From the President
Nancy Mowell Mathevs

Once again, Scott Ferris deserves our heartfelt thanks for getting out the CRSA Forum in what little free time his job allows him. He has been our conscience and resolutely prodded us to live up to our promises of text. As a result, the Forum has become an invaluable tool for anyone interested in issues of research, authenticity, and the complex challenges of the catalogue raisonné. Hats off to Scott!

Thanks are also in order to Jeffrey Coven who organized our recent panel on online publishing at the February, 2005, CAA meeting in Atlanta and to our panelists, Christine Podmanisky, Michael Schroeder, and Charles Ritchie. Although, at the last minute, Jeff wasn’t able to attend, the three panelists presented their websites on N.C. Wyeth, Gilbert Munger, and the Gemini GEL artists respectively and set forth the issues inherent in online publishing.

As you already know, we have been awarded a grant from the Dedalus Foundation for continuing the CRSA Forum, the CRSA website, and public events such as last year’s panel on “The Scholar and the Auction House.” We are grateful to the Dedalus Foundation for their support and welcome ideas and helping hands to see these programs rise to a new level.

I would also like to thank Lisa Koenigsberg of the NYU School of Continuing and Professional Studies for organizing the upcoming conference, “Where Angels Fear to Tread: The Catalogue Raisonné and Its Explosive Potential”, Saturday, April 16- Sunday, April 17, 2005. For more information, please see our website, catalogue raisonne.org or call (212) 998-7137.

Recently we have had a discussion on our CRSA list serve about possible web hosts for online publishing of catalogues raisonnés. This is a topic of great interest to our members who face astronomical fees for publishing in book form. We are now looking for a volunteer who might chair a committee to discuss the various issues and options and present recommendations to the membership. Please send your nominations to me, nmathews@williams.edu.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

At Last, Something On Photography:
Observations on Photograph Catalogues Raisonné
Steven Manford

Foreword

This paper was given at the conference ‘A Catalogue Raisonné: A Seminar in New York’ on April 17, 2004. The conference was organized by Lisa Koenigsberg for the School of Continuing and Professional Studies, Programs in the Art, New York University.

As a photo historian preparing a catalogue raisonné of Man Ray’s Rayographs I have taken an interest in others efforts to compile a photograph catalogue raisonné. Presently it is a small group of scholars. Just three photograph catalogues raisonné have been published to date. It is because we are witnessing a beginning that I believe this new catalogue raisonné is worth our close attention. Here then, is an informal orientation on the history of the photograph catalogue raisonné. Along the way Man Ray makes a few appearances.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Something on Photography
continued from page one

While photography was invented in 1839, it is only in the last three decades that a real enthusiasm and sustainable market for creative photography has emerged. In the 1970s photography galleries took root, primarily in New York City. The history of photography then becomes a modest area of study in the university. The photography auction market develops at Sotheby's and Christie's. Notable publications broke new ground—pointing in the right direction. A few could be considered a precursor to the photograph catalogue raisonné. Among those, Weston Naef's *The Collection of Alfred Stieglitz: Fifty Pioneers of Modern Photography*. Published in 1978 by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the book is an inventory of the collection of photographs given by Stieglitz to the museum. Simultaneously, Naef's examination of the individual photograph as object was unprecedented. Inscriptions and notations were transcribed. The particulars about the mounts were noted. Examples of signatures and monograms were reproduced. Photographic papers were analyzed. The book remains invaluable as a model for scholarship.

By the 1980s, museums are regularly exhibiting and collecting photography. But despite the rapid successes—in the excitement—the photography world forgot about the catalogue raisonné. Forgotten is not the right word. The notion of the catalogue raisonné had yet to really make an impression. The idea had not sufficiently matured.

The successes and disasters of the 1990s would draw the trade and scholar to the subject of the catalogue raisonné. The first trend was an emerging interest for photographs, Man Ray being among those. Photographs were finally acknowledged as unique and rare objects. We awakened to the Fallacy that great photographs were in endless supply. 'Vintage photograph' became an overused expression. We see a more rigorous examination of the photograph. With each new auction record set, one saw greater demand for catalogue raisonné type research.

But the wake up call came when a large numbers of photographs by Lewis Hine and Man Ray were proven to have been forged. As a Man Ray scholar specializing in the photographs of Man Ray I myself was not surprised by events.
Too many people had easy access to Man Ray's negatives. Many negatives remain unaccounted for. In a related matter, until recently, unauthorized posthumous prints were being made from Man Ray's negatives. The number of prints may exceed one thousand. This is not the problem. They were poorly identified as posthumous. Many have found their way into museums, particularly Japan and France. Vaguely marked posthumously printed photographs is not a problem unique to Man Ray.

In the 1990s we still accepted with little hesitation the authenticity of the photograph, providing that it was a picture we recognized as having been made by a known photographer. As a consequence of the scandals of the 1990s scholars are becoming aware of the demand for an inventory of a photographer’s oeuvre. Recent events showed the role a photograph catalogue raisonné could play—and these events gave an urgency to such projects.

continued on page 6

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION
Our series on lesser known artists continues with this introduction to Sally James Farnham by Michael Reed.

Sally James Farnham
Michael P. Reed

In 1908 The Monumental News lauded the work of seven women sculptors who dominated the field of monumental sculpture in America. These women were “not mere amateurs amusing themselves, but women who take and execute practical work in competition with artists of the other sex.” They pioneered in a field largely dominated by men and were awarded important commissions for public sculpture on their own technical and artistic merit. Today the names of these women have gone largely unnoticed by scholars and collectors of American art. The current resurgence of interest in art during this vital period has shed new light and advanced scholarship on the careers of important women sculptors such as Evelyn Beatrice Longman, Anna Hyatt Huntington and Harriet Frishmuth, to name just a few.

That Sally James Farnham was named among this group was an incredible feat for a woman who had just six years prior taken up the vocation without any technical training. Her creativity was often driven by personal heartache and her indomitable will to succeed in her chosen field was repeatedly challenged by professional setbacks. At the height of her career, Farnham would enjoy an international reputation. Despite her accomplishments and notoriety, she is regarded today as a minor sculptor and her work is largely forgotten. Her long and remarkable career is due for reexamination.

Sarah Welles James was born on November 27, 1869 in Ogdensburg, New York into a family of some wealth and a lineage that could be traced back to the Mayflower’s William Bradford. From an early age, Sally was an accomplished equestrienne who loved the physical activities that life on the St. Lawrence River afforded. Motherless by the age of ten, Sally moved to New York City with her father, Col. Edward C. James, a celebrated trial lawyer. Together they traveled the world exploring foreign cultures and art. There is little indication that she showed any overt interest in creating “art” much less pursuing it as a viable career in her future.

On December 31, 1896 Sally married Paulding Farnham, the award winning design director of jewelry and silver at Tiffany and Company. Together they moved to his family’s estate in Great Neck, New York and she settled into an active life as wife, mother and society matron. This idyllic existence came to an abrupt end in 1901. That year her beloved father died and she later was afflicted with an illness that confined her to a hospital bed. Depressed and bedridden, her husband brought her some modeling clay hoping it would take her mind off of her infirmity. She immediately began to model horses and small figures, later remembering that it was “as if in some mysterious previous state of existence I had actually been a sculptor and the memory of it was beginning to leak back into my fingers and thumbs.”

In the face of oppressive constraints brought on by society and motherhood, Farnham decided to seriously pursue this new interest as a profession and opened a studio in New York the following year. Advice and guidance were given her husband, a sculptor in his own right, and Frederic Remington, a friend from her days in Ogdensburg. Following a busy year of producing portrait busts and small studio works, she was awarded her first important commission, a garden fountain for Col. Isaac Emerson of Baltimore. The fountain was a Beaux Arts confection depicting three life size nude maidens frolicking hand in hand around a center spout topped with a young figure of Pan. The work is illustrative of Farnham’s early output being ambitious in scope and a bit daring in content. The work brought her an astounding $5,000 and was prominently illustrated in a 1905 article on the artist in The New York Times.

Over the course of the next few years, she won numerous competitions to create war memorials in Ogdensburg and Rochester, NY. These works were praised for their “unique solution of the problem presented by the typical soldiers monument.” In 1906, the social activist Jacob Riis commissioned her to model a bas-relief of President Theodore Roosevelt. The relief was placed in the gymnasium of the Henry Street Settlement House in New York City. This gave Farnham her first true dose of national exposure as news briefs regarding the work were found in newspapers across the country. Her reputation as a capable and increasingly formidable sculptor began to precede her.

Portrait, Jascha Heifetz, Bronze, ca. 1923, Dorothy Chandler Pavilion. Photo courtesy McMahon Family Archives.
In 1908, she was invited to create four bronze relief panels for the Governing Board Room of the new Pan American Union building in Washington, D.C. The task was difficult as themes of the discovery, exploration and settlement of the New World were tricky to depict. Farnham was sensitive to the realties and the brutality that the conquest of these lands provoked. After reworking the content of many of the panels to please various factions, The Frieze of the Discoverers was critically well received and praised for its exact attention to historical detail, as well as its sensitive treatment and modeling. Commissions for various marbles busts of South American patriots were awarded to Farnham on the success of the frieze.

In sharp contrast to her burgeoning career, Farnham’s marriage began to quickly deteriorate. Her husband had abruptly resigned as Tiffany’s in 1907 and had moved west, draining the family’s resources on various get rich quick mining schemes. The emotional and financial toll ended when Sally was awarded a divorce on the grounds of abandonment in 1915. Farnham became solely responsible for the financial welfare of her young children and, despite her personal heartache, succeeded in securing the most important commission of her career, one that would bring her international acclaim.

The Venezuelan government sought to replace an often-criticized equestrian monument of Simon Bolivar originally given to the city of New York in 1886. The original bronze by R. de la Cora was notoriously labeled a “monstercpiece.” Farnham’s noble rendering of the Liberator was chosen over the work of fifteen other top sculptors. Numerous delays hampered the production of her monument. The war in Europe had hindered the availability of competent workmen and the necessary bronze. Farnham’s final clay version was destroyed during the course of a public dispute with her landlord over the issue of unpaid rent. Five years later the fifteen-foot monument was dedicated on April 19, 1921 before a crowd of thousands, including the keynote speaker President Warren G. Harding. The work was critically acclaimed by all accounts and was lauded as “the largest work by a woman which history anywhere records.” At the time it was also the only equestrian monument of a man created by a woman. For her incredible effort, Sally was awarded the highest honor bestowed by the Venezuelan government, the Order of the Liberator.

During the 1920’s, Farnham continued exhibiting her work at various venues, including the National Sculpture Society, the National Academy of Design and the Pennsylvania Academy of Art. Her portraiture work was sought after and recorded the visages of some of the decade’s most notable personalities, including President Harding, Lynn Fontanne, Marshal Ferdinand Foch and William Mulholland. Her cutout portrait of violinist Jascha Heifetz is a beautiful example of Farnham’s mastery in this field, a lesson in a paired down naturalism that Farnham increasingly developed. Later in the decade she was awarded a commission to create a heroic sized monument depicting Father Junipero Serra (1925) for the San Fernando Mission in Los Angeles and another important war memorial (1927) for Fultonville, NY.

*continued on page 5*

**IN REVIEW**

Scott R. Ferris

Dan Burne Jones, with an Introduction by Carl Zigrosser

*The Prints of Rockwell Kent: A Catalogue Raisonné*


catalogue raisonné. An annotated catalogue of the works of an artist that aims at completeness.

Producing a catalogue raisonné (hereafter: CR) is a daunting, all consuming task. The scholar compiling a CR must possess an intimate knowledge of the artwork under study, have examined the artwork and relevant studies, and have access to related, often obscure references—artist’s notes, photography, publications, ephemera. For the chronicler who is fortunate enough to be working with an artist, the burden may be vastly reduced.

Though late out of the gate on this specific project, Dan Burne Jones had accumulated volumes of reference materials, over decades of collecting, prior to obtaining the artist’s confidence. Therefore, when Carl Zigrosser, who had begun the process of cataloguing Kent’s prints, decided he could not complete the project, he confidently relinquished his task to Burne Jones.

Burne Jones came to this CR project a trained studio artist and a teacher of fine arts, whose own graphic work reflected the influence of Kent and Lynd Ward. He was a traditionalist in the sense that he maintained a restricted view of how a print was created. For example, he favored the theory that a lithograph was directly drawn on and hand pulled from a stone or plate. Nevertheless, he apparently possessed no qualms about Kent’s propensity to have his relief prints pulled from an electrotype versus the original block.

Though Burne Jones, like most CR scholars, was meticulous (not infallible) in his research, the odds of locating all the artwork and related data were stacked against him. Consequently, there are a few factors that instigated the updating of this CR: 1.) the publication of this tome alerted holders of previously undisclosed material to come forth with their objects; 2.) the ongoing study of this artist and his work generated a wealth of new data; and 3.) the greater access to original resources, and the critiquing by informed critics, brought to light errors throughout the text.

Not long after its initial release, Alan Wofsy, a publisher of catalogues raisonné, anticipated the need for a revised edition of *The Prints of Rockwell Kent* (hereafter: Original Edition). He first had contact with this author in January of 1982, when I was in the final stretch of my tenure as director of The Rockwell Kent Legacies—the promotional arm of the Kent estate. Though no discussion of the CR occurred between us, Wofsy, for all intensive purposes, had established contact with the estate. Subsequent attempts to develop a working relationship with the estate waned. When Sally Kent Gorton—Kent’s widow and the owner of most of his intellectual property—passed away
in May of 2000, she bequeathed the majority of her rights to the College Foundation at the State University of New York College at Plattsburgh. Apparently, during the transition of affairs from Sally Gorton to the College Foundation, any negotiations, that may have germinated between Mr. Wofsy and the estate collapsed. The failure to establish a cooperative venture has crippled the release of the revised edition (hereafter: Revised Edition).

The Revised Edition, a collaboration between Mr. Wofsy, as publisher and Kent aficionado Robert Rightmire as editor (with additional commentary by fellow Kent aficionado and dealer, Jake Milgram Wien) was printed in 2002 and is being marketed independently through Alan Wofsy Fine Arts. In retrospect, the unfortunate misunderstanding between Mr. Wofsy and the copyright holders foreshadowed the mistakes that would encumber the Revised Edition, which now requires a fresh revision.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN DESIGN**

If one were to judge a book solely by its cover, the Revised Edition would come across as a rich, colorful tome. Its dust wrapper provides a handsome alternative to the sharp design of the Original Edition: it displays Kent's lithograph, *Sermilik Fjord* (DBJ#65), in full, albeit slightly off, color. The rich tonalities and bold modeling Kent created to depict the Greenland terrain are better appreciated by removing the dust wrapper and unfolding it horizontally. The strength of this surface design is carried over inside the hard-cover, from the frontispiece to page vii. Within this space the designer has juxtaposed elements from both editions, adding measurably by incorporating illustrations of four of Kent's colored prints (three of these are depicted full page). Five additional prints are illustrated in color, also within the front matter, but to lesser effect.

The Revised Edition was produced in a smaller format but with a substantial increase in the number of pages. The page increase is due, in good part, to the separation of several of the major print illustrations from the related text and imagery, and by the inclusion of two new appendices. One advantage of this separation, as well as of the larger font and line spacing, is that the page is easier to read. The new layout is basically sound design, though occasionally misapplied, as in Appendix I, "Posthumous Prints."

From a visual perspective the "posthumous" section will be remembered more for its white paper. In an attempt to maintain the text-to-the-left, image-to-the-right layout, the designer reduced the size of the image versus working the text around a larger illustration.

An appropriate choice was made to exchange the textured paper of the Original Edition for a matte finish in the Revised. Unfortunately, the potential benefits of the matte finish were lost when the designer declined to use new photography. As a consequence, the illustrations in the Revised Edition are drastically darkened, jeopardizing the integrity of Kent's fine lines and subtle shading; extreme examples of this include *Seated Nude* (DBJ#80) and *Princeton Tiger* (DBJ#144).

Another shortcoming, that could readily have been avoided, pertains to related illustrations and how they are used to clarify the text; I offer three examples that speak to this matter.

1.) Identifying an artist's technical applications through illustrations. The lithograph *Glory, Glory Hallelujah* (DBJ#134) was conceived as a broadside, of sorts, incorporating figural and textual elements. In the Original Edition this print is illustrated solely in its figural state; in the Revised Edition we see it in its completed form. Appropriately, the accompanying CR entry provides the explanation that the illustrations fail to do on their own: the figural imagery was created as a lithograph; the text was added later as hand-set type.

2.) Identifying the print and, where relevant, its variant forms: For example, *Supplication* (DBJ# 8) was printed in an edition of 1560: 60 as the figural composition only, and 1500, with text, as an announcement for an exhibition of Kent's watercolors. It is believed that the total edition was pulled from the same printing block.

3.) The artist's proclivity to recycle his imagery. Kent created a composition—*In the Year of Our Lord*—whose similarities to three other works has led to misattributions. In *the Year of Our Lord* (DBJ#112) is a wood engraving continued on page 8

*Bacchia Fountain, Bronze, 1903, Private Collection, Baltimore, MD.*

**Sally James Farnham continued from page 4**

The dire financial crisis the country faced after the stock market crash of 1929 limited the work of many artists, including Farnham. Her output was minimal during this period. Regardless of her own productivity, she was actively engaged in supporting and advancing the careers of the next generation. Artists such as Olaf Wieghorst, William Wheeler, William Zorach, Evelyn Borchard Metzger and Will James can thank Farnham for her influence and connections in getting some of their early work seen.

In 1930, Farnham modeled what
she considered to be her best work. "Pay Day" was an obvious homage to her early mentor and friend, Frederic Remington, depicting four rowdy cowboys racing into town to spend their paychecks on liquor and women. The work is full of the robust energy for which Farnham was known. She liked best "sculptures that are full of force, feeling and emotional expression. I want to believe the whole heart and soul of the artist is in his work. When he can make others believe that, he is a great artist."

Farnham's last truly important work took form in 1936. She entered a competition to create a lasting memorial to the memory of Will Rogers. The work was a powerhouse of subtle detail and quiet contemplation. Rogers' widow refused to have her husband remembered as a cowboy and the commission eventually was awarded to Jo Davidson, but Farnham's "Rogers" won the hearts of admirers across the country as photos of it surfaced in newspapers and magazines. She wrote, "I have always felt beauty as well as strength, and loved them. These are important things in sculpture. To mould feeling, strength and wisdom, to see through the outer form and bring to the surface the unconscious joys of life, this is my task." The bronze brought a record $48,000 at auction in 1988 for a work by the artist.

On April 28, 1943 Farnham died in New York after several years of poor health. Her reputation seemed to have virtually died with her. In 1951, her magnum opus, the Simon Bolivar monument was moved to a new location within Central Park. The rededication of the work was a grand affair, yet newspaper accounts and even the official brochure incredibly failed to mention Farnham's name even once.

For a more complete look at the career of Sally James Farnham, a website has been developed documenting and illustrating her various works at http://www.sallyjamesfarnham.org. Like so many of her hard working contemporaries, she rightly deserves a second look.

©Michael P. Reed 2004

CRSA Forum

Something on Photography continued from page 3

In 2002 and 2003, at last, the photograph catalogue raisonné appears. The first is Alfred Stieglitz: The Key Set by Sarah Greenough. It is published by the National Gallery of Art, in Washington, and Harry Abrams. Some do not consider this book a catalogue raisonné. I do. Stieglitz accumulated 2,500 photographs. Over time he edited the material destroying portions. Later Georgia O'Keeffe selected one of each print, including variants and placed them with the National Gallery. In total 1,642 photographs. It is Alfred Stieglitz's catalogue raisonné of Alfred Stieglitz. It seems to me that Stieglitz has a right to edit his catalogue raisonné. The Key Set is no mere collection inventory. Greenough notes where other examples of photographs reproduced in The Key Set are located. The details of these photographs are included. The two volumes run to 1000 pages.

The enormous Stieglitz offering was followed in 2003 by Julia Margaret Cameron: The Complete Photographs. The catalogue was coauthored by Julian Cox, Assistant Curator of Photographs at the J. Paul Getty Museum, and Colin Ford, former head of The National Museum of Photography, Film & Television, in Bradford, England. The J. Paul Getty Museum, in Los Angeles published the catalogue and hosted the project. The Complete Photographs is 560 pages.

Following Stieglitz, and Cameron, the publication, The Photographs of Linnæus Tripe: A Catalogue Raisonné was released. Authored by Janet Dewan and published by the Art Gallery of Ontario, in Toronto, it is the first notable photograph catalogue raisonné using in its title the phrase "Catalogue Raisonné". Linnaeus Tripe, for those not familiar with his work, photographed much of the architecture and landscape of India and Burma in the 1850s. A single slipcased catalogue it runs 782 pages.

These catalogues 'as projects' are similar. Let me offer some general observations about their likeninded character: Each were institutionally supported by an art museum: the National Gallery, the J. Paul Getty Museum, and the Art Gallery of Ontario. At least some of the funding base has come from those institutions. The Key Set benefited from the financial support of the Eastman Kodak Company. The Linnaeus Tripe received some foundation funding.

The scholarship largely comes from within the host institution. Besides Sarah Greenough, Curator of Photographs at the National Gallery, other staff members of the Galllery contributed to the Stieglitz catalogue. The Cameron catalogue had contributors from outside the Getty. The Tripe catalogue is unique. Author Janet Dewan is an independent scholar not affiliated with the host institution. This is common. Many well advanced photograph catalogue raisonné projects are currently being undertaken outside the museum. Larry Schaaf's research for the William Henry Fox Talbot catalogue raisonné, and my research for the Rayograph catalogue raisonné are examples.

Scholarship has been a longstanding commitment. Greenough, Dewan, and Colin Ford each devoted twenty years to their work on their photographer. The timelines for the catalogues themselves have been shorter. When these scholars began their research I doubt they envisioned a catalogue raisonné. Today, it is not surprising to see a photo historian launch into a project with the goal of producing a catalogue raisonné. Such has been the growth of the profession and the appetite for photo history.

Each institution had a vested interest in a publication. The National Gallery, as mentioned, owns 1,600 Stieglitz photographs. The largest collection of Stieglitz photographs. The Getty owns 303 Cameron photographs, making it the second largest such collection. The Art Gallery of Ontario, owns 148 Tripe photographs, with others on extended loan to the Canadian museum. Ownership of rich collections provided a compelling rationale for undertaking labour intensive and costly projects.

Fortunately, these were projects of manageable scope and size. The three catalogues each involve between 1000
and 1700 entries; a large but reasonable number. One contentious issue faced by the photograph catalogue raisonné scholar is: What constitutes a photographer's life work? None of the publications really confront this problem, or has to wrestle with incorporating the additional material. Allow me an example. Roughly 13,500 negatives by Man Ray are housed in the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris. He produced many more negatives in his lifetime. This gives a sense of the number of photographs made in his lifetime. How could one ever entertain a catalogue raisonné of Man Ray's photographs? Who could lift such an enormous set of catalogues? (Perhaps a publication in a DVD format is the only solution.) Since Man Ray took on commercial assignments, incidental portrait work, and copy work, as many photographers did, what would be included in such a catalogue raisonné? Who decides?

My research for the Rayograph catalogue raisonné is manageable because each of the cameraless photographs is unique. Each is made without a negative. I aspire to a reasonable sized volume numbering an estimated 500 unique works, plus portfolios, and editions. These Man Ray considered works of art, quite distinct from his other photography. It is hard to say what else Man Ray would consider to put in to a catalogue raisonné of his photographs.

Delving into the catalogues: How have the authors dealt with issues specific to the medium of photography? What are the solutions when there is no model for the photograph catalogue raisonné? Two questions seem critical: How are photographs catalogued? The other: Are the photographer's negatives incorporated into the catalogue? Each catalogue organizes and interprets photographs and negatives differently. We have no agreement as to a standard for dealing with photographs and negatives.

Organizing and selecting the photographer's photographs is not a straightforward task. While photography is a multiple many photographs made from the same negative can vary enormously. What do you do with variants? Photographs used are markedly different in colour, tonal scale, and texture. Later photographs from old negatives can be radical reinterpretations by the photographer. Does the scholar catalogue and illustrate every photograph made? Or does one select just the best example? Who is to say which photograph from one negative is the definitive example?

Each photograph in Alfred Stieglitz: The Key Set is reproduced, catalogued, and given a catalogue number. Variants are not a subset. They are numbered consecutively though. This is one solution. On a given double page spread there might be four photographs from the same negative. Two might be photogravures (in different formats), and the other two may be gelatin silver prints (printed at different dates), for example. There are minor drawbacks to Greenough's cataloging. If for instance, you owned a gelatin silver print of this image but it was larger than the two prints catalogued. If you wanted to reference The Key Set which entry number would you cite?

The Cameron catalogue is more complicated in its organization. The photographs are grouped into eight chapters. Chapters include the titles: "Women," "Men," "Children," "Religion" and "Ceylon." Within each chapter the photographs are sequenced alphabetically according to the sitters' last name— even when the photograph is titled. Within this order photographs are sequenced chronologically. For the reader, this organization is initially a little difficult to navigate through. Organizing by sitters name works well when you have one sitter. As more sitters are introduced the authors fix upon one name and attempt to reconstruct the day's photographic session. Thankfully, titles and sitter names are indexed. The problem is there is no way to view the work chronologically as a whole. Even within a chapter you are constantly jumping backward and forward in time. It is therefore unfortunately not possible to track the evolution of the work.

As to which photographs are reproduced. In the 'Notes to the Reader' the authors write that "their principal goal has been to show one print from each unique Cameron negative." Selecting the 'one print' has been controversial. But there are a few facts worth considering before rushing to judgment. The catalogue itself reproduces the works as small black and white prints. Therefore, the extravagance of reproducing variants and subtly different cropped versions is really lost anyhow. The Stieglitz Key Set works in reproducing numerous variants in gravure, carbon, platinum, gelatin-silver, and palladium, works precisely because the reproductions are exquisitely reproduced. These were also scaled, and are slightly larger reproductions.

The Cameron catalogue falls short of the unrealistic goal of noting every Cameron print in existence. The Trine catalogue meets the challenge. Under extremely ideal circumstances, it is possible to locate and catalogue all of a photographer's photographs. Because Trine was employed by the Government of India and the Madras Presidency we know how many photographs he made. Photographs were produced in sets in portfolios, making the number a known quantity. And because Trine was an employee he had to account for the quantity of photographic paper and photographic chemicals he used. An inventory exists of supplies. So, Dewan was able to approximate the photographer's oeuvre. That much of the work was collected in portfolios further helped.

Photo historians are divided on the appropriate use of a photographer's negatives. Printing from the original negative for research purposes is a flash point. Some photographer's estates restrict access to such negatives. Arguably, the negative reveals secrets about the creation of a photograph. From the photographer's perspective this is a bad thing. To paraphrase Man Ray: 'People want to know how a picture was made rather than why a picture was made.' On the other hand, comparing the negative to the photograph is inevitably insightful. It is not surprising that each catalogue handles the question of the negative in a thoughtful manner.

Greenough does not take up the subject of Stieglitz's negatives, nor does she reproduce any negatives. This is no sur-
prise. Stieglitz would oppose anyone using or printing his negatives. My sense is that the negatives were not considered because of the wishes of the estate. Whether Greenough might have liked to have cited the negatives is another question. Rumours that Stieglitz's negatives were cancelled and discarded could not be confirmed.

In his catalogue essay Cox meticulously examines the subject of the negative. The project identifies two surviving negatives. One of the large glass plates was available for study. Since Cameron made her negatives—which involved sensitizing and coating a sheet of the glass with a solution of wet collodion—and developed them herself, Julian's remarks center on her technique and proficiency. No virtual positive was manufactured. The two surviving negatives are reproduced as entries. They are placed alongside photographs made during the same session. I'm not convinced the negatives belong among the photographs.

Janet Dewan makes a compelling case for using the Tripe negatives. Some Tripe photographs remain unlocated. When this has happened the negative has been used to create a virtual positive. No physical print was manufactured. The catalogue printer reversed the tonal scale of the negative reproduction in the printing. Whenever this has been done it is noted in the catalogue entry.

There is, I propose, an interesting rationale for making virtual positives of the Tripe material. One could not take a Stieglitz negative reverse the tones and call it a facsimile of an Stieglitz photograph. A Stieglitz photograph is consciously a work of art requiring the talents of an accomplished printmaker. Tripe's photographs are vital as historic documents of place. Tripe did not need to make his prints. Printing here is a purely mechanical act. The newly created small catalogue reproductions are perfectly useful facsimiles. Dewan uses the negative to recover lost work.

It is too soon to draw conclusions about the role the negative will play in catalogue raisonné scholarship. The authors worked with the resources they had available to them. Each was responsive and sensitive to the nature of the photographer's oeuvre. Whenever negatives were reproduced they were fully described. Nothing in the way of posthumous prints have been generated, published, or sold. So far, so good.

When I began my catalogue raisonné research for the Rayographs my inspiration was catalogue raisonné of paintings, etchings, and multiples. Looking for a kindred spirit I would reach for David Sylvester's exquisite multivolume catalogue raisonné for Rene Magritte. Now Tripe, Cameron, and Stieglitz are a kindred spirit for the next generation of photo historians. They will engender a dialogue, and offer lessons. It is the right time. There are no less than ten photograph catalogue raisonnés in the research stages. Manuel Alverez-Brajo, Dora Maar, William Henry Fox Talbot & His Circle, Moholy-Nagy, and Man Ray are now in the hands of the catalogue raisonné scholars. The pendulum has swung back. Photo historians are looking at the Stieglitz, Cameron, and Tripe catalogues. The catalogue raisonné is now a known entity. At last we have something.

© Steven Manford

---

REVIEW: RK Prints
continued from page 5

That depicts a mother, alarmed by an explosion (a ball of light) to her left, shielding her child at her right flank. A second work, considered to be a drawing, depicts the same mother and child, but this time the mother looks toward two people who are fleeing from a burning building, while sparks from the fire blow their way. This second image was reproduced in the newsletter, Equal Justice (Sept. 1939), under the title, "The Hunted"; in the September, 1937 edition of The Labor Defender, in the article, "From This Time Forward, Forevermore" (the article is mis-titled in both CR editions); in Kent's book, This Is My Own (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1940), under the title, "In the Year of Our Lord"; and in Andrei Che- godaev's hardcover book, Rockwell Kent (1962 and 1963). The third composition, referred to as the "original drawing" for In the Year of Our Lord (though again, varying slightly in composition: reversed; flames shooting toward the couple, who are framed in light; detailed ground cover), was reproduced, relatively recently, in an edition of 159 offset prints, authorized by Plattsburgh State Art Museum—brining us to four variant forms of a similar composition. Needless to say, visual support, by means of related illustrations, would have helped identify the variations in each case described above.

I will address two additional issues—one pertaining to design, the other, regarding new material—before turning to more specific matters of content.

Kent's wood engraving, Starlight (DB#52), was reversed in the Original Edition; the error was corrected in the Revised Edition. A brief statement regarding this correction would have eliminated any lingering doubt as to its proper position. Unfortunately, two other images, in the Revised Edition, are illustrated in reverse: The Christmas Tree (DB#155 and RR [Robert Rightmire] #0) and the reproduced drawing, Madonna and Child (RR# P2).

There are two new appendices in the Revised Edition: a "Title Index" and "Posthumous Prints." Both of these appendices are welcomed additions, though with the following caveat. Easier referencing may have been the result had the "Title Index" been placed at the beginning of all appendices—much like a table of contents—succeeded by the "List of Variant Print Titles." All other appendices—equally visual as textual—would then follow. "Posthumous Prints" presents an assortment of complex issues (that will be discussed below) that underscore the purpose of a print CR: identifying what constitutes a print; the ethics of posthumous printing; and a somewhat more general issue, the structure of a CR (chronological order is presumed to be the standard).

WHEN A CR IS NOT A CR:
CONTENT

The underlying problem with The Prints of Rockwell Kent: A Catalogue

CRSA Forum
Raisonné—both the Original and the Revised Editions—is that it lacks CR foundations. What I mean by this is that the book has its roots and general structure in an anthology that the artist and his friend, Carl Zigrosser, published in 1933—*Rockwellkentiana: Few Words and Many Pictures* by R. K. and, Carl Zigrosser, A Bibliography and List of Prints."

Zigrosser, as we know, was a print specialist: a former director at Weyhe Gallery in New York and head of the print department at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. He left his enormous Kent collection (hundreds of drawings, prints, etc.) to PMA and his papers—including his correspondence with Kent—to the University of Pennsylvania.

If we take the subtitle literally, and we should, *Rockwellkentiana* provides a simple list of prints, not a CR. Nevertheless, Zigrosser's accompanying comments, titled "Notes," enrich his entry by shedding light on Kent's printing and spare documenting processes. "The dates given [to the prints in the checklist] are those of execution, which sometimes do not coincide with the dates of publication," Zigrosser wrote, and "an exception to this has been made in the case of small and relatively unimportant woodcuts, which are arranged in a separate chronological list numbered with letters of the alphabet." Regarding wood engravings, Zigrosser said: "Mr. Kent...print[s] not from the original block, but from an electro-type of the original block, carefully worked over with a burin by the artist." (Identifying which of Kent's prints were produced in this manner and which were produced directly from the engraver's block, should have been done at the very top of each catalogue entry.) With respect to the frequent misattribution of Kent's various media, Zigrosser wrote: "In order to avoid any possible confusion that might ensue between the true woodcuts and certain signed reproductions of brush drawings, a list of the reproductions with dimensions is given below."

In essence, Zigrosser was offering an outline of how, and how not to catalogue Kent's work. Without heeding his warnings, Burne Jones modeled his catalogue after Zigrosser's list, which became the template for Mr. Rightmire as well. Therefore, the problems that we face in the Original Edition are compounded in the Revised Edition, and they begin with the very first entry.

Burne Jones began his CR with the wood engraving, *Blue Bird* (DBJ#1). Mr. Rightmire began the Revised Edition with a print that Mr. Wien owns, *The Christmas Tree* (see Jake Milgram Wien, "Rockwell Kent's First Print," *Print Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII, 2001). Though Mr. Wien argues, in his *Print Quarterly* review of the Revised Edition (Vol. XX, 2003), that the Burne Jones text should have been reorganized, he does not stray from his conclusion that *The Christmas Tree* is Kent's first print.

Mr. Wien also differs with Burne Jones on how *The Christmas Tree* was produced—the medium Kent employed. Mr. Wien believes it to be a woodcut: Burne Jones, a linoleum cut. It appears that this print was pulled by rudimentary means (not using a press), even so, the grain of a wood block should be visible; conversely, the smooth surface of a linoleum block does have the propensity to smudge, as is evident in the illustrations provided in both the Original and the Revised Editions. Considering the available evidence—partial and full artist's proofs (the location of the block is still unknown)—the linoleum cut theory seems logical.

In Mr. Wien's review of the Revised Edition, he argues that *Mother and Child at Monhegan* (circa 1910), an etching on copper, and *Punch and Judy Show* (1914), a woodcut, would be, had Burne Jones followed Peter Morse's CR of John Sloan's prints as a model, catalogued as Kent's first two prints. I would agree with him except for the fact that Frederic Dorr Steele, in his article "Veteran Illustrator Goes Reminiscent," (*The Colophon*, No. 3, Sept., 1939), illustrates his reminiscences of Kent with a small block he captioned, "First wood block by Rockwell Kent." The illustration depicts a lone tree at waters edge before a jut of land that could arguably be the island, Manana, just off Monhegan Island (a believable Kent composition). Burne Jones knew of this earlier "wood block," but when, and if he came to any conclusions regarding its dating or authenticity, is not known.


We have determined that chronology must be addressed in a newly revised CR. Another issue that needs to be revisited is, what defines the various print media? Below are a few examples that warrant this scrutiny. 1.) There is some argument that the series of images for *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* (DBJ#40-49) should not be considered lithographs, though these works are composed by the artist using transfer and direct marking processes. 2.) Kent's involvement in the development of the engravings *Library of Congress Bookplate* (DBJ#120) and *S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.* (DBJ#121), went no further than providing the design; the transfer and engraving was done by others. 3.) *King Street* (DBJ#154; rightly omitted from the Revised Edition) has been determined by this author (see *Print Quarterly*, Vol. XIX, 2002) to be by the hand of another Rockwell Kent (1858-1934).

The appendix "Posthumous Prints" presents its own set of problems. For various reasons, several of these compositions cannot be considered "posthumous prints"; among them are the linecuts *Madonna and Child* and *Portrait of Me Trapped* (P12), and the photo-silk screes *Forest Pool* (P4) and *The Lovers* (P5). These works are reproductions of drawings and wood engravings that were commissioned by the Rockwell Kent Legacies. The prudent CR editor would have taken Zigrosser's advice to prepare a separate list of reproductions.
"Posthumous Prints" also raises ethical questions. The Kent Legacies—at the time, consisting of the artist's widow, Sally Kent Gorton, and her second husband, John Gorton, an ex-minister—authorized the reworking and printing of several blocks. To be more explicit, the Legacies allowed artist/printeer Letterio Calapai to restore the cracked block referred to as "Embarkation" (P7), re-glue and execute what he considered Kent's final cuts might be on the block known as "Contemplation" (P8) and print small editions from each of these. It is believed that neither one of these blocks had been proofed, in their final state, by the artist.

Calapai was aggressive in his desire to work with Kent's prints. One disagreement between the Legacies—Sally Gorton and myself (following his death I succeeded John Gorton as director of the Kent Legacies)—and Calapai put a stop to the authorized publishing of Kent's works. While on the topic of works attributed to Kent, I will quickly address the matter of "Twenty-eight Drawings by Kent Cut in Wood by J. J. Lanke's" (see Appendix III, in the Original Edition, V in the Revised). As the title of this appendix suggests, it was believed that Kent drew the images for these woodcuts, sending the designs on to Lanke's to cut and print. Recent evidence suggests that this apparently was not the case, at least for some of these woodcuts. Kent did indeed draw compositions on maple wood engraving blocks but Lanke's did not cut those that have recently surfaced. A few of these blocks came into the hands of a Nashville, Tennessee, collector, through the Lankes family. Two of the blocks include a pencil and ink drawings and one sketch that were commissioned by Doremus and Company (an advertising agency). According to Lanke's detailed ledger—a copy of which the Nashville collector has also obtained—there were 30 woodcuts for Doremus, as well as, a set of eight prints based upon drawings from Kent's book, Wilderness (proofs of seven of these prints are also in the Nashville collection). In his ledger Lanke indicates that he redrew several of Kent's designs and photographically transferred others onto blocks before cutting them.

There remain several factual errors and omissions in both editions. To acknowledge them all would be to submit the full revision that this CR requires. Therefore, I will briefly mention a few examples within four categories.

—Titles. 1) Mr. Rightmire refers to Child and Star (DBJ#19) and Mother and Child at Monteghan (DBJ#153 and RR#P1) as Child and Bird and Mother and Daughter at Monteghan, respectfully, without an explanation for the retitling. 2) The "Title Index" does not include titles for the "print patterns and designs on cloth," and the appendix by the same name does not include a list of the additional designs that are in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. (The "Print Patterns and Designs on Cloth" appendix begs us to revisit the questions: What constitutes a print and/or what should or should not be included in a CR?)

—Omissions and errors. 1) Regarding preliminary drawings: the drawing for Pinnacle (DBJ#20)—known to many Kent collectors as the (partial) cover illustration for The Kent Collector (Vol. IV, No. 3, Winter, 1977)—is owned by this author; a drawing for Resting (DBJ #36) is owned by The Art Gallery of Hamilton; and preliminary drawings for Girl on Cliff (DBJ# 57) and Self-portrait (DBJ#104) were recently auctioned on the internet. 2) The maple engraver's block for the composition known as the Gerald Kelly bookplate—see The Bookplates and Marks of Rockwell Kent (Pynson Printers, 1929, #21)—is in the collection of the Rhode Island School of Design. (According to Don Roberts, in his book Rockwell Kent: The Art of the Bookplate—see pages 33-35—the "bookplate itself was printed from an ink drawing"; it is now apparent that the bookplate originated from the wood engraving). 3) The block for Flame (DBJ#24) is now in the collection of Boston Public Library. 4) In the Original Edition, Burme Jones refers to several printing blocks and plates, as well as sketches and drawings, that were in the Kent collection in Au Sable Forks, NY. It is believed that many of these are now in the Kent Collection at Plattsburgh State Art Museum. The museum's curator, Cecilia Esposito, states that she has not had the time to catalogue this aspect of their new holdings. 5) References to Kent's print exhibitions, and related publicity, have been omitted, for the most part.

—Additional or incorrect references. 1) Kent's prints appeared in numerous publications during his lifetime, though not all are accounted for in either edition of the CR; below I cite a few additional references. Blue Bird is illustrated in Art and Artists of Today (Sept.-Oct. 1937); Twilight of Man (DBJ#6) is illustrated in Printer's Ink Monthly (Mar., 1927) and The Golden Book Magazine (Mar., 1929); Masthead (DBJ#7) appears in The Spur (Dec. 1, 1928); Foreboding (DBJ#9) is illustrated in You, Who Love Life, A Book of Poems by Helen Sobell (1956). 2) It should be noted that some book references seem to be incorrect; this is due to the fact that variant editions did not always follow the same pagination (or include all of the same illustrative material). For example, Flame (DBJ# 24), is illustrated facing page 460 in one edition and on page 544 in another, in 101 of the World's Greatest Books; 3) Starlight illustrates "My Unconquerable Soul," not "Invisits," in The Book of Noble Thoughts.

4) The color proofs (marked, "tp."—trial proof—and "a.p."—artist proof) for Sermilik fjord that were in the collection in Au Sable Forks, NY, were sold during my tenure at the estate. This transaction would be on file in my early papers, that are now part of the collection at Plattsburgh State. 5) Quarsman (DBJ# 86) was not reproduced in Rhythm (No. 3, 1959) but the similar print, Drifter (DBJ#92) was (there are additional discrepancies regarding the prints illustrated in Rhythm that are not accounted for in both editions). 6) The study for Sledging (DBJ#99) could likewise have been a study for the oil painting by the same name (see illustration in Rockwellkennians). 7) Self-portrait is the cover illustration for American Book Collector (Summer, 1964) .8) The oil painting Heavy, Heavy Hangs Over Thy Head, not the lithograph by the same name, is reproduced on the cover of Rally for Peace and Disarmament, and as illustrative matter in Kent's autobiography, It's Me O Lord (Dodd, Mead & Co., 1955) and in American Book Collector. The painting and lithograph are not "similar in all respects..."
exception of the incised title at the bottom," as stated in both CRs. On the contrary, the appearance of the title in both works is one of their similarities. The details are the devil: the child is covered by a blanket in the lithograph and naked in the painting; there is a teddy bear in bed with the child in the painting, not so in the lithograph; there are curtains at the windows in the painting, not so in the lithograph; the landscape in the lithograph appears to be a composite whereas an Adirondack landscape serves as the backdrop in the painting, etc.

—Incorrect dates. 1.) *Twilight of Man* appears in the May, 1922 issue of *Century Magazine*, not May 22, 1926. 2.) *August XXIII, MCMXXVII* (DBJ#13) appears in the June 23, 1936 issue of *New Masses*, not August 23, 1936. 3.) *Precipice* (DBJ# 15) appears in the April, 1928 issue of *Harpers Magazine*, not April, 1929.

There are no less than 50 additional illustrative references that have not been cited (publications that reproduced Kent's prints during his life time), and this does not include the mass media or exhibition brochures and catalog illustrations, or the innumerable Soviet publications in which Kent's work appeared. At least a half dozen dates and several general errors have also not been corrected.

**CODA**

It was made abundantly clear to me recently by a Kent collector that there are several independent Kent scholars or "students of Kent," but never has this group of individuals, who know each other, worked together. This problem is not uncommon in the world of art research and publication. It is now obvious that the Revised Edition could have benefited from a broader cooperative effort, and that *The Prints of Rockwell Kent* still needs to be amended.

© Scott R. Ferris

(My thanks to EP and PA.)

---

**ONLINE DISCUSSION:**
**We have a Pulse**

Over the past couple of months we have experienced a fair amount of online chatter, proving once and for all that we do have a pulse. As you will read below the chatter ranges from technical jargon to the hotly debated issue of compensation for our work. I hope that we will keep up the momentum online and during the NYU-CR gathering in April. The topics discussed in this chatter give purpose to our association, and are a welcomed breath of fresh air.

---Original Message---

On Behalf Of JFranklin@Gallery.ca
To: CRSA-L@Baylor.edu
Subject: Software for collaborative catalogue raisonné projects

I would be interested to hear about any collaborative catalogue raisonné projects using software which allows scholars in different cities or countries to contribute records to a central catalogue database housed in one institution. Details, contacts, websites, name of the software—all welcome.

From posting the same question on other discussion lists, I received a suggestion to look at the ItaNet Consortium (http://www.dante.md.edu/digital/), and news of other projects, but none quite what I am after.

Thanks in advance.

Jonathan Franklin
Head of Collections and Database Management, Library
National Gallery of Canada
380 Sussex Drive
PO Box 427, Station A
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 9N4 Canada
Telephone (613) 990 0590; fax (613) 990 6190; email jfranklin@gallery.ca

In response Richard Grant at diebenkorn.org wrote:

Dear Jonathan,

The Diebenkorn Project team has been sharing a common database to build our Catalogue. People at a variety of locations use the facilities of Microsoft Remote Desktop to access "The Museum System" (which is the application program we use) on a server in our office in Berkeley, CA. The server runs unattended and five researchers hook up from all over the country. From any computer that has access to the Internet, users can run the application as if they were sitting at the console at the central office. The number of concurrent users that can be supported is just a matter of software licensing and sufficient RAM.

We have been operating like this for a number of years and find it quite satisfactory. The means of access via Remote Desktop is fast and reliable, and the application program (see www. gallerysystems.com) might be considered by some to be vast overkill, but it is worth many times its cost for the time it saves. It is used by most major museums, and since the requirements for a catalogue raisonné are a subset of a museum’s requirements, it has all of the facilities needed for the project. We are going to be able to go straight from the database to fully-formatted catalogue pages, thus eliminating the typesetting step. This will allow us to keep complete control and eliminate the re-editing usually required after typesetting.

I would be happy to let you hook up to our server and take it out for a spin. Let me know if we can be of assistance.

Richard Grant
The Richard Diebenkorn Catalogue Raisonné Project
3200 College Avenue #2
Berkeley, CA 94705
510-428-1400
dick@diebenkorn.org

Also responding, Michael Schroeder at miker@schroederpr.com wrote:

You should be able to use Microsoft Sharepoint to accomplish this.
http://www.microsoft.com/sharepoint/
Dear catalogue raisonné scholars,

Working on the Alexander Archipenko sculpture catalogue raisonné I am using a complex database running on Filemaker. To allow for access from outside the office I am now considering hosting the database on a web server. In this regard I would be interested to know if any of you, who use Filemaker, have made this transition and if there were any problems? Many thanks in advance.

Best regards,
Alexandra Keiser

Alexandra Keiser
Research Curator
The Archipenko Foundation
P.O. Box 247
Bearsville, NY 12409 USA
tel: 845.679.8191
fax:845.679.5593
akeiser@archipenko.org
www.archipenko.org
http://www.archipenko.org

On the same topic Nasr, Laili at LNSR@NGA.GOV wrote:

At the National Gallery, we also use FileMaker Pro for the Mark Rothko works on paper catalogue raisonné I and would also be very interested in the possibility of accessing the database from outside the office.

Laili Nasr
Mark Rothko Catalogue Raisonné
National Gallery of Art
Tel (202) 842-6779
>
>> >> >> >> >> >> >> << << << <<
>
-----Original Message-----
This message required a timely response (which has since passed) but I include it to keep our non-computerized members up to snuff.

no-reply32@collegeart.org wrote:

Dear CAA Member,

As you may know, the U.S. Copyright Office is soliciting the public for formal comments on the problem of "orphan" works. The College Art Association has joined with the Association of Research Libraries and a number of other groups to develop a joint filing. If successful, this initiative may make a significant difference to artists, scholars, and others who use copyrighted images and texts in their work.

We have moved forward with this task quickly, as it has a very short deadline —March 14. For art historians and artists, the problem is huge. In order to make our case strongly to the Copyright Office, we need lots of anecdotes about specific instances where a scholar or artist has had difficulty using copyrighted material where the copyright holder can't be traced.

CAA has posted a webpage on our website, describing the initiative and asking for personal anecdotes from scholars and artists. The webpage includes an easy web submission form, where you can insert your anecdotes as a set of answers to some simple questions.

Go here: http://www.collegeart.org/orphan-works/
There is a link to the submission form, or you can go straight to that form: http://www.collegeart.org/orphan-works/submit.html

I urge you all to visit the webpage, and if you have any anecdotes, please fill in the form. And please send the link to as many people as you can think of.

Many thanks,

Eve Sinaiko
Director of Publications
College Art Association

>> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> ÷ << << << <<

CRSA scholars and commercial venues.
The following, lengthy online discussion addresses the potential relationship between CRSA members and Arnet (see CRSA Forum, Autumn 2004 page 12) though moreover, concerns our relationship—not only as individuals but as an association—with all commercial venues. As Nancy Mathews has suggested we should pick up on this topic while a goodly number of us are in New York for the NYU-CR event. (If someone is willing to chair this discussion, please let Nancy or me know.) I believe our discussion should result in the ultimate goal of producing a blanket CRSA compensation policy that any one of us can utilize. Entering into a commercial relationship, with the backing of our association, (I believe) will give us negotiating leverage that we might not otherwise have.

Initially, Gail Levin at Gail_Levin@baruch.cuny.edu wrote:

Dear Colleagues:

Just having been approached by Arnet.com about the possibility of excerpting my catalogue raisonné on their website. I wish to go on record that I am strongly against any commercial enterprise that seeks to have scholars provide content, write, or otherwise work for it for free. Their interest in excerpting from my catalogue raisonné for their website without compensation to me for my time, expenses, and expertise is simply unfair. Their employees do not work for free, but they expect us to. How do they think that we pay our bills, purchase photographs, computers, software, travel to look at original works of art, etc.?

Arnet.com has the right to sell ads on its site, which is potentially very lucrative. What they need is valuable content to attract more hits so that they can sell more ads for more money. And they want us to provide this for free? Does anyone know who owns Arnet.com and where they get such nerve?

I once wrote commissioned articles without pay for The Dictionary of Art. I mistakenly thought that this was such a big scholarly project that they couldn't afford to pay us all. I then watched them give lavish publication parties and charge a huge price for the published books, while failing to provide the scholar/authors with even offprints of their articles. To add insult to injury, they followed up with a series of commercial books reutilizing the writing in the original dictionary. We authors never earned one cent and we didn't receive copies of any of the books. When the dictionary went online, we were not allowed to use it for free, which would not have cost the publishers anything at all. So I hope that you see my point. For profit companies should compensate scholars for
their work, just as they pay their website designers or their electric bills.

While some members of CRSA may be heavily supported by foundations and won't mind the extra publicity of the ArtNet.com website, for independent scholars or academics with limited budgets and limited time to conduct research and writing, this policy is unfair and unreasonable. Therefore I propose that we all band together and that CRSA oppose this exploitation of our scholarly work. Our work is valuable and is worth supporting, especially by any commercial entity which wants to profit from it by putting it online without compensation or in any other way.

Wouldn't it be better to come up with a profit-sharing solution online that would benefit our memberships in ways that count?

Sincerely,
Gail Levin
Professor of Art History,
The City University of New York
Founding President, CRSA


Adding to the discussion, Steven W. Manford at s.manford@utoronto.ca wrote:

Dear CRSA Members:

Like others I was charmed by ArtNet, taken to lunch and toured the offices. The person working on this project seemed quite nice. My sense was that they really were not fully aware of the implications of what they were asking for. In the end, I felt this seemed to be a poor collaboration between scholar and commerce. I agree that we should take a firm position.

Thus far, I have yet to see any CRSA members get involved with the ArtNet CR project.

I believe the company is German. There should be information on the website. They have a large staff in New York.

Best regards to all,
Steven Manford
Man Ray Rayograph Catalogue Raisonné
Man Ray Research Scholar
CRSA, Director of Programs

FVOC@aol.com at FVOC@aol.com wrote:

Dear Colleagues:

I agree with Gail Levin and Steven Manford completely. I also explored ArtNet about a year ago, and came to the same conclusion.

Can CRSA find sponsorship for a site that would publish CRs—some sort of consortium of scholars/art institutions, for instance?? This would permit the publication of out-of-print CRs—as well as new ones. The design of such a site would also have the advantage of establishing a format for an online catalogue raisonné—just as the site I am designing for my history of the American mural will hopefully establish a format for a complex art history book online.

CRSA ought to explore all this in detail.

-- Francis V. O'Connor

Tina Dickey at pajarita@bigfoot.com wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

I arrived at the same conclusion—after recommending them! I then discovered how much work was necessary, and how much it duplicates what's already being done, without adding anything to the mix that I can see. Gail's points about compensation are important.

A long-term institutional site is necessary for online publishing, but a college, library, or museum would be more appropriate, and hopefully less subject to market whims.

Re: online software design, I suggest that everyone pay close attention to Richard Grant's demonstration of "The Museum System" at the NYU symposium in April. The database is used by over 500 museums worldwide, and the company has developed an online publishing augmentation called emuseum. Pricey, but so are long programming hours—and why reinvent the wheel? Some standardization in our systems would help in finding a host institution.

Yours,
Tina Dickey

Heidi Colsman-Freyberger at hefi@barnettnewman.org wrote:

Dear Gail,

We were approached last year, considered the invitation, and decided against it for the very reasons that you are spelling out.

Thanks for starting the discussion.
Heidi
Heidi Colsman-Freyberger for The Barnett Newman Foundation

Ellen Russotto at estatedavidshare@yahoo.com wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

My first—and continued—impression of ArtNet is that it is a commercial site. While we may all need the support of commercial entities at some point in our careers for the publication of our projects/research, I feel that those who wish to present their research in the name of scholarship should have a site void of any commercial/political relationship. Is it possible?

Ellen Russotto

Scott Ferris at twcny.rr.com wrote:

Dear Colleagues:

I couldn't agree more with the call for compensation for our work! I couldn't agree more with Gail's statement that "we all band together and CRSA should oppose this exploitation of our scholarly work"! I suggest that we apply our energy and debate to all scholar/commercial venue relationships, not just ArtNet. For instance, some of us are paid for our work with auction houses and galleries; most of us are not. Can we band together to rectify this discrepancy? Let not our guns fall silent.
Dear CRSA Members,

It seems to me the most important comment on this matter made so far, beyond the unanimous rejection of a commercial host for CRs, is Tina's point that a long term institutional affiliation is necessary for a multiple CR site. Also, the notion of one site providing a standardization presentation format makes sense.

As some of you know, I was not able to attend (for health reasons) our CAA session, which I co-chaired. Had I been there I would have given a demonstration of the multiple CR site I have been working on, which is for CRs of American printmakers. It is currently called the "American Printmakers Online Catalogue Raisonné Project" and is intended to be a strictly non-profit, non-commercial operation.

Although it is in an early stage of development and not really ready for public viewing, it can be visited at the address below. The long term future of a site like mine is completely dependent on institutional affiliation for a list of reasons including standards, maintenance, financing, etc. The committee that Nancy suggests might serve us well if it considered how to go about finding a sponsorship for a multi-CR website. It might also consider how much of a hand CRSA should have in its general operations. After all who would be more qualified to oversee such a project than the professional organization the core of which is the CR. I am not sure how much of this came up in Atlanta, but it certainly would have had I been there.

http://www.catrais.org/

I should just add that I am not in a position to chair such a committee.

Best Regards,

Jeff Coven

Ellen Epstein at ee27@erols.com wrote:

Surely non-commercial would be the most desirable avenue. Might the Getty have some thoughts on this project?

Perhaps we could arrange some time during the upcoming seminar for a discussion about this "ArtNet affair".

Regards,

Ellen Epstein.

> 

Mary Ran at MRANGALLERY@aol.com wrote:

What about the "Inventory of American Paintings" at the Smithsonian working with us?

Mary Ran

> 

Michael Schroeder at mike@schoederpr.com

From what I can tell, the IAP is very under funded and understaffed. They cannot even add new entries to their database just now, or at least the delay in doing so is many years.

What we need is for some stable institution to commit to providing an archival web hosting service, where the content will be maintained indefinitely. Non-profit, scholarly sites ought to be hosted for free or for a fairly small fee. My inclination would be to take a permissive attitude about the format of the individual offerings, just like we do for books. Web-based catalogs are still a new phenomenon and authors need a lot of latitude to explore various organizational paradigms. Ideally the institution would be a public one, say like the Library of Congress or the Smithsonian American Art Museum, but we should be open to a charitable offer from a suitable private foundation or company.

Mike Schroeder

> 

Vivian Barnett at vbarnett@att.net wrote:

I think we must keep a broad perspective that is not restricted to American artists so that the website includes many nationalities.

Vivian Barnett

> 

Ellen Holtzman at holtzman@hluce.org wrote:

All best,

Nancy

Nancy Mowll Mathews
nmowllmathews@williams.edu
413-597-2335

> 

Jeff Coven at saltimbanque_prints@yahoo.com wrote:
This may be common knowledge already but, IFAR (the International Foundation for Art Research) in NYC is in the long-term process of establishing an electronic database for catalogues riaisonné—those already published and those that are underway. The Luce Foundation recently approved a grant to assist them and they are actively seeking other funding. The project will take a VERY long time, but the organization is dedicated, credible and stable, if somewhat modest.

Ellen Holtzman
Program Director for the Arts
Henry Luce Foundation

> 

Nancy Mowll Mathews at Nancy.
Mowll.Mathews@williams.edu wrote:

Dear Ellen,

Does the IFAR project include hosting online CRs as well as creating a database list of existing and in-progress CRs?

Either way, it is a great project.

All best,

Nancy
Nancy Mowll Mathews
Eugenie Prendergast Senior Curator of 19th and 20th Century Art and Lecturer in Art
Williams College Museum of Art
15 Lawrence Hall Drive, Suite 2
Williamstown, MA 01267-2566
413-597-2335

> 

Bill Camfield at bille@rice.edu wrote:

I have a concern regarding online publication of CRs that I would like to put out to our colleagues.

A catalogue riaisonné published as a traditional bound paper copy is a fixed product that remains intact. That fixedness of the traditional book is a problem insofar as there is no way to incorporate in it later additions and corrections to our knowledge. That problem is eliminated in an online publication that permits easy and continued updating.

However, doesn’t this very virtue of the online publication bear serious risks? In contrast to the fixed book format, nothing is fixed.

Works accepted by the original author could be eliminated without a trace. Works rejected by the original author could be entered. Differing opinions on everything from dates to titles and authenticity could be effaced.

If, as I take it, these risks are real, then how can the integrity of an online catalogue riaisonné be maintained? Is it not important to maintain the original catalogue even though it may have some errors and be incomplete? How to incorporate the work of subsequent cataloguers without losing the work of the first cataloguer(s)? Who will maintain the catalogue riaisonné sites? What standards and controls will be in place? Who will be responsible for verifying that these standards are maintained?

Many thanks,

Bill Camfield

Editor’s Notes

Whew! Feel that steam running down my neck. It’s so refreshing to see our gears turn.

Again, I will echo Nancy Mathew’s call for a chairperson to step forward to lead a discussion on the CR scholar and compensation, that should occur sometime over the weekend of 16-17 April.

Once Lisa Koenigsberg completes her detailed agenda for the NYU-CR event we will be able to work our meeting into the weekends events. How many CRSA members will be in Manhattan for the events? Will people be coming into town on Friday, earlier? Any suggestions as to where we may meet? If we could consider an hour—perhaps a little more—to a meeting, that should give us time to reach some consensus and hammer out some goals.

I must apologize for this extraordinary delay in getting the now Winter issue of the Forum published. As some of you know my paid employment has taken precedence over my volunteer work (which editing the Forum is)—I have been away from home for all but two weeks since the end of December. Though my travel schedule is hardly set in stone, my travel and working on the Forum usually can co-exist with the manuscript deadlines that I proposed on page two (under “Submitting Manuscripts/Notices”).

One problem with the (inevitable) backlog of desk work following business trips is that editing this newsletter has gotten short shrift; please excuse the shortcomings that you will find within.

Also, I am still have difficulty getting members to submit materials (essays, announcements, legal news, etc.) which makes producing this newsletter a constant challenge. Now that we know we have a “pulse” I hope that we will be forthcoming with material for the Forum. I am open for suggestions regarding the timing of the newsletter: if more people are better able to submit materials at another time of year, great, let me know.

I believe that Jeff Coven and/or Steven Manford, and/or Nancy, will provide a review of the February CAA-CRSA meeting in our next issue (June).

I will encourage all of you planned participants in the NYU-CR event to submit your papers for publication in future issues of the Forum (beginning with the June issue). There has been some concern regarding this as NYU has suggested that at some time they may publish these papers. Please remember your “home” newsletter, and that what we publish in these pages will not derail your career as a NYU published writer.

I am hopeful that this will be the last issue under this format. We have acquired software (InDesign; an earlier version at a reduced rate—$75) that should give me the ability to stretch out beyond these columns.

See you in April. SRF

***************


Membership List

Members, please check your personal data to make sure all information is correct. If changes need to be made please let me know directly (as well as updating Nancy) Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Artists and CRSA related services are included in this list.

ARTISTS:

ALEXANDER ARCHIPENKO
(see Alexander Kezer)
WILLIAM BAZIOTES
(see Michael Preble)
THOMAS HART BENTON
(see Henry Adams)
HARRY BERTOIA
(see Mary Thorp)
NORMAN BLUMH
(see John Yau)
P A U L  B R I L
(see Louisa Wood Ruby)
JAMES BROOKS
(see Meg J. Perelman)
CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI
(see Barbara A. Wollman)
THEODORE EARL BUTLER
(see Patrick Bertrand)
P E T E R  C A N I
(see Eileen Costello)
A L E X A N D E R  C A L D E R
(see Alexander S. C. Rower)
A R T H U R  B .  C A R L E S
(see Barbara A. Wollman)
J O H N  C A R R O L L
(see Touran K. Latham)
M A R Y  C A S S A T
(see Nancy Mowll Mathews)
S A I N T  C L A I R  C E M I N
(see Joyce L. Glass)
C E Z A N N E
(see Jayne Warman)
F R E D E R I C K  E D W I N  C H U R C H
(see Gerald L. Can)
C H A R L E S  C A R L Y  C O L E M A N
(see Adrienne Baxter Bell)
G U S T A V E  C O U R B E T
(see Sarah Faunce)
J A S P E R  F .  C R O P S E Y
(see Kenneth W. Maddox)
F R A N C I S  C U N N I N G H A M
(see Valerie Mendelson Moylan)
D A  V I N C I
(see Patricia Truitt-Coohill)
P I E R R E P U V E S  D E  C H A V A N N E S
(see Aimée Brown Price)
D O R O T H Y  D E I N E R
(see Joan M. Marter)
T A M A R A  D E L E M P I C K A
(see Alain Blondel)
M A R I A  O A K E Y  D E W I N G
(see Susan A. Hobbs)
T H O M A S  W .  D E W I N G
(see Susan A. Hobbs)
R I C H A R D  D I E B E N K O R N
(see Richard Grant)
E D W I N  D I C K I N S O N
(see Helen Dickinson Baldwin)
A R T H U R W E S L E Y  D O W
(see Nancy Green)
M A B E L  D W I G H T
(see Susan Barnes Robinson)
K E R R  E B Y
(see Margaret D. Hauberg)
S A L L Y J A M E S  F A R N H A M
(see Michael P. Reed)
L Y O N E L  F E I N I N G E R
(see Achim Moeller)
E R N E S T  F I E N E
(see Jeffrey A. Cohen)
J O H N  F O L I N S B R E E
(see Peter B. Cook)
E M I L  G A N S O
(see Donald S. Smith)
G U N T H E R  G E R Z S O
(see John Michael Gerzso)
S A M  G L A N K O F F
(see Wendy Snyder)
G L I C E N S T E I N
(see Charlotte Sholod)
R O B E R T  G O O D N O U G H
(see Ellen J. Epstein)
A S H I L L E  G O R K Y
(see Melvin P. Lader)
J .  J .  G R A N D V I L L E
(see Clive F. Gerry)
C H A I M  G R O S S
(see April Paul)
D A V I D  H A R E
(see Ellen Russo)
K E I T H  H A R I N G
(see Julia Gruen)
M A R S D E N  H A R T L E Y
(see Gail Levin)
R O B E R T  H E R N I
(see Valerie Ann Leeds)
H A N S  H O F F M A N N
(see Tina Dickey)
K A T S U S H I K A  H O K U S A I
(see Roger Keyes)
W I N S O W  H O M E R
(see Abigail Booth Gerds)
E D W A R D  H O P P E R
(see Gail Levin)
H E N R I  G A B R I E L  I B E L S
(see Magda Le Donne)
R O B E R T  I N D I A N A
(see Elizabeth A. Barry)
G E O R G E  I N N E S
(see Michael Quick)
J A S P E R  J O H N S
(see Roberta Bernstein)
E A S T M A N  J O H N S O N
(see Patricia Hills)
V A S I L Y  K A N D I N S K Y
(see Vivian Endicott Barnett)
R O C K W E L L  K E N T
(see Scott R. Biersch)
P A U L  K L E E
(see Josef Helfenstein)
L E E  K R A S N E R
(see Ellen G. Landau)
J O H N  L E W I S  K R I M M E L
(see Milo M. Naive)
P A U L  K L E E
(see Josef Helfenstein)
J A C O B  L A W R E N C E
(see Michelle Duflois with Peter T. Nesbett)
E R N E S T  L A W S O N
(see Valerie Ann Leeds)
L Y N N  H E R S H I M A N  L E E S O N
(see Robin Held)
W I L L I A M  R O B I N S O N  L E I G H
(see Deborah White)
R O Y  L I C H E N T E I N E N
(see Jack Cowart with Yolande Trincere, Justine Price)
W I L L I A M  M A C M O N N I E S
(see E. Adina Gordon)
U G O  M A L V A N O
(see Anna Malvano)
M A R C E L L O
(see Caterina Y. Pierre)
B R I C E  M A R D I E N
(see Eileen Costello)
A L F R E D  J A C O B  M I L L E R
(see Deborah White)
D A V I D  B .  M I L N E
(see David P. Silcox)
L A S Z L O  M O H O L Y - N A G Y
(see Hattula Moholy-Nagy)
G I L B E R T  M O N G E R
(see Michael D. Schroeder)
E D W A R D  M O R A N
(see Joseph Carlston)
T H O M A S  M O R A N
(see Phyllis Braff, Melissa Webster Speidel)
R O B E R T  M O T H E R W E L L
(see Allison Harding with Joachim Pissarro, Katy Rogers)
E D W A R D  M U N C H
(see Gerda Woll)
B A R N E T T  N E W M A N
(see Heidi Colson-Freyberger)
I S A M U  N O G U C H I
(see Bonnie Rychlak with Neil Printz)
G E O R G I A  O ’  K E E F F E
(see Doris Bry, Barbara Buhler Lynes)
S T E P H E N  P A R R I S H
(see Roma Schneider)
L I L L A  C A B O T  P E R R Y
(see Pamela Moffait)
F R A N C I S  P I C A B I A
(see Maria Luisa Borras with Pierre Calle and William Camfield)
C A M I L L E  P I S S A R R O
(see Joachim Pissarro)
C H A R L E S  A .  P L A T T
(see James B. Atkinson)
E D W A R D  P O T T H A S T
(see Mary Ran)
F A I R F I E L D  F O R T E R
(see Joan Ludman)
P R E N D E R G A S T
(see Nancy Mowll Mathews)
W I L L I A M  R A N N E Y
(see Sarah Boehme with Julie Coleman)
M A N  R A Y
(see Steven Manford)
H A N S  R E I C H E L
(see Deborah Browning Schimek)
F R E D E R I C K  R E M I N G T O N
(see Sarah Boehme with Julie Coleman and Emily Ballew Neff, Laura Foster)
T H E O D O R E  R O B I N S O N
(see Sony K. Johnston)
M A R K  R O T H K O
(see David Anfam, Ruth Fine, Laili Nusr)
T H E O D O R E  R O U S S E L
(see Margaret D. Hauberg)
P E T E R  P A U L  R U B E N S
(see Anna-Marie Logan)
E D W A R D  R U S C H I
(see Rainer Crone, Robert Dean, Petrus Schaesberg, Erin Wright)
CHARLES M. RUSSELL
(see Elizabeth A. Dear)

ROBERT RYMAN
(see Amy Baker Sandbach)

KAY SAGE
(see Stephen Robson Miller)

JOHN SINGER SARGENT
(see Elizabeth Oustinoff)

FREDERICK FERDINAND SCHAER
(see Jerome H. Saltzer)

FRANK E. SCHOFNOVER
(see John R. Schoonover)

CORNELIUS SCHUT
(see Gertrude Wilmers)

JOHN SLOAN
(see Joyce K. Schiller)

JUNIUS R. SLOAN
(see Richard H. W. Brauer)

LEON SPIELAERT
(see Anna Adriensi-Pannier)

ALFRED STIEGLITZ
(see Doris Bry)

YVES TANGUY
(see Alessandra Carinelli, Stephen Robson Miller)

TAO SOCIETY OF ARTISTS
(see Ashley Waechter)

MARK TOBEY
(see Achim Muller)

JOAQUIN TORRES-GARCIA
(see Cecilia de Torres))

MICHELE TOSINI
(see Heidi J. Hornik)

ELIHU VEDDER
(see Regina Soria)

FRANCESCO D'UBERTINO VERDI
(see Robert G. La France)

ESTEBAN VICENTE
(see Ellen Ruston)

HUBERT VON HERKOMER
(see Lee M. Edwards)

FRANKLIN T. WOOD
(see Kenneth A. Pollack)

NEWELL CONVES WYETH
(see Christine B. Podmarcik)

WILLIAM & MARGARET ZORACH
(see Roberta K. Tarbell)

SERVICES:

Art Law
(see Barbara Hoffman, Ronald D. Spencer, Peter R. Stern, Robert S. Warshaw)

Authentication Issues
(see Sharon Fischer)

Consultant: Wyeth family of artists
(see Joyce Hill Stoner)

Educational Programming
(see Lisa Koenigsgberg)

Photography
(see Michael F. Felicetta)

Recent American Art
(see Jack Flam)

Henry Adams
Chair, Dept. of Art History
Case Western Reserve University

Room 103, Mather House, 11201 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland Ohio 44106
henry.adams@case.edu
Thomas Hart Benton
Dr. Anne Adriensi-Pannier
Adjunct-Curator, XXth Century Drawings
Museum of Modern Art
Musieumstraat, 9
B-1000 Brussels Belgium
adriensi@fine-arts-museum.be
Leon Spilliaert
Dr. David Anfam
Art Ex Ltd.
Flat 9, Marina 1, 10 New Wharf Road
London N1 9RT England U.K.
danfam@phaidon.com
Mark Rothko
James B. Atkinson
117 Town House Road
Cornish NH 03745
atholm@valley.net
Graphic work of Charles A. Platt
Helen Dickinson Baldwin
3711 Whitland Avenue
Nashville TN 37205
robertbalwinrab@aol.com
Edwin Dickinson 1891-1978
Vivian Endicott Barnett
140 Riverside Drive
New York NY 10024
vbarnett@worldnet.att.net
Vasily Kandinsky's Drawings
Elizabeth A. Barry
P.O. Box 7007
Portland ME 04112
Artgirl5@aol.com
Robert Indiana
Adrienne Baxter Bell
594 Highland Avenue
Upper Montclair NJ 07043
BaxterBell@att.net
Charles Caryl Coleman
Roberta Bernstein
Professor of Art History
University at Albany
225 Noyak Road
Valatie New York 12184
rbernstein555@aol.com
Jasper Johns
Patrick Bertrand
P.O. Box 10993
Oakland CA 94610
giveny@us.s.net
Theodore Earl Butler
Alain Blondel
50, rue du Temple
75004 Paris France
info@emcelya.com
Tamara de Lempicka
Sarah Boehme
The John S. Bagas Curator of Western Art
Buffalo Bill Historical Center
720 Sheridan Avenue
Cody Wyoming 82414
Sarahb@bbhc.org
Frederic Remington*and William Ranney
Maria Luisa Borras
Art Historian
Comite Picabia
Consell de Cent 369
28009 Barcelona Spain
Borras@mente.net
Francis Picabia
Phyllis Braff
333 East 55th Street
New York NY 10022
pbraff@rcn.com
Thomas Moran
Richard H.W. Brauer
Brauer Museum of Art
Valpariso University Center for the Arts
Valpariso IN 46383
Richard.Brauer@Valpo.edu
Junius R. Sloan
Mark L. Brock
174 Sunset Road
Carlisle MA 01741
mark@brockando.com
Doris Bry
11 East 73rd Street
New York NY 10021
dby@earthlink.net
Stieglitz/Keeffe
Pierre Calle
President, Comite Picabia
26, Rue Danielle Casanova
Paris France
archives@comite-picabia.com
Francis Picabia
William A. Camfield
Prof. Emeritus, Dept. of Art & Art History
Rice University
1117 Milford
Houston TX 77006
bille@rice.edu
Francis Picabia
Dr Joseph Carlton
Two Sutton Place South
New York NY 10022
Jyrlahn@aol.com
Edward Moran
Alessandra Carinelli
Executive Director
Pierre & Maria Gaetana Matisse Foundation
1 East 53 Street, 4th Floor
New York NY 10022
acarinelli@pmmgf.org
Yves Tanguy - Paintings & works on paper in color
Gerald L. Carr
608 Apple Road
Newark DE 19711.
gcarr@dpnet.net
Frederic Edwin Church
Claudia Carson
29 Park Hill Avenue
Norwalk CT 06851
cloey@yahoo.com
Computer Data Bases

Julie Coleman
Curatorial Assistant
Buffalo Bill Historical Center
720 Sheridan Avenue
Cody Wyoming 82414
juliec@bbhc.org
Frederick Remington/William Ranney
Heidi Colsman-Freyberger
The Barnett Newman Foundation
654 Madison Avenue, Suite 1900
New York NY 10021
hefi@barnettnewman.org
Barnett Newman

Peter B. Cook
4 Humboldt Street
Cambridge MA 02140
peterbcook@comcast.net
John Folinbee, N.A. (1892-1972)

Eileen Costello
Matthew Marks Gallery
335 Mulberry Street, #4
New York NY 10012
ecostello@mail.utexas.edu
Peter Cain; Brice Marden

Jeffrey A. Cozen
7 Village Way
Smithtown NY 11787
catniss@yahoo.com
The prints of Ernst Fiene

Jack Cowart
Executive Director,
Roy Lichtenstein Foundation
745 Washington Street
New York NY 10014
Roy Lichtenstein

Prof. Dr. Rainer Crone
Ludwig Maximilian Universität, München,
Germany
452 Riverside Drive, #85
New York NY 10027
rainner@edruscha.org
Edward Ruscha Works on Paper

Cecilia de Torres
140 Greene Street
New York NY 10012
mail@ceciliatdeortes.com
The works of Joaquin Torres-Garcia

Robert Dean, Editor
3581 Ocean View Avenue
Los Angeles CA 90066
robert@edruscha.org
Edward Ruscha

Elizabeth A. Dear
Curator, C.M. Russell Museum
400 Thirteenth Street North
Great Falls MT 59401
cdear@cmrusse11.org
Charles M. Russell

Tina Dickey
P.O. Box 450, Salt Spring Island, B.C.

CRSA Forum

V8K 2W1 Canada
pajartia@bigfoot.com
Hans Hofmann

Michelle DuBois
P.O. Box 980
Manomet MA 02345
Mdubois68@aol.com
Jacob Lawrence

Dr. Lee M. Edwards
P.O. Box 489
Locust Valley NY 11560
ledwal234@aol.com
Hubert von Herkomer

Ellen J. Epstein
33 Park Drive
Mount Kisco NY 10549
ee27@erols.com
Robert Goodnough

Sarah Faunce
Project Director
Courbet Catalogue Raisonne Project
28 East 78th St., 5th Floor
New York New York 10021
faunce-courbet@mindspring.com
Gustave Courbet Paintings

Scott R. Ferris
8867 Jackson Hill Road
Boonville NY 13309
Kentiana@twcnx.r.r.com
Rockwell Kent

Ruth Fine
Curator Special Projects in Modern Art
National Gallery of Art
2000 B South Club Drive
Landover MD 20785
r-fine@nga.gov
Mark Rothko: The Works on Paper

Jack Flam
Prof. of Art History
City University of New York
35 West 81st Street, Apt. 11D
New York New York 10024
Jackflam@aol.com
Recent American Art

Sharon Flescher
Executive Director
International Foundation for Art Research
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 935
New York NY 10110
Authentication Issues

Laura A. Foster
Curator, Frederic Remington Art Museum
303 Washington Street
Ogdensburg NY 13669
linfo@fredericremington.org
Frederic Remington

Jonathan Franklin
Head of Collections & Database Management
National Gallery of Canada Library
380 Sussex Drive, P.O. Box 427, Station A
Ottawa Ontario Canada
jfrankl@ag.ca
Collaborative Catalogue Raisonne Projects

Abigail Booth Gerds
Ph.d Program in Art History
CUNY Graduate Center
365 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10016
Winslow Homer

John Michael Gerzso
1630-A 30th Street, #232
Boulder CO 80301
mike gerzso@earthlink.net
Gunther Gerzso

Clive F. Getty
Miami University
Department of Art
Oxford Ohio 45056
gettye@muohio.edu
J.J. Grandville

Joy L. Glass
24 Fifth Avenue, No. 224
New York NY 10011
jlglass@ mindspring.com

Steve R. Golay
359 Warren Avenue
Cincinnati OH 45220
sgolay40@hotmail.com

Charles B. Goldstein
8 Hardwick Place
Rockville MD 20850
chadeg@erols.com

E. Adina Gordon
Ph.D
155 Elm Road
Englewood NJ 07631
Yadina@earthlink.net
Sculpture of William MacMonnies

Richard Grant
Project Manager
Richard Diebenkorn Catalogue Raisonne
3200 College Avenue, #2
Berkeley CA 94705
dick@diebenkorn.org
Diebenkorn

Nancy Green,
Chief Curator
Johnson Museum
Cornell University
Ithaca NY 14853
neg4@cornell.edu
Arthur Wesley Dow

Julia Green,
Exec. Director
The Estate of Keith Haring
676 Broadway, 5th floor
New York NY 10012
haringesk@aol.com
Keith Haring

Allison Harding
Project Manager
The Dedalus Foundation, Inc.
555 West 57th Street, Suite 1222
New York NY 10019
aharding@dedalusfoundation.org
Robert Motherwell
Initiatives in Art and Culture
New York University

Where Angels Fear to Tread:
The Catalogue Raisonné and Its Explosive Potential –
A Conference in New York
Saturday, April 16 – Sunday, April 17, 2005

Following last year’s highly successful exploration of the catalogue raisonné, “a book that lists all known works by an artist” and which has the potential to document, authenticate, and interpret any art medium that is its focus, this NYU symposium further explores this cornerstone of art history, a focus of renewed attention. Monographic in approach, this heretofore less heralded form of art historical literature can be both factual and interpretative, anchoring the most creative approaches to an artist’s oeuvre and life and deepening historical understanding of the artist’s stature and context. We celebrate the work of the scholars who carry out this research.

In addition to considering unique works of art such as paintings, we explore the complexities of multiples including cast sculpture, photography, prints, stencils and other nontraditional forms produced by contemporary artists, and the paradoxes of works that are both unique and multiples such as monotypes. We also consider the interrelationship between catalogues raisonné and other forms of art historical scholarship: what for example, is the ramification for the catalogue raisonné when research for a subsequent exhibition unearths new material that calls into question previous assertions about an artist's oeuvre?

We continue to grapple with legal and ethical issues including the interrelationship between opinions, market values, and the law; and research methods and confidentiality, and protection of the scholar. The challenge that is presented to living artists with respect to documenting their work is explored in depth. We also undertake an examination of the influence of technology and its relationship to the future of the catalogue raisonné. Formal events are complemented by an evening reception at Spanierman Gallery.

Among those who have agreed to participate: David Anfam, independent scholar and author, Mark Rothko Catalogue Raisonné; Denise Bethel, senior vice president, Auctioneer, director, Photographs Department, Sotheby’s Inc. New York; Tina Dickey, author of the Hans Hoffman Catalogue Raisonné; John Driscoll, director, Babcock Galleries and director, The John F. Kensett Catalogue Raisonné Project; Scott Ferris, author, Rockwell Kent Catalogue Raisonné and editor, CRSA Forum; Abigail Booth Gerds, director, City University of New York, Lloyd Goodrich and Edith Havens Goodrich, Whitney Museum of American Art Record of Works by Winslow Homer sponsored by Spanierman Gallery, LLC (1990-present); Richard Grant, project manager, Richard Diebenkorn Catalogue Raisonné and specialist in information management; Boris Groys, a contributor to the Catalogue Raisonné of Ilya Kabakov; Sona Johnston, curator of American Painting, Baltimore Museum of Art and author, Theodore Robinson Catalogue Raisonné; Glenn Peck, author, George Bellows Catalogue Raisonné; Peter Stern, lawyer, McLaughlin & Stern LLP; and Peter Rooney, owner, Magnetic Reports, authority on Catalogue Raisonné Software System (CRSS). Lisa Koenigsberg, Advisor to the Dean for Arts Initiatives and adjunct professor of arts at New York University and Nancy Mowll Mathews, Eugenie Prendergast senior curator, Williams College Museum of Art and president of the Catalogue Raisonné Scholars Association organized the conference. S-session Appraisal Studies or Arts Administration elective.