in the Metropolitan Museum New York City". Inscribed below: "Horizon 60 inches", and "Distance picture 30 inches".
Drawing in pencil and ink on paper, 24 x 19 in. G-97.
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1942.
25. STUDY FOR “WILLIAM RUSH CARVING HIS ALLEGORICAL FIGURE OF THE SCHUYLKILL RIVER” 1876
Signed l.r.: “T. E. 76”, and on back: “EAKINS 76”.
20 x 24 in. G-111. A study for Cat. No. 27.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. James W. Fosburgh.

26. STUDY FOR “WILLIAM RUSH CARVING HIS ALLEGORICAL FIGURE OF THE SCHUYLKILL RIVER”
A study for Cat. No. 27.
Unsigned, undated.
Canvas mounted on cardboard, 14¼ x 11¾ in. G-113.
Lent by Dr. John Jay Ireland.
27. WILLIAM RUSH CARVING HIS ALLEGORICAL FIGURE OF THE SCHUYLKILL RIVER 1877

Eakins shows William Rush (1756-1833), sculptor and ship carver of Philadelphia and the first native American sculptor, carving a statue to commemorate the inauguration of waterworks to supply water from the Schuylkill River to the inhabitants of Philadelphia. Other sculptures by Rush that appear in the background represent Washington and an allegorical figure of the Schuylkill (freed). For preparatory studies and models, see Cat. Nos. 25, 26, and 97.

Signed l.r.: "EAKINS 77", and on back: "T. E."


Philadelphia Museum of Art.
28. THE COURTSHP (Unfinished)  About 1878
The model for the girl was Miss Nannie Williams, who posed for the figure of the model in *William Rush* (Cat. Nos. 25, 26, 27).
Unsigned, undated.
20 x 24 in.  G-119.
*Lent by Mrs. John Richard Hacke.*
29. THE SPINNER (SKETCH)
Sketch for Cat. No. 28.
Recorded as having been signed on back of original canvas: “T.E.”
30\(\frac{1}{16}\) x 25\(\frac{3}{16}\) in. G-121.
Lent by Worcester Art Museum.
30. STUDY FOR "NEGRO BOY DANCING"
Study for Cat. No. 31.
Unsigned, undated.
Canvas mounted on cardboard, 19 5/8 x 15 in. G-125.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.
31. NEGRO BOY DANCING 1878
Signed on bench at r.: “EAKINS 78”.
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1925.
32. STUDY FOR "NEGRO BOY DANCING"
Study for Cat. No. 31.
Unsigned, undated.
21 1/8 x 9 1/2 in. Not in Goodrich.
Lent by The Estate of Joseph Katz.
SEVENTY YEARS AGO  1877

Mrs. King, who was the model for this figure, appears as the chaperon in William Rush (Cat. Nos. 25, 27). She also posed for the figure in Cat. No. 100.

Signed u.r.: “EAKINS 77”.
Water color, 12 x 9 in. (sight). G-114.

Lent by The Art Museum, Princeton University.
34. DR. JOHN H. BRINTON 1876
A well-known surgeon, Major of U.S. Volunteers in the Civil War, medical director of Grant's army and co-founder of the Army Medical Museum, Dr. Brinton taught for many years at Jefferson Medical College where he succeeded to the chair of Dr. Gross.
Signed l.r.: "Eakins 76".
78\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 57\(\frac{1}{4}\) in.  G-101.

*Leut by The Medical Museum of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.*

SIXTY-SIX
MRS. JOHN H. BRINTON 1878
Wife of Dr. Brinton (Cat. No. 34). Born Sarah Ward, she was the sister-in-law of Mrs. William Shaw Ward (Cat. No. 51).
Signed l.r.: "LAKINS 78".
24¼ x 20½ in. G-126.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. R. Meyer de Schauensee.
36. SKETCH FOR “THE FAIRMAN ROGERS FOUR-IN-HAND” 1879
Sketch for Cat. No. 37.
Signed l.r.: “T. E.”.
On wood, 10¼ x 14½ in. G-134.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
37. **THE FAIRMAN ROGERS FOUR-IN-HAND** 1879

Fairman Rogers, an intimate friend of Eakins, was a civil engineer, a sportsman and horseman, and one of the first in Philadelphia to drive a four-in-hand; also Director of The Pennsylvania Academy; Chairman of its committee on instruction. In 1879 he commissioned the artist to paint his four-in-hand coach being driven in Fairmount Park, paying him the largest sum he had received up to that time, $500. On the box seat are Fairman Rogers and Mrs. Rogers; on the seat behind, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin A. Dick and Mrs. Rogers' brother and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. George Gilpin; on the back seat, two grooms. Originally called *A May Morning in the Park.*

Signed on stonework, l.l.: "EAKINS 79".

24 x 36 in. G-133.

*Philadelphia Museum of Art.*
38. THE CRUCIFIXION  1880

J. Laurie Wallace, painter, pupil of Eakins at The Pennsylvania Academy and chief demonstrator of anatomy there in 1882 and 1883, posed for this picture. It was painted in Eakins’ studio, though the studies for it of Wallace strapped to a cross were made outdoors.

Inscribed on back: “CHRISTI EFFIGIEM EAKINS PHILADELPHIENSIS PINXIT MDCCCLXXX”.

96 x 54 in. G-142.

Philadelphia Museum of Art.
39. GENERAL GEORGE CADWALADER 1880
Served in the Mexican War and in the Civil War, and was for many years Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Mutual Assurance Company in Philadelphia. Eakins may have completed this portrait with the assistance of a photograph because the General died in 1879.
Unsigned, undated.
36½ x 24½ in. G-138.
Lent by The Butler Institute of American Art.
THE PATHETIC SONG  
1881

The singer is Miss Harrison, sister of Thomas Alexander and Birge Harrison, Philadelphia marine and landscape painters; the pianist is Susan Hannah Macdowell, who became Eakins' wife in 1884.

Signed ll.: “Eakins 1881”.
45½ x 32¾ in.  G-148.

Lent by The Corcoran Gallery of Art.
SPINNING     1881

The model is the artist’s sister, Margaret Eakins, whose death in about 1882 was one of the greatest griefs of his life. She also appears in Cat. No. 5.

Signed on side of spinning wheel: “EAKINS 1881”.
Water color on paper, 11 x 8 in. (sight). G-144.

Lent by Mrs. John Randolph Garrett, Sr.
42. **SHAD-FISHING AT GLOUCESTER ON THE DELAWARE RIVER**

1881

Scene at the shad-fisheries at Gloucester, N. J. The spectators on the shore include Benjamin Eakins, father of the artist, one of his sisters, and their red setter, Harry.

Signed on back: "T. E."

12½ x 18¼ in. G-152.

*Philadephia Museum of Art.*
SHAD-FISHING AT GLOUCESTER ON THE DELAWARE RIVER
1881

Unsigned, undated.
12 x 18 in. G-154.
Lent by Miss Elisabeth Ball.
44. THE MEADOWS, GLOUCESTER, N. J.  
Eakins' only large pure landscape.  
Originally signed on back: "T. Eakins".  
32½ x 45½ in.  C-161.  
*Philadelphia Museum of Art.*
45. MENDING THE NET  1881
Scene at the shad-fishing grounds at Gloucester, N. J.
Signed on lumber at r. near center: "EAKINS 81".
32 x 45 in.  G-155.
*Philadelphia Museum of Art.*
AN ARCADIAN  About 1883

It would seem, from faint chalk marks now obliterated, that Eakins intended to add at the right the figure of a nude youth playing the pipes. This is one of a very few representations the artist made of idyllic subject matter. For others see Cat. nos. 101, 102.

Signed l.r.: “Eakins”.
14 x 18 in.  G-200.

_Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Goodrich._
HARRY L. BARNITZ 1884
Pupil of Eakins at The Pennsylvania Academy. On the back is a sketch of a street lined with buildings.
Unsigned, undated.
8¼ x 6¾ in. Not in Goodrich.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert A. Harrison.
48. **THE SWIMMING HOLE**  1883

The models for this picture were friends or pupils of Eakins; the artist himself appears swimming at the lower right; the dog is his red setter, Harry.

Signed on rock at outer end of pier: “EAKINS 1883”; inscribed on back by Mrs. Eakins: “Swimming Hole, Thomas Eakins, 1883”.

27 x 36 in.  G-190.

*Lent by Fort Worth Art Association.*
49. COWBOYS IN THE BAD LANDS 1888

This picture shows cowboys with their horses, reconnoitering in the Bad Lands of Dakota, where Eakins spent three months on a ranch during the summer of 1887. The models for the horses were Eakins’ white horse, “Billy,” and his brown Indian pony, “Baldy.”

Signed l.r.: “EAKINS 88”.
32½ x 45½ in.  G-224.

Lent by Mrs. Francis P. Garvan.
PROFESSOR WILLIAM D. MARKS  1836
An engineer and Whitney professor of dynamical engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, and one of Eakins' closest scientific friends, Professor Marks was associated with the artist in experiments in photographing moving animals and athletes.
Signed on side of table at r. center: "EAKINS 36".
76 x 54 in.  G-216.
Lent by Washington University, St. Louis.

EIGHTY-TWO
MRS. WILLIAM SHAW WARD (Unfinished) 1884
Mrs. Ward was the sister-in-law of Mrs. John H. Brinton (Cat. No. 35).
Eakins was commissioned to execute this portrait, which he started in
May, 1884, but never finished because Mrs. Ward could not continue
the sittings.
Unsigned, undated.
40 x 30 in. G-212.
Lent by Mr. T. Edward Hanley.

EIGHTY-THREE
The first meeting between the painter and the poet occurred in 1887 when Eakins went to Camden, N. J., to ask Whitman if he would consent to pose for a portrait. They became close friends, and Whitman was among the few of Eakins’ sitters who genuinely appreciated his portrayal of them. Signed u.r.: "EAKINS 1887"; inscribed on back: "WALT WHITMAN PAINTED FROM LIFE BY THOMAS EAKINS 1887". (Actually finished in the spring of 1888).

30 x 24 in. G-220.

Lent by The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts.
DOUGLASS M. HALL            About 1888
Pupil of Eakins at the Art Students' League of Philadelphia. He died at the age of twenty-seven.
Unsigned, undated.
24 x 20 in.  G-233.

Lent by Dr. and Mrs. W. E. Studdiford, Jr.
Dr. D. Hayes Agnew, who is shown in his clinic at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, was one of the greatest surgeons and anatomists of his time, and for twenty-six years taught surgery at the University. The students commissioned the portrait on the occasion of his resignation in 1889, and Eakins completed in three months what was to be his largest and most ambitious composition. It was presented to the University by the undergraduate classes of the Medical School at the annual commencement, May 1st, 1889. Dr. Agnew, in white surgical costume, is talking to the class about the operation he has just performed, for cancer of the breast. His assistant, Dr. J. William White, later a famous surgeon, applies a dressing to the wound. Dr. Joseph Leidy II holds a sponge to wipe the blood, and the anesthetist, Dr. Ellwood R. Kirby, stands at the patient’s head. Eakins himself (painted by Mrs. Eakins) appears at the extreme right and Dr. Fred H. Milliken is whispering to him. The students posed for the figures in the background.

Inscribed on back: "AGNEW CHIRURGI EAKINS PHILADELPHIENSIS EFFIGIEM PINXIT"; on frame: "D. HAYES AGNEW M. D. CHIRURGUS PERITISSIMUS, SCRIPTOR ET DOCTOR CLARISSIMUS, VIR VENERATUS ET CARISSIMUS, MDCCCLXXXIX".

74 1/2 x 130 1/2 in. G-235.

Lent by University of Pennsylvania.
MRS. LETITIA WILSON JORDAN BACON 1888

Sister of David Wilson Jordan (Cat. No. 75). Eakins saw Mrs. Bacon at a party wearing this dress and asked her to pose for him.

Inscribed l.r.: “TO MY FRIEND D. W. JORDAN. EAKINS 88”.

59 x 39½ in. C-222.

In the Brooklyn Museum Collection.
DR. HORATIO C. WOOD     About 1889
A well-known physician and naturalist, noted especially as a therapeutist. Dr. Wood taught for over forty years at the University of Pennsylvania.
Signed l.r.: "EKINS".
64 x 50 in.  G-239.
Lent by The Detroit Institute of Arts.
57. **FRANKLIN L. SCHENCK**  About 1890
Painter and pupil of Eakins at the Art Students' League of Philadelphia, and its second curator. Poetic and unworldly in temperament, he subsequently lived like a hermit on Long Island. Eakins utilized him as a model in six other pictures.
Unsigned, undated.
24 x 20 in.  G-244.
*Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Wheelwright.*
MISS AMELIA C. VAN BUREN  About 1891
An artist, and one of Eakins’ most gifted pupils at The Pennsylvania Academy.
Unsigned, undated.
45 x 32 in.  G-263.
Lent by The Phillips Collection.
WILLIAM H. MACDOWELL

About 1891

This is a study for an unfinished water color (G-262). It was Eakins' custom to make oil studies for his water colors. For another portrait see Cat. No. 60.

Signed on back: "T. Eakins". Squared off with three faint lines on face.

23 x 22 in.  G-261.

Lent by Randolph-Macon Woman's College.
60. WILLIAM H. MACDOWELL  About 1891
An engraver and Eakins father-in-law, he was a frequent model for the artist. See Cat. No. 59.
Signed on back: "EAKINS".
24 x 20 in. G-260.
Lent by Mr. Walter G. Macdowell.

NINETY-THREE
SKETCH FOR "PROFESSOR HENRY A. ROWLAND" 1891
Unsigned, undated. Inscribed u.r.: "original sketch for Portrait of Prof. Rowland by Thomas Eakins 1891". Squared off for enlarging.
12 x 9 in. G-265.
Lent by Addison Gallery of American Art, Phillips Academy, Andover.

OPPOSITE:

PROFESSOR HENRY A. ROWLAND 1891
Professor of physics at Johns Hopkins University. Of this portrait Eakins wrote: "Professor Rowland is shown with a diffraction grating in his hand. His engine for ruling is beside him and in the background his assistant, Mr. Schneider, is working at his lathe. The frame is ornamented with lines of the spectrum and with coefficients and mathematical formulae relating to light and electricity."
Inscribed on floor, i.l.: "Prof. Henry A. Rowland, Thomas Eakins, 1891".
32½ x 53½ in. G-264.

NINETY-FIVE
63. 

WEDA COOK  

About 1895

Singer, who posed for The Concert Singer (Cat. No. 64). Weda Cook married the pianist Stanley Addicks of whom Eakins also painted a portrait.

Signed lr.: “Eakins”.

24 x 20 in.  G-277.

Lent by The Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts.
64. THE CONCERT SINGER 1892
Portrât of Weda Cook, a well-known singer, friend of Walt Whitman and composer of music for his O Captain! My Captain! The conductor's hand was posed for by Charles M. Schmitz, conductor of the old Germania Orchestra in Philadelphia.
Signed u.r.: "EAKINS 92".
75 x 54 in.  G-266.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
RITER FITZGERALD  1895
Art and music critic of the Philadelphia Item, one of the city’s most brilliant critics, and a friend and constant champion of Eakins.
Signed on base of bookcase, l.l.: “EAKINS 95”.
76 x 64 in.  G-230.

The Art Institute of Chicago, Friends of American Art and Goodman Fund.
66. THE 'CELLO PLAYER 1896

Portrait of Rudolph Hennig, leading 'cellist of the Thomas Orchestra in the '70s. In 1897 The Pennsylvania Academy purchased The 'Cello Player, Eakins' first sale to a leading museum. He gave half of the sale price to Hennig for posing.

Signed l.r.: "Eakins 96".
64 x 48 in. G-291.

Lent by The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts.
SALUTAT 1898

The fighter is Billy Smith. In the audience can be recognized Samuel Murray, David Wilson Jordan (see Cat. No. 75) and Clarence W. Cranmer (see Cat. No. 71).

Signed l.r.: “EAKINS 1898”; carved on original frame: “Dextra victrice conclamantes salutat”.

50 x 40 in. G-310.

Lent by Addison Gallery of American Art, Phillips Academy, Andover.
STUDY FOR "SALUTAT"  Prob. 1898
Inscribed on back: "Dextra victrice Conclamantes salutat. To his friend Sadakichi Hartmann, Thomas Eakins". Sadakichi Hartmann, a well-known art critic of the day, wrote A History of American Art (1902).
20 x 16 in.  G-311.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. James H. Beal.
TAKING THE COUNT

The standing fighter is Charlie McKeever, the kneeling one, Joe Mack; the referee is H. Walter Schlichter. All the spectators are portraits.

Signed l.l.: "EAKINS 98".
96\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 84\(\frac{3}{4}\) in.  G-303.

Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Francis P. Garvan, Class of 1897.

ONE HUNDRED TWO
STUDY FOR "WRESTLERS" 1899

The finished picture is owned by the National Academy of Design, New York, to which Eakins gave it as his "diploma" picture on his election as Academician in 1902.

Signed l.r.: "T. E.", and on back: "T. E.".
16 x 20 in. G-318.

Lent by Los Angeles County Museum, Harrison Collection.
STUDY FOR THE TIMER IN "BETWEEN ROUNDS"  1899
The timer is Clarence W. Cranmer, newspaperman and friend of Eakins
(see Cat. Nos. 67, 72).
Inscribed across bottom: "Souvenir. Clarence W. Cranmer from his
friend Thomas Eakins".
21 x 17 in.  G-316.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Rubin.
72. BETWEEN ROUNDS  1899
The fighter is Billy Smith (see Cat. Nos. 67, 68); the second waving a
towel is Billy McCarney; the one bending over is Ellwood McCloskey.
See Cat. No. 71. All the spectators are portraits. The scene is the
Arena at Broad and Cherry Streets, Philadelphia, no longer in existence.
Signed l.r.: "EAKINS 99".
50¼ x 40 in. G-312.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
ADDIE, WOMAN IN BLACK  1899
Also called MISS MARY ADELINE WILLIAMS. She was a lifelong friend of the Eakinses and lived with the artist and his wife after 1900. Eakins painted a later portrait of her (Cat. No. 80).
Unsigned, undated.
24 x 20 in.  G-323.
The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of Friends of American Art.
MRS. SAMUEL MURRAY (Unfinished)  About 1897
Wife of the sculptor Samuel Murray, Eakins' favorite pupil, and daughter of Mrs. Anna A. Kershaw (Cat. No. 89).
Unsigned, undated.
40 x 30 in.  G-297.

Lent by F. M. Hall Collection, University of Nebraska.
DAVID WILSON JORDAN 1899
Painter, particularly of landscapes. He was a pupil of Eakins at The Pennsylvania Academy and later became a close friend. His sister also posed for Eakins (see Cat. No. 55).
Inscribed l.l.: “DAVID WILSON JORDAN FROM HIS FRIEND THOMAS EAKINS 1899”.
60¼ x 28¼ in. G-329.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Frank I. Winton, Birmingham, Michigan.

ONE HUNDRED EIGHT
The Dean's Roll Call

1899

Portrait of Professor James W. Holland, calling the roll of candidates to receive degrees. He was Dean of Jefferson Medical College for thirty years.

Signed l.r.: “Eakins 1899”.
34 x 42 in. G-327.

Lent by Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts.
THE THINKER: LOUIS N. KENTON 1900
Husband of Mrs. Eakins' sister, Elizabeth Macdowell Kenton.
Signed l.r.: “Eakins 1900”.
82 x 42 in.  G-331.

Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Kennedy Fund, 1917.

ONE HUNDRED TEN
WILLIAM M. CHASE    About 1899
Painter and teacher; for ten years President of the Society of American Artists. During his appointment as Head of the schools of The Pennsylvania Academy from 1897 to 1909, he would often drop in at Eakins' studio, where, both being expert shots, they had rigged up a shooting gallery. They painted portraits of each other, and Eakins gave Chase several pictures (see Cat. No. 15).
Inscribed on back: "TO MY FRIEND WILLIAM M. CHASE, THOMAS EAKINS".
24 x 20 in. G-330.
Lent by Joseph H. Hirshhorn Collection.
79. CLARA       About 1900
Portrait of Clara Janney Mather, a Quaker, pupil and friend of Eakins.
He also did two sketches of her, standing, in black evening dress, which
were studies for a full-length portrait never carried out; instead he
painted this portrait.
Signed l.r.: "T. Eakins".
24 x 20 in.  G.341.
Lent by Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris.
80. ADDIE 1900
Portait of Miss Mary Adeline Williams. For another portrait see Cat. No. 73.
Signed on back: "T. E."
24 x 18 in. G-333.

Philadelphia Museum of Art.
MRS. WILLIAM D. FRISHMUTH  1900

Mrs. Frishmuth was honorary curator of musical instruments at the Pennsylvania Museum and a collector of musical instruments, of which she gave a collection to the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania.

Signed l.r.: “EAKINS 1900”.

96 x 72 in. G-338.

Philadelphia Museum of Art.

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEEN
82. **FRANK JAY ST. JOHN** 1900

Businessman and inventor.

Signed r. center: "EAKINS 1900".

24 1/2 x 20 1/2 in.  G-337.

*Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Fleischman.*
FRONTISPICE:

83. SELF-PORTRAIT 1902
The artist as he saw himself in his 58th year. Painted as his "diploma" portrait on the occasion of his election as Associate of the National Academy of Design.
Unsigned, undated.
30 x 25 in. G-358.
Lent by National Academy of Design.

OPPOSITE:

84. MRS. ELIZABETH DUANE GILLESPIE (Unfinished) 1901
Of this portrait Professor Leslie W. Miller (see Cat. No. 85) wrote: "Mrs. Gillespie refused to go near him [Eakins] again after he received her one blistering hot day in his studio up three or four flights of stairs, dressed only in an old pair of trousers and an undershirt. He wanted her to give him one or two more sittings, but she not only refused them, but wanted me to destroy the portrait after it came into my possession—which of course I didn't do." Professor Miller was the Principal of the Pennsylvania School of Industrial Art.
Inscribed on back: "UNFINISHED PORTRAIT OF MRS. E. D. GILLESPIE BY THOMAS EAKINS PRESENTED BY HIM TO THE PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL ART, 1901".
45 x 30 in. G-351.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.
85. PROFESSOR LESLIE W. MILLER 1901
Painter and teacher of art; Principal of the School of Industrial Art of the Pennsylvania Museum for forty years. He is shown addressing an audience.
Signed on floor, lr.: "Eakins 1901".
38 1/8 x 44 in. G-348.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEEN
THE YOUNG MAN (Unfinished)  About 1902

Portrait of Kern Dodge, son of James Mapes Dodge, prominent Philadelphia businessmen and friend of artists; later consulting engineer and the Director of Public Safety of Philadelphia.

Signed l.r.: "T. Eakins", and on back: "r. e."

45 x 26 in.  G-368.

Philadelphia Museum of Art.
SIGNORE GOMEZ D'ARZA 1902
Italian actress and wife of Enrico Gomez d'Arza, impresario of a small theater in the Italian quarter of Philadelphia. Eakins, who knew Italian well enough to talk it and to read Dante in the original, frequented this theater. The d'Arzas became good friends of the Eakinses.
Signed on back: "T. E. 1902".
30 x 24 in. G:360.
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, George A. Hearn Fund, 1927.
ARCHBISHOP WILLIAM HENRY ELDER       1903
For many years Bishop of Natchez. During the Civil War he was arrested
for not using a form of prayer for the President. He was convicted, but
Signed l.r.: "Eakins 1903".
66 1/2 x 45 1/2 in.  G-374.
Lent by Archbishop Alter of Cincinnati.
MRS. ANNA A. KERSHAW  1903
Mother of Mrs. Samuel Murray (Cat. No. 74), to whom the picture is dedicated.
Inscribed on back: "JENNIE DEAN KERSHAW FROM THOMAS EAKINS 1903".
24 x 20 in.  G-382.
Lent Anonymously.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-TWO
MRS. MARY HALLOCK GREENEWALT  1903

Pianist, soloist with the Pittsburgh and Philadelphia symphony orchestras. The first to coordinate performances of musical compositions and color lighting effects.

Signed u.t.: “EAKINS 1903” ; inscribed on back: “MARIAE HALLOCK EFFIGIEM THOMAS EAKINS PHILADELPHIENSIS PINXIT AN MCMIII”.

36 x 24 in.  G-390.

Lent by Roland P. Murdock Collection, Wichita Art Museum.
Monsignor Diomede Falconio 1905
Third Apostolic Delegate to the United States, Procurator-General of the Franciscan Order and in 1911 created a Cardinal.
Inscribed on back: "HANC EFFIGIEM ILLMI AC REVMI DIOMEDI FALCONIO ARCHLARISSENSIS ET DELEGATI APOSTOLICI IN STATIBVS FOEDERATIS AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS PINXIT THOMAS EAKINS WASHINGTONII MDCCCCV"; and: "EAKINS".
72 1/8 x 54 1/4 in.  C-425.
National Gallery of Art, Gift of Stephen C. Clark.
MUSIC 1904

Portrait of Hedda van der Beemt, violinist of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and Samuel Myers, pianist. Eakins also painted a separate portrait of each of these musicians. On the wall hangs a reproduction of Whistler's *Pablo de Sarasate*, who was one of the most famous violinists of the day.

Signed l.l.: "EAKINS 1904".

39 1/2 x 49 3/4 in.  G-402.

*Lent by Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York, George Cary, Edmund Hayes and James G. Forsyth Funds.*

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE
93. MRS. EDITH MAHON 1904
Pianist, of English birth.
Inscribed on back: "TO MY FRIEND EDITH MAHON, THOMAS EAKINS, 1904".
20 x 16 in. G-407.
Lent by Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Massachusetts.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX
MISS FLORENCE EINSTEIN    1905

Teacher of art, who was for many years head of the department of design of the School of Design for Women in Philadelphia.

Inscribed on back: “TO HIS FRIEND FLORENCE EINSTEIN, THOMAS EAKINS, 1905”.

24 x 20 in.  G-424.

Lent by Mr. and Mrs. R. Sturgis Ingersoll.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-SEVEN
95. A. W. LEE  1905

Though a commission, this portrait was not accepted by the sitter, who paid for it but returned it to the artist.

Unsigned, undated.

49 x 32 in.  G-427.

*Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Fleischman.*

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-EIGHT
MRS. GILBERT LAFAYETTE PARKER 1910
Mother of Gilbert Sunderland Parker who was Curator of Paintings at The Pennsylvania Academy and organized the Eakins Memorial Exhibition in that Institution.
Inscribed on back: "TO HIS FRIEND MRS. PARKER, THOMAS EAKINS, 1910".
24 x 20 in. G-470.
Lent by Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts.
97. STUDIES FOR "WILLIAM RUSH CARVING HIS ALEGROICAL FIGURE OF
THE SCHUYLKILL RIVER"
Plaster casts made in 1932 from the wax models made by Eakins for his painting
William Rush (Cat. No. 27). The original waxes (G-498) will be shown in
Philadelphia only.
a) Head of Rush: H. 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) in.; base 4\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 5 in.
b) Head of Model: 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) in.; 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 3 in.
c) Standing figure of Washington: 8\(\frac{3}{8}\) in.; 4 x 2 in.
d) Nymph and Bittern: 9\(\frac{1}{4}\) in.; 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) in.
e) Schuylkill (freed) : 4\(\frac{3}{4}\) in.; 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 2\(\frac{3}{8}\) in.
A sixth wax model, Figure for the Model, was owned by Mrs. Eakins in 1933. Its
whereabouts today is unknown.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

98. THE MARE "JOSEPHINE" 1878
Relief of one of the horses belonging to Eakins' friend Fairman Rogers. Eakins
also made three anatomical reliefs of this horse.
Signed: "EAKINS 78".
Bronze, 22 x 28 in. G-499.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

99. SPINNING 1882-1883
This and Cat. No. 100 were made on commission as chimney-piece decorations for
the house of James P. Scott in Philadelphia, but were refused by him. They were
carved in plaster in 1881, and cast in 1882-1883.
Inscribed: "SPINNING. THOMAS EAKINS, 1881".
Bronze, 19 x 15 in. (oval). G-504.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

100. KNITTING 1882-1883
Companion piece to Cat. No. 99. The same model as the chaperon in William
Rush (Cat. Nos. 25, 27) and the woman knitting in Seventy Years Ago (Cat. No. 33).
Inscribed: "KNITTING. THOMAS EAKINS, 1881".
Bronze, 18\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 15 in. (oval). G-505.
Philadelphia Museum of Art.

ONE HUNDRED THIRTY
101. ARCADIA  1883
One of three reliefs relating to this subject which was also taken up by Eakins in several paintings, and this is one of his few excursions into the idyllic. See Cat. Nos. 46 and 102.
Signed: “EAKINS 1883”.
Bronze, 12½ x 25 in.  G-506.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Fleischman.

102. A YOUTH PLAYING THE PIPES  1883
One of Eakins’ few representations of idyllic subject matter. See also Cat. Nos. 46 and 101.
Signed: “THOMAS EAKINS 1883” (date erroneous).
Bronze, 20½ x 11¼ in.  G-508.
Lent by Mr. T. Edward Hanley.

103. PHOTOGRAPHS OF MOTION
These photographs were taken by Eakins whose interest in science and anatomy led him, in 1884-1885, to study the exact positions human and animal bodies assumed while in motion. For this purpose he devised a camera with a single viewpoint which could produce successive distinguishable images, and which was simpler and more accurate than the multiple cameras in use at the time.
Upper left: Man bending a dissected horse’s leg.
Upper right: Man on ladder bending a dissected horse’s leg.
Center left: Man broad jumping.
Center right: Man walking.
Lower left: Man running.
Lower right: Man pole vaulting.
All photographs are contact prints, 3¾ x 4½ in.