

OUTLINES OF THE
HISTORY OF
PAINTING



EDMUND von MACH

CRYSTAL
BOOK JACKET COVERS
MADISON 17

IN MEMORIAM



ROBERT HOLMES

R C A
FOR MANY YEARS A TEACHER
IN THIS COLLEGE
THIS BOOK IS ONE OF A NUMBER
FROM THE LIBRARY OF MR HOLMES
PRESENTED TO THE ONTARIO
COLLEGE OF ART BY HIS RELATIVES
JUNE 1930

OUTLINES OF THE
HISTORY OF PAINTING

FROM 1200-1900 A.D.

BY

EDMUND VON MACH, PH.D.

AUTHOR OF "GREEK SCULPTURE: ITS SPIRIT AND PRINCIPLES," "A HANDBOOK OF GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE,"
EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE "ALLGEMEINES LEXIKON DER BILDENDEN KÜNSTLER"



GINN & COMPANY
BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

685

759

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL

COPYRIGHT, 1906

By EDMUND VON MACH

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

667

The Athenæum Press
GINN & COMPANY • PRO-
PRIETORS • BOSTON • U.S.A.

PREFACE

Since lack of perspective often prevents students from reaping the benefit of their exertions, the author has endeavored to present here an arrangement which will assist them in obtaining a comprehensive view of the whole field of painting.

The task of grouping and grading all the artists was one of such responsibility that the author submitted the proof sheets to various men, and arranged that each table should pass through the hands of at least one art critic, one executing artist, one art historian, and one director of an art school. He also availed himself of the kind services of specialists in preparing the pronouncing vocabulary of foreign names.

In explanation of the general plan of the book the following points deserve mention.

1. Artists are listed by their family names unless they are generally known by other names. In such cases the List of Artists contains cross references.

2. The List of Artists gives the full names of the painters; the tables, however, contain generally only the family names unless it is necessary to distinguish between two or more men of the same or similar family names.

3. Three kinds of type are used in the tables to distinguish between the greatest artists, the important painters, and the less conspicuous men. These last are grouped alphabetically below partition lines. Above the lines the names are arranged chronologically. In groups of the nineteenth century heavy type is not used.

4. Dates are given without question marks, if they are generally believed to be correct. Often the only information obtainable is that a man was of a certain age when he died. In such cases the date of his birth has been calculated by subtracting the number of his years from the known year of his death. The dates of many living artists were unascertainable.

5. On Table 23, American painting of the nineteenth century, more names are given than the scope of the book may seem to warrant, because the natural interest in this period seemed to demand it. Space forbade including the names of all American painters of note. They can be found in the *American Art Annual*, edited by Miss Florence N. Levy, and the *Artists' Year Book*, edited by Mr. Arthur Nicholas Hosking.

6. The tables are arranged with a view of serving also as a means of classifying photographs, stereopticon slides, or books. For example, Giotto belongs to the first division of the first group of Italian painting. The first letter of his name, printed separately, distinguishes him from other men of the same division. Photographs of

works by Giotto may, therefore, be designated as It. I. 1. G. In order to facilitate such a use of the tables, the group designations are printed in the upper left-hand corners and are repeated as headings of the groups if there are several on one table. The columns represent divisions, and are numbered accordingly. The letters designating the various artists are given chronologically above the partition lines and alphabetically below them. In arranging photographs the alphabetical order should be followed throughout.

In preparing this larger book for the press the author pleasantly remembers its modest predecessor, which was privately printed three years ago for the benefit of the seniors of Bradford Academy, to whom, "in appreciation of good work and as a sign of friendship," they were dedicated.

EDMUND VON MACH

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

June, 1906

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| ART MAP OF EUROPE AND KEY | vi |

PART ONE — TABLES

TABLES

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | GREAT PAINTERS OF ALL COUNTRIES | 2 |
| 2-6 | ITALIAN PAINTING | 4 |
| 7-9 | GERMAN PAINTING | 14 |
| 10-12 | FLEMISH PAINTING | 20 |
| 13-16 | DUTCH PAINTING | 26 |
| 17 | SPANISH PAINTING | 34 |
| 18-20 | FRENCH PAINTING | 36 |
| 21 | BRITISH PAINTING | 42 |
| 22-23 | AMERICAN PAINTING | 44 |
| 24 | RUSSIAN PAINTING | 48 |
| 25 | SWEDISH PAINTING | 50 |
| 25 | NORWEGIAN AND FINNISH PAINTING | 51 |
| 26 | DANISH PAINTING | 52 |
| 27-28 | JAPANESE PAINTING | 54 |
| 28 | CHINESE PAINTING | 57 |

PART TWO — LIST OF ARTISTS

| | |
|--|----|
| KEY TO THE PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY OF THE LIST OF ARTISTS | 60 |
| LIST OF ARTISTS | 61 |

PART THREE — A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE HISTORY OF PAINTING

CHAPTERS

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| I | INTRODUCTION | 91 |
| II | ITALIAN PAINTING | 95 |
| III | GERMAN PAINTING | 110 |
| IV | FLEMISH PAINTING | 124 |
| V | DUTCH PAINTING | 131 |
| VI | SPANISH PAINTING | 139 |
| VII | FRENCH PAINTING | 143 |
| VIII | BRITISH PAINTING | 155 |
| IX | AMERICAN PAINTING | 162 |
| X | RUSSIAN PAINTING | 169 |
| XI | SCANDINAVIAN PAINTING | 171 |
| XII | JAPANESE PAINTING | 177 |
| INDEX TO PART THREE | | 183 |



Copyright, 1906, by Edmund von Mach



ART MAP
OF
EUROPE

Scale of Miles
0 50 100 200 300 400

Longitude East from Greenwich

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF PAINTING

PART ONE

TABLES

GREAT PAINTERS

With the Exclusion of those

| | ITALY | GERMANY | THE NETHERLANDS |
|--|---|--|---|
| The XIIIth and XIVth Centuries and earlier | Cimabue 1240-1302 Giotto <i>fi</i> 1266-1337 | Meister Wilhelm fl. 1370 | |
| The XVth Century | Fra Angelico <i>fi</i> 1387-1455 Mantegna 1431-1506 Botticelli 1446-1510 Giovanni Bellini <i>va</i> 1428-1516 Carpaccio <i>va</i> 1440-1522 Perugino 1446-1523 | Durer 1471-1528 | H. van Eyck <i>38</i> ?-1426 J. van Eyck <i>38</i> 1381-1440 Bosch <i>D-26</i> 1460-1516 |
| The XVIth Century | Giorgione 1477-1511 da Vinci 1452-1519 Raphael 1483-1520 Correggio <i>u</i> 1494-1534 Michelangelo 1475-1564 Titian <i>va</i> X 1477-1576 Veronese 1528-1588 Tintoretto 1518-1594 Caravaggio 1569-1609 Ludovico Carracci 1555-1619 | Holbein the Younger 1497-1543 Lucas Cranach the Elder 1472-1553 | Massys <i>5</i> 1460-1530 Scorel <i>H-21</i> 1495-1562 Mor <i>5</i> 1512-1576 Pourbus <i>5</i> 1510-1584 |
| The XVIIth Century | Lo Spagnoletto (Ribera) 1588-1656 | | Rubens 1577-1640 van Dyck 1599-1641 Potter 1625-1654 Snyder <i>2-23</i> 1579-1657 Frans Hals 1584-1666 Rembrandt 1607-1669 Gerard Dou 1613-1675 Jordaens 1593-1678 de Hooghe 1632-1681 Ruysdael <i>5</i> 1625-1682 Teniers the Younger 1610-1690 Hobbema 1638-1709 Huysmans <i>fi</i> 1648-1727 |
| The XVIIIth Century | Tiepolo 1696-1770 Guardi 1712-1793 | Mengs 1728-1779 | |

OF ALL COUNTRIES

Table 1

of the XIXth Century

| SPAIN | FRANCE | GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA | OTHER COUNTRIES |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Kana-oka fl. 850 A.D. |
| | | | Chō Densu 1351-1427 Sesshiū 1421-1507 Shiū-bun fl. xvth century |
| | | | Moto-nobu 1477-1550 Tan-yu 1602-1674 |
| Ribalta 1550-1628 | | | |
| Velásquez 1599-1660 | Poussin 1593-1665 | | |
| Murillo 1618-1682 | Claude Lorrain 1600-1682 | | |
| | | | Moro-nobu ?-1711 Kō-rin 1660-1716 |
| | Watteau 1684-1721 | Hogarth 1697-1764 | |
| | Chardin 1699-1779 | Ramsay 1713-1784 | |
| | Vernet 1712-1789 | Gainsborough 1727-1788 | Ō-kio 1733-1795 |
| | Greuze 1725-1805 | Reynolds 1723-1792 | Abilgård [Danish] 1742-1809 |
| Goya 1746-1828 | | Copley 1737-1815 | Levitzky [Russian] 1735-1822 |
| | | Stuart 1755-1828 | Gan-ku 1749-1838 |

Gothic Period and

1

2

| FLORENTINE SCHOOL | | | SIENESE SCHOOL | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| C | Cimabue | 1240-1302 | | | |
| G | Giotto | 1266-1337 | | | |
| | | | D | Duccio | 1260-1339 |
| O | Orcagna (Andrea di Cione) | 1308-1368 | L | Pietro Lorenzetti | ?-1350 |
| | | | L ₂ | Ambrogio Lorenzetti | fl. 1342 |
| G ₂ | Giottino (Tommaso di Stefano) | 1324-1369 | | | |
| S | Spinello Aretino | 1333-1410 | | | |
| | | | B | Taddeo Bartoli (di Bartolo) | 1363-1422 |
| A | Andrea da Firenze | fl. 1380 | B ₂ | Bartolo di Fredi | 1330-1409 |
| A ₂ | Antonio Veneziano | 1312-1388 | G | Guido da Siena | fl. 1275 |
| D | Daddi | ?-1380 | M | Memmi | ?-1356 |
| G ₃ | Gaddi, Agnolo | 1333-1396 | S | Simone di Martino | 1284-1344 |
| G ₄ | Gaddi, Gaddo | 1239-1312 | | | |
| G ₅ | Gaddi, Taddeo | 1300-1366 | | | |
| G ₆ | Giovanni da Milano | fl. 1370 | | | |
| J | Jacopo da Casentino | fl. 1350 | | | |
| L | Lorenzo Monacco, Don | 1370-1422 | | | |
| N | Niccolo di Pietro (Gerini) | fl. 1380 | | | |
| S ₂ | Starnina | 1354-1413 | | | |
| T | Traini | fl. 1350 | | | |
| V | Volterra, Francesco da | fl. 1350 | | | |

Trecento. XIVth Century

3

VARIOUS SCHOOLS

PAINTERS OF TRANSITION

Note. These three painters are often called the painters of transition. In reality there was an unbroken development of art. The names of these artists, therefore, are again listed where they properly belong, as indicated by the designations in brackets.

Starnina [It. I. 1. S₂] 1354-1413
 Gentile da Fabriano [It. II. 3. F] 1360-1428
 Fra Angelico (Giovanni da Fiesole) [It. II. 1. A] 1387-1455

Bologna

A Avanzii, Jacopo degli fl. 1375

Tuscany at large

M Margaritone 1216-1290

Umbria

L Lorenzo da San Severino 1374-?

Venice

S Semitecolo 1351-1400

Verona and Padua

A₂ Altichiero da Zevio fl. 1350

A₃ Avanzi, Jacopo d' fl. 1375

Quattrocento. XVth Century

| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| FLORENCE | | SIENA | | UMBRIA AND PERUGIA | | FERRARA AND BOLOGNA | |
| M | Masaccio 1401-1428 | | | F | Gentile da Fabriano 1360-1428 | | |
| A | Fra Angelico 1387-1455 | | | | | | |
| L | Fra Filippo Lippi 1406-1469 | | | | | | |
| V | Verrochio 1435-1488 | | | S | Giovanni Santi 1435-1494 | T | Cosimo Tura 1430-1495 |
| G | Ghirlandajo, Domenico 1449-1494 | | | M | Melozzo da Forli 1438-1494 | | |
| B | Botticelli 1446-1510 | | | N | Niccolo da Foligno 1430-1502 | | |
| L ₂ | Filippino Lippi 1457-1504 | | | S ₂ | Signorelli 1441-1523 | F | Francia, Francesco 1450-1517 |
| | | | | P | Perugino 1446-1523 | | |
| C | Piero di Cosimo 1462-1521 | | | P ₂ | Pinturicchio 1454-1513 | | |
| C ₂ | Lorenzo di Credi 1459-1537 | | | S ₃ | Lo Spagna ?-1530 | C | Lorenzo Costa 1460-1535 |
| B ₂ | Baldovinetti 1427-1499 | A | Ansano di Pietro 1405-1481 | B | Bonfiglio 1425-1496 | B | Bianchi 1447-1510 |
| B ₃ | Botticini 1446-1497 | D | Domenico di Bartolo ?-1444 | C | Camevale, Fra fl. 1456 | C ₂ | Cossa fl. 1450-1470 |
| C ₃ | Castagno 1390-1457 | F | Fungai 1460-1516 | F ₂ | Fiorenzo di Lorenzo 1444-1521 | G | Grandi, Ercole di Giulio 1462-1531 |
| D | Diamante, Fra 1430-1492 | G | Giorgio di Martini 1439-1502 | F ₃ | Francesca 1420-1492 | G ₂ | Grandi, Ercole di Roberti fl. 1475-1496 |
| D ₂ | Domenico Veneziano 1390-1461 | M | Matteo di Giovanni 1435-1495 | G | Genga 1476-1551 | M | Mazzuola (lived in Parma) ?-1505 |
| G ₂ | Garbo, Raffaelino del 1466-1524 | S | Stefano di Giovanni (Sassata) fl. 1436 | I | Ingegno, L' fl. 1480 | P | Panetti 1460-1512 |
| G ₃ | Ghirlandajo, Benedetto 1458-1497 | V | Vecchietta 1412-1480 | N ₂ | Nelli, Ottaviano ?-1444 | Z | Zaganelli ?-1518 |
| G ₄ | Ghirlandajo, Davide 1452-1525 | | | P ₃ | Palmezzano 1456-1527 | | |
| G ₅ | Gozzoli, Benozzo 1424-1498 | | | P ₄ | Pellegrino da Modena 1468-1524 | | |
| M ₂ | Mainardi ?-1513 | | | | | | |
| M ₃ | Masolino 1383-1440 | | | | | | |
| P | Pesellino 1422-1457 | | | | | | |
| P ₂ | Pollajuolo, Antonio 1433-1498 | | | | | | |
| P ₃ | Pollajuolo, Pietro 1443-1496 | | | | | | |
| R | Rosselli, Cosimo 1439-1507 | | | | | | |
| U | Ucello, Paolo 1397-1475 | | | | | | |

PAINTING

Table 3

Early Renaissance

5

6

7

8

| LOMBARDY | | PADUA | | VERONA AND VICENZA | | VENICE | |
|----------------|---|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | P | Vittore Pisano (Pisanello) 1380-1456 | B | Jacopo Bellini 1400-1464 |
| F | Vincenzo Foppa the Elder 1455-1492 | | | | | C | Carlo Crivelli 1430-1493 |
| | | M | Mantegna 1431-1506 | | | A | Antonello da Messina 1444-1493 |
| B | Borgognone, Ambrogio 1445-1523 | | | M | Morando (Cavaz- zola) 1486-1522 | B ₂ | Giovanni Bel- lini 1428-1516 |
| | | | | M ₂ | Bartolommeo Montagna 1450-1523 | C ₂ | Carpaccio 1440-1522 |
| | | | | | | C ₃ | Catena 1465-1531 |
| B ₂ | Bembo, Bonifazio ?-1500 | M ₂ | Montagnana 1450-1499 | B | Bonsignore 1455-1519 | A ₂ | Alemannus, Gio- vanni fl. 1444-1451 |
| B ₃ | Bembo, Gian Francesco ?-1526 | P | Pizzolo fl. 1470 | C | Caroto 1470-1546 | A ₃ | Antonello da Saliba fl. 1490 |
| B ₄ | Boccaccino 1460-1518 | S | Squarcione 1394-1474 | F | Falconetto 1458-1534 | B ₃ | Barbari 1440-1516 |
| B ₅ | Bramantino 1450-1526 | Z | Zoppo, Marco 1445-1498 | L | Liberale da Ve- rona 1451-1536 | B ₄ | Bartolommeo Veneto fl. xvth century |
| B ₆ | Buttinone 1436-1507 | | | M ₃ | Morone, Dome- nico 1442-1508 | B ₅ | Basaiti 1450-1521 |
| G | Galassi ?-1473 | | | M ₄ | Morone, Fran- cesco 1474-1529 | B ₆ | Bastiani 1450-1508 |
| G ₂ | Giovenone } Piede- | | | S | Speranza fl. 1500 | B ₇ | Bellini, Gentile 1426-1507 |
| M | Macrino } mont fl. 1500 | | | S ₂ | Stefano da Zevio 1393-1450 | B ₈ | Bissolo 1464-1528 |
| | d'Alba } Branch ?-1528 | | | | | C ₄ | Cima da Cone- gliano 1460-1517 |
| M ₂ | Melone fl. 1490 | | | | | D | Diana ?-1500 |
| S | Sacchi, Pier-Fran- cesco (lived in Genoa) fl. 1512-1526 | | | | | F | Fiore, del fl. 1400-1439 |
| Z | Zenale 1436-1526 | | | | | G | Giovanni di Mar- rini da Udine ?-1535 |
| | | | | | | M | Mansueti fl. 1500 |
| | | | | | | M ₂ | Marziale fl. 1492-1507 |
| | | | | | | P | Previtali 1480-1528 |
| | | | | | | R | Rondinello fl. 1425-1500 |
| | | | | | | | The Vivarini |
| | | | | | | V | Antonio da Murano ?-1470 |
| | | | | | | V ₂ | Bartolommeo da Murano fl. 1450-1499 |
| | | | | | | V ₃ | Luigi (Alvise) the Elder fl. 1414 |
| | | | | | | V ₄ | Luigi the Younger ?-1503 |

Cinquecento. XVIth Century

1

2

3

| FLORENCE AND ROME, ALSO UMBRIA | | SIENA | FERRARA AND BOLOGNA |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| A | Albertinelli | 1474-1515 | |
| B | Fra Bartolommeo | 1475-1517 | |
| V | Leonardo da Vinci | 1452-1519 | |
| R | Raphael | 1483-1520 | |
| S | Andrea del Sarto | 1486-1531 | |
| G | Giulio Romano | 1492-1546 | S Il Sodoma 1477-1549 |
| M | Michelangelo Buonarrotti | 1475-1564 | D Dosso Dossi 1479-15 |
| Followers of Albertinelli and Fra Bartolommeo | | Followers of Michelangelo | |
| B ₂ | Bugiardini 1475-1554 | V ₂ | Venusti 1515-1585 |
| G ₂ | Ghirlandajo, Ridolfo 1483-1561 | V ₃ | Volterra, Daniele da 1509-1666 |
| G ₃ | Granacci 1477-1543 | See also Piombo It. III. 6. P ₂ | |
| P | Paolino, Fra 1490-1547 | Followers of Raphael | |
| S ₂ | Sogliani 1492-1544 | A ₂ | Andrea da Salerno (Sabbatini) 1480-1545 |
| Followers of Andrea del Sarto | | C | Carravaggio, Polidore da 1490-1543 |
| B ₃ | Bacchiacca, Il 1494-1557 | G ₄ | Giovanni da Udine 1487-1564 |
| F | Franciabigio (Bigio) 1482-1525 | P ₄ | Penni (Il Fattore) 1488-1528 |
| P ₂ | Pontormo 1494-1557 | V ₄ | Vaga, del 1500-1547 |
| P ₃ | Puligo 1492-1527 | V ₅ | Vincenzo da San Gimignano 1492-1529 |
| R ₂ | Rosso de' Rossi (Il Rosso) 1494-1541 | V ₆ | Vite 1469-1523 |
| U | Ubertini 1494-1557 | See also Bagnacavallo It. III. 3. B | |
| | | | Imola It. III. 3. I |
| | | | Primaticcio It. III. 3. P |
| B | Beccafumi 1486-1551 | B | Bagnacavallo 1484-1542 |
| G | Girolamo di Benvenuto 1470-1524 | F | Ferrari, Defendente fl. 1525 |
| P | Pacchia 1477-1535 | F ₂ | Fontana, Lavinia 1552-1614 |
| P ₂ | Pacchiarotti 1474-1550 | F ₃ | Francia, Giacomo 1486-1557 |
| P ₃ | Peruzzi 1481-1537 | F ₄ | Francia, Giambattista 1533-157 |
| | | F ₅ | Francia, Giulio 1487-? |
| | | G | Garofalo 1481-1 |
| | | I | Imola 1494- |
| | | M | Mazzolino 1478 |
| | | M ₂ | Mazuoli ? |
| | | O | Ortolano, L' 1467 9 |
| | | P | Passerotti 1520 |
| | | P ₂ | Primaticcio 1504 7 |
| | | P ₃ | Procaccini, Camillo 15 526 |
| | | P ₄ | Procaccini, Ercole the Elder vit 1 ary |
| | | P ₅ | Procaccini, Giulio Cesare 1 544 |
| | | | See also Calvaert Fl |

PAINTING

Table 4

High Renaissance

4

5

6

7

| LOMBARDY | | PARMA | | VENICE | | Under Venetian Influence BRESCIA, VERONA, VICENZA, etc. | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | G | Giorgione 1477-1511 | | |
| L | Luini 1475-1533 | | | P | Palma Il Vecchio (i.e. the Elder) 1480-1528 | | |
| | | C | Correggio (Antonio Allegri) 1494-1534 | P ₂ | Sebastiano del Piombo 1485-1547 | M | Il Moretto 1498-1555 |
| | | | | T | Titian (Tiziano Vecellio) 1477-1576 | | |
| | | G | Gatti 1490-1575 | B | Paris Bordone 1500-1570 | M ₂ | Moroni 1520-1578 |
| S | Lo Scarsellino 1551-1621 | | | V | Paolo Veronese 1528-1588 | | |
| | | | | T ₂ | Tintoretto, Jacopo 1518-1594 | | |
| A | Abbate 1512-1570 | A | Allegri, Pomponio 1521-1593 | B ₂ | Bassano, Francesco 1550-1591 | B | Badile 1516-1560 |
| A ₂ | Aleni (Il Fadino) fl. 1500-1515 | A ₂ | Anselmi 1491-1554 | B ₃ | Bassano, Giovanni Battista } fl. xvith century | B ₂ | Brusasorci the Elder (Domenico Riccio) 1494-1567 |
| A ₃ | Anguisciola Sofonisba 1535-1625 | B | Bartolotti 1450-1527 | B ₄ | Bassano, Girolamo } fl. xvith century | B ₃ | Brusasorci the Younger (Felice Riccio) 1540-1605 |
| B | Beltraffio 1467-1516 | C ₂ | Caselli fl. 1489-1507 | B ₅ | Bassano, Jacopo the Elder 1510-1592 | B ₄ | Buonconsiglio (Il Marescalco) fl. 1497-1530 |
| C | Campi, Bernardino 1522-1590 | M | Mazzola, Girolamo 1520-1580 | B ₆ | Bassano, Leandro 1558-1623 | F | Farinati, Battista 1532-1592 |
| C ₂ | Campi, Galeazzo 1477-1536 | P | Parmigianino (Francesco Mazzola) 1504-1540 | B ₇ | Beccaruzzi fl. 1527-1544 | F ₂ | Farinati, Paolo 1524-1606 |
| C ₃ | Campi, Giulio 1500-1572 | R | Rondani ?-1548 | B ₈ | Bonifazio I (Veronese the Elder) 1490-1540 | F ₃ | Fogolino, } fl. early xvith century |
| | Cesare da Sesto 1485-1523 | | | B ₉ | Bonifazio II (Veronese the Younger) ?-1533 | G | Girolamo dai Libri 1474-1555 |
| | Civerchio 1470-1540 | | | B ₁₀ | Bonifazio III (Veronese) fl. 1555-1579 | M ₃ | Montagna, } fl. early xvith century |
| | Conti, Bernardino dei fl. 1490 | | | C | Cagliari, Benedetto (Veronese) 1538-1598 | R | Romanino 1485-1566 |
| | Ferrari, Gaudenzio 1481-1547 | | | C ₂ | Cagliari, Carletto (Veronese) 1570-1596 | S | Savoldo 1480-1548 |
| | Foppa, Vincenzo } fl. xvith century | | | C ₃ | Cagliari, Gabriele (Veronese) 1568-1631 | T | Torbido (Il Moro) 1486-1546 |
| | Frolamo, da Capri 1501-1561 | | | C ₄ | Campagnola 1490-1564 | | |
| Pi. | 1510-1578 | | | C ₅ | Cariani 1480-1541 | | |
| Ri. | d'Oggione 1470-1530 | | | C ₆ | Contarini 1549-1605 | | |
| R ₂ | ni (Giam-petrino) fl. 1520-1550 | | | F | Francesco da Santacroce fl. 1504-1541 | P ₄ | Pellegrino da San Daniele 1460-1547 |
| T ₁ | aino (Salai) 1483-1520 | | | G ₂ | Girolamo da Santacroce fl. 1520-1549 | P ₅ | Pordenone, Bernardino ?-1541 |
| | Colario 1458-1530 | | | K | Kalkar, Giovanni di 1510-1546 | P ₆ | Pordenone, Giovanni 1483-1539 |
| | Tibaldi 1532-1592 | | | L | Lotto, Lorenzo 1480-1554 | S | Schiavone, Andrea 1522-1582 |
| | | | | M | Marconi fl. 1505-1520 | T ₃ | Tintoretto, Domenico 1562-1637 |
| | | | | P ₃ | Palma Il Giovane (i.e. the Younger) 1544-1628 | V ₂ | Vecellio, Francesco 1475-1560 |
| | | | | | | V ₃ | Vecellio, Marco 1545-1611 |
| | | | | | | V ₄ | Vecellio, Orazio 1515-1576 |
| | | | | | | Z | Zeloti 1532-1592 |

6 (continued)

The XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries and in the

1

2

3

| THE MANNERISTS | | | THE ECLECTICS | | | THE NATURALISTS | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| B | Bronzino | 1502-1572 | | | | | | |
| V | Vasari | 1511-1574 | | | | | | |
| | | | C | Annibale Carracci | 1560-1609 | C | Michelangelo da Caravaggio, | 1569-160 |
| | | | C ₂ | Ludovico Carracci | 1555-1619 | | | |
| | | | D | Domenichino (Domenico Zampieri) | 1581-1641 | | | |
| | | | G | Guido Reni | 1575-1642 | | | |
| | | | | | | S | Lo Spagnoletto (Giuseppe Ribera) | 1588-1650 |
| | | | | | | R | Salvator Rosa | 1615-1673 |
| | | | D ₂ | Carlo Dolci | 1616-1686 | | | |
| | | | | | | | See also Elzheimer | G. III. E |
| A | Allori, Alessandro | 1535-1607 | A | Albani | 1578-1660 | C ₂ | Cambiaso, of Genoa | 1527-1585 |
| B ₂ | Baroccio | 1528-1612 | A ₂ | Allori, Cristofano | 1577-1621 | C ₃ | Castello, Bernardo, of Genoa | 1557-1629 |
| C | Carducci | 1560-1608 | B | Badalocchio | 1581-1647 | C ₄ | Castello, Castellino | 1579-1647 |
| C ₂ | Cesare, Giuseppe (Cavaliere d'Arpino) | 1568-1640 | B ₂ | Berettini da Cortona, Pietro | 1596-1669 | L | Lissandrino (Alessandro Mag-nasco) | 1661-1677 |
| S | Salviati | 1510-1563 | B ₃ | Bonone (Carracci of Ferrara) | 1569-1632 | P | Pomaranche, Cristoforo delle (Roncalli) | 1552-1626 |
| S ₂ | Santi di Tito | 1563-1603 | C ₃ | Cagnacci | 1601-1681 | P ₂ | Pomaranche, Niccolo delle (Roncalli) | fl. end 17th centry |
| Z | Zuccherò, Federigo | 1543-1609 | C ₄ | Carracci, Agostino | 1557-1602 | S ₂ | Strozzi, Bernardo (il Capuc-cino) | 1581-1644 |
| Z ₂ | Zuccherò, Taddeo | 1529-1566 | C ₅ | Carracci, Francesco | 1595-1622 | | | |
| | | | C ₆ | Cavedone | 1577-1660 | | | |
| | | | C ₇ | Crespi | 1590-1630 | | | |
| | | | G ₂ | Guercino, Il (Barbieri) | 1591-1666 | | | |
| | | | L | Lanfranco | 1580-1647 | | | |
| | | | M | Maratti (Maratta) | 1625-1713 | | | |
| | | | R | Romanelli | 1610-1662 | | | |
| | | | S | Sassoferrato, Il | 1605-1685 | | | |
| | | | S ₂ | Schidone | 1570-1615 | | | |
| | | | S ₃ | Solimena | 1657-1747 | | | |
| | | | S ₄ | Stanzione | 1585-1656 | | | |
| | | | T | Tiarini | 1577-1668 | | | |
| | | | V | Vaccaro | 1598-1670 | | | |

XVIth Century the Forerunners of the Late Styles

4

5

| THE LATE VENETIANS | | OTHER ARTISTS | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | a | b |
| | | Schools of Bologna, Florence, Genoa | Schools of Naples, Perugia, Rome, Siena |
| | | | A Vincenzo Aniemo, of Naples ?-1540 |
| Il Padovanino | 1590-1650 | | |
| Piètro Liberi | 1605-1687 | | |
| | | | G Luca Giordano (Fa-Presto), of Naples 1632-1705 |
| Il Canaletto (Antonio da Canale) | 1697-1768 | L Benedetto Cavaliere Luti, of Florence 1666-1724 | P Giovanni Paolo Pannini, of Rome 1695-1768 |
| Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista | 1696-1770 | | |
| Belotto (Il Canaletto the nephew) | 1720-1780 | | A ₂ Francesco Appiani, of Perugia 1704-1792 |
| Guardi | 1712-1793 | | |
| | | School of Bologna | School of Naples |
| Amalteo | 1505-1584 | C Cignani 1628-1719 | C Conca 1679-1764 |
| Amigoni | 1675-1752 | P Procaccini, Ercole the Younger 1596-1676 | |
| Carriera | 1675-1757 | S Spada 1576-1622 | School of Rome |
| Canzani | 1515-1565 | | B Batoni 1708-1787 |
| Carlini | 1657-1735 | School of Florence | F Ferri 1634-1689 |
| Canali (Vincentino) | 1539-1614 | F Furini 1600-1649 | P ₂ Pietro da Cortona 1596-1669 |
| Canziano | 1530-1592 | G Gentileschi 1562-1647 | S Sacchi, Andrea 1600-1661 |
| Canazza | ?-1561 | M Manozzi 1590-1636 | V Vanvitelli (van Wittel) 1647-1736 |
| Piazzetta | 1682-1754 | P ₂ Passignano 1550-1608 | |
| Ricci, Marco | 1679-1729 | R Rosselli, Matteo 1578-1650 | School of Siena |
| Ricci, Sebastiano | 1659-1734 | Z Zuccarelli 1702-1788 | S ₂ Salimbeni 1557-1613 |
| Tiepolo, Domenico | 1727-1804 | | V ₂ Vanni 1563-1609 |
| Turchi (L'Orbetto) | 1582-1650 | School of Genoa | |
| | | C ₂ Carloni, Giambattista 1594-1680 | |
| | | C ₃ Carloni, Giovanni 1591-1630 | |
| | | C ₄ Castiglione 1616-1670 | |
| | | P ₃ Piola 1628-1703 | |

PAINTING

Table 6

| 4 | | | 5 | | | 6 | | |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|---|---------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| TUSCANY | | | ROME | | | NAPLES | | |
| | | | | Eclectic | | | | |
| | | | C | Camuccini | 1775-1844 | | | |
| | | | M | Minardi | 1787-1871 | | | |
| | History | | | History | | | Genre | |
| F | Fattori | 1828- | | | | M | Michetti | 1852- |
| M | Mussini, Luigi | 1813-1888 | B | Barabino [of Genoa] | 1832-1891 | M ₂ | Morelli | 1826- |
| | Portrait | | | Genre | | P | Palizzi | 1818-1888 |
| G | Gordigiani | 1828- | S | Sartorio, Aristide [Famous also for his landscape studies in pastels] | 1861- | | | |
| | | | | | | | Landscape | |
| | | | | | | B | Brancaccio | - |
| | | | | | | V | Vertunni | 1826-1897 |
| | | | | See also Fortuny | Sp. III. 2. F | | See also Fortuny | Sp. III. 2. F |
| | | | | Pradilla | Sp. III. 1. P | | Nittis, de | Fr. IV. 13. N |
| | | | | Villegas | Sp. III. 2. V | | | |
| | | | | Romanticist | | | | |
| B | Benvenuti, Pietro | 1769-1844 | C ₂ | Coggetti | 1804-1875 | | | |
| | History | | P | Podesti | 1800-1895 | | | |
| B ₂ | Bezzuoli | 1784-1855 | | | | | Genre | |
| B ₃ | Bruzzi | - | | | | C | Campriani | 1848- |
| C | Cassioli | 1832-1891 | | | | C ₂ | Celentano | 1835-1863 |
| C ₂ | Ciseri | 1821-1891 | | | | C ₃ | Chirico, di | 1845- |
| F ₂ | Franchi | 1838- | | | | D | Dalbono | 1843- |
| M ₂ | Maccari | 1840- | | | | M ₃ | Mancinelli, Giuseppe | 1813-1875 |
| M ₃ | Martinetti | - | | | | M ₄ | Marinelli | 1820-1892 |
| M ₄ | Mussini, Cesare | 1808- | | Genre | | M ₅ | Miola | 1840- |
| P | Pollastrini | 1817-1876 | B ₂ | Bompiani | 1821- | N | Netti | 1832-1894 |
| S | Signorini | 1835 | C ₃ | Chierici | 1838- | N ₂ | Nigris | 1812- |
| U | Ussi | 1822- | C ₄ | Corelli | 1855- | S | Saporetta | 1832- |
| | Genre | | F | Fracassini | 1838-1868 | S ₂ | Sciuti | 1835- |
| A | Andreotti | 1847- | J | Jocavacci | 1838- | S ₃ | Simoni | 1846- |
| G ₂ | Gelli | 1852- | J ₂ | Joris | 1843- | | | |
| V | Vinea | 1846- | S | Sanctis, de | 1829- | | Landscape | |
| | | | T | Tiratelli | 1842- | C ₄ | Carlandi | 1848- |
| | | | V | Vanutelli | 1834- | C ₅ | Cortese | 1829- |
| | | | | | | S ₄ | Sassi | - |
| | | | | | | S ₅ | Simonetti | - |
| | | | | Landscape | | | | |
| | | | | See above, Tiratelli | It. V. 5. T | | | |
| | | | | | | | Animals | |
| | | | R | Rossi Scotti | 1848- | C ₆ | Chialiva [Studio in France] | - |

The XIVth, XVth,

I.—BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH AND THE FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| SCHOOL OF COLOGNE Niederrheinische Schule | | SCHOOL OF WESTPHALIA including Frankfort and Mayence | | SCHOOL OF SUABIA Allemannisch-Schwäbische Schule | | SCHOOL OF BOHEMIA | |
| M | Meister Wilhelm fl. 1370 | | | | | T | Theodorich of Prague fl. 1348-1378 |
| M ₂ | Meister Stephan Lochner fl. 1450 | | | | | | |
| M ₃ | Master of the Altar of St. George } fl. xivth century | F | Fyoll, Konrad fl. 1466-1498 | I | Isenmann, Kaspar ?-1466 | W | Wurmser, Nicolaus fl. 1348-1366 |
| M ₄ | Master of the Bartholomew and Thomas Altar fl. 1500 | K | Körbecke fl. xivth century | J | Justus de Allamagna fl. 1451 | | |
| M ₅ | Master of the Glorification of Mary } fl. xvth century | L | Lon, Gert von fl. 1505-1521 | M | Moser, Lucas fl. 1431 | | |
| | | M | Master of the Amsterdam Cabinet (des Wolfegger Hausbuchs) } fl. xivth century | M ₂ | Multscher, Hans } fl. xvth century | | |
| M ₆ | Master of the Holy Kith and Kin } fl. end xivth century | M ₂ | Master of Liesborn fl. 1465 | W | Witz, Konrad fl. 1430-1450 | | |
| M ₇ | Master of the Life of Mary fl. 1463-1492 | S | Soest, Konrad von fl. 1400 | | | | |
| M ₈ | Master of the Lyversberg Passion fl. 1463-1480 | | | | | | |
| M ₉ | Master of St. Severin } fl. xvth century | | | | | | |
| M ₁₀ | Meister (Master) Berthold fl. 1425 | | | | | | |

PAINTING

Table 7

and XVIth Centuries

II.—THE GREAT PERIOD—THE LATE FIFTEENTH AND THE SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

1

2

3

4

FRANCONIAN SCHOOL

SCHOOL OF WESTPHALIA and the Lower Rhine

SUABIAN SCHOOL including Countries South of Suabia

SAXON SCHOOL

Hans Pleydenwuff ?-1472

W Michel Wolgemut 1434-1519

D Albrecht Dürer 1471-1528

A Heinrich Aldegrever 1502-1558

S Martin Schöngauer 1446-1488

P Michel Pacher 1430-1498

H Hans Holbein the Elder 1460-1524

B Hans Burckmair 1473-1531

H₂ Hans Holbein the Younger 1497-1543

A Hans von Aachen (Aachen) 1562-1615

R Johann Rottenhammer 1564-1623

C Lucas Cranach the Elder 1472-1553

C₂ Lucas Cranach the Younger 1515-1586

A Altdorfer 1480-1538

B Baldung 1476-1545

B₂ Beham, Barthel 1502-1540

B₃ Beham, Sebald 1500-1550

B₄ Binck 1490-1569

D₂ Dürer, Hans 1490-?

F Feselen ?-1538

K Kulmbach ?-1522

M Mielich 1516-1573

P₂ Pencz 1500-1550

P₃ Pleydenwuff, Wilhelm 1450-1494

S Schüpfelin 1490-1540

S₂ Springinklee ?-1540

U Uffenbach 1570-1640

B Bruyn, Arnold fl. 1550

B₂ Bruyn, Barthel the Elder (Bartholomäus) 1494-1557

B₃ Bruyn, Barthel the Younger fl. 1550

D Dünwegge, Heinrich fl. 1520

D₂ Dünwegge, Victor fl. 1520

F Fries 1465-1520

M Master of the Death of Mary* fl. 1530-1550

R Ring, Hermann tom 1521-1597

R₂ Ring, Ludger tom, the Elder 1496-1547

R₃ Ring, Ludger tom, the Younger 1521-1584

W Woensam fl. 1528-1561

A₂ Amberger fl. 1530-1561

A₃ Apt, Ulrich fl. 1486-1532

A₄ Asper 1499-1571

B₂ Bocksberger 1540-?

B₃ Breu ?-1536

B₄ Burckmair, Toman fl. 1460-1523

F Frass, Leo [Perhaps identical with artist signing L. F.] fl. 1502

G Giltlinger 1460-1522

H₃ Herbst fl. 1500

H₄ Herlin ?-1499

H₅ Holbein, Siegmund 1465-1540

M Maurer fl. 1570

S₂ Schaffner fl. 1500-1535

S₃ Schüchlin ?-1505

S₄ Schwarz 1550-1597

S₅ Stimmer 1534-1582

S₆ Strigel 1461-1528

Z Zeitbloom fl. 1484-1517

G Grunewald ?-1529

See also Neuchatel Fl. II. 1. N

* Perhaps identical with Joost van Cleef Fl. II. 1. C

See also Witte (Candido) Fl. II. 1. W

Spranger, Bartholomäus Fl. II. 1. S.

The XVIIth and

| III. — THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY | | | IV. — THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | | | HISTORY AND FIGURE | LANDSCAPE Architecture, Animals | | | | |
| E | Adam Elzheimer | 1574-1620 | R | Georg Philipp Rugendas | 1666-1742 | | | |
| | | | D | Balthasar Denner | 1685-1749 | | | |
| R | Johann Heinrich Roos | 1631-1685 | C | Daniel Chodowiecki | 1726-1801 | | | |
| | | | G | Anton Graff | 1736-1813 | | | |
| II | Heinz, Joseph the Elder | 1565-1609 | K | Kupetzki | 1667-1740 | B | Beich | 1665-1748 |
| H ₂ | Heinz, Joseph the Younger | 1590-1655 | M | Meytens (Mytens) (born in Stockholm) | 1696-1770 | B ₂ | Brand, Christian Hilfgott | 1695-1756 |
| H ₃ | Hoffmann, Samuel | 1592-1648 | | | | B ₃ | Brand, Johann Christian | 1723-1795 |
| K | Kager | 1566-1634 | | | | F | Feistenberger, Anton | 1678-1722 |
| K ₂ | König | fl. 1610 | | | | F ₂ | Feistenberger, Joseph | 1684-1735 |
| L | Lembke | 1631-1713 | | | | F ₃ | Fischer | 1729-1810 |
| L ₂ | Loth, Karl (Carlotto) | 1632-1698 | | | | G | Gessner | 1730-1787 |
| M | Merian, Maria Sibylla | 1647-1717 | | | | H | Hackert | 1737-1807 |
| M ₂ | Merian, Matthäus | 1621-1687 | | | | K | Kobell | 1740-1799 |
| M ₃ | Mignon | 1640-1679 | | | | M | Morgenstern | 1738-1819 |
| O | Owens, Jürgen | 1623-1679 | | | | R | Riedinger, Johann Elias | 1698-1767 |
| P | Paudiss | 1618-1666 | | | | R ₂ | Roos, Johann Melchior | 1659-1731 |
| R ₂ | Roos, Philipp Peter (Rosa di Tivoli) | 1655-1705 | | | | R ₃ | Roos (Rosa), Joseph | 1726-1805 |
| R ₃ | Ruthart | fl. 1660-1680 | | | | | | |
| S | Sandart | 1606-1688 | | | | | | |
| S ₂ | Scheits | 1640-1700 | | | | | | |
| S ₃ | Soest (Zoest), Gerard | ?-1681 | | | | | | |
| T | Tamm | 1658-1724 | | | | | | |
| W | Weyer | ?-1690 | | | | | | |

PAINTING

Table 8

XVIIIth Centuries

IV. — THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

3

4

5

DECORATION

STILL LIFE AND IMITATORS
of Various Style

CLASSICAL REVIVAL

G Daniel Gran 1694-1757

M Anton Raphael Mengs 1728-1779

C Asmus Jacob Carstens 1754-1798

K Angelica Kauffmann 1741-1807

A Asam 1686-1742
K Knoller 1725-1804
T Troger 1698-1777
U Unterberger 1695-1758
Z Zick 1733-1797

A Angermeyer [Still Life] 1674-1740
B Byss [Still Life] 1660-1738
D Dietrich, Christian 1712-1774
H Hamilton, Charles William de 1670-1754
H₂ Hamilton, Jean George de 1666-1740
H₃ Hamilton, Philip Ferdinand
de fl. 1664-1750
J Juncker [Still Life] 1703-1767
Q Querfurt 1697-1761
S Seekatz 1719-1768

K₂ Koch, Joseph Anton 1768-1839
S Schick 1779-1812
T Tischbein 1751-1829
W Wächter 1762-1852

The XIXth Century

1

2

3

| CLASSICISTS AND PAINTERS OF HEROIC LANDSCAPES | | ROMANTICISTS (NAZARENES) AND FRESCO PAINTERS | | OLDER ARTISTS OF IMPORTANT ART CENTERS | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | a | b |
| G | Genelli 1798-1868 | C | Cornelius 1783-1867 | Düsseldorf | |
| P | Preller, Friedrich the Elder 1804-1878 | K | Kaulbach, Wil- helm von 1805-1847 | A | Achenbach, Andreas [Landscape] 1815- |
| R | Rottmann 1797-1850 | O | Overbeck 1789-1869 | C | Camphausen 1818-1885 |
| | | S | Schnorr von Carolsfeld 1794-1872 | K | Knaus [Genre] 1829- |
| | | | | L | Lessing [History and Land- scape] 1808-1880 |
| | | | | S | Schadow [The father of the Düsseldorf School] 1789-1862 |
| | | | | S ₂ | Schrödter 1805-1875 |
| | | | | V | Vautier 1829-1898 |
| | See also Corne- lius G. V. 2. C | | See also Schadow G. V. 3. S | | See also Cornel- ius G. V. 2 C |
| | | | | Düsseldorf | |
| P ₂ | Preller, Friedrich the Younger 1838- | F | Führich 1800-1876 | A ₂ | Achenbach, Oswald 1827- |
| R ₂ | Robert, Leopold 1794-1835 | R ₂ | Richter, Ludwig 1803-1884 | B | Bendermann [Landscape] 1811-1889 |
| | | S ₂ | Schwind, von 1804-1871 | H | Hasenclever [Genre] 1810-1853 |
| | | S ₃ | Steinle 1810-1886 | H ₂ | Hübner [Genre] 1814-1879 |
| | | V | Veit 1793-1877 | J | Jordan [Genre] 1810-1887 |
| | | | | S ₃ | Schirmer [Land- scape] 1807-1863 |
| | | | | Various Art Centers | |
| | | | | A ₃ | Adam, Albrecht [Battle scenes] 1786-1862 |
| | | | | A ₄ | Adam, Franz 1815-1886 |
| | | | | A ₅ | Amerling 1803-1887 |
| | | | | B ₂ | Becker, Jacob 1810-1872 |
| | | | | D | Danhauser (of Vienna) 1805-1845 |
| | | | | E | Ender, Johann 1793-1854 |
| | | | | E ₂ | Ender, Thomas 1793-1875 |
| | | | | E ₃ | Enhuber 1811-1867 |
| | | | | F | Friedrichs 1774-1840 |
| | | | | G | Gauermann (of Vienna) 1807-1862 |
| | | | | G ₂ | Gensler, Jacob 1808-1845 |
| | | | | G ₃ | Gensler, Martin 1811-1881 |
| | | | | H ₃ | Hess, Peter von 1792-1871 |
| | | | | H ₄ | Hildebrandt 1804-1874 |
| | | | | H ₅ | Hoffmann, Hein- rich 1824- |
| | | | | H ₆ | Hoguet 1821-1870 |
| | | | | H ₇ | Horschelt 1829-1871 |
| | | | | Berlin | |
| | | | | B | Blechen [Land- scape] 1798-1840 |
| | | | | K | Krüger [Horses and Portraits] 1797-1857 |
| | | | | Hamburg | |
| | | | | R | Runge 1777-1810 |
| | | | | Munich | |
| | | | | B ₂ | Bürkel [Genre] 1802-1869 |
| | | | | H | Hess, H. M. von 1798-1863 |
| | | | | M | Morgenstern [Landscape] 1805-1867 |
| | | | | R ₂ | Riedel 1802-1883 |
| | | | | Various Art Centers (continued) | |
| | | | | K ₂ | Kauffmann, Her- mann 1808-1889 |
| | | | | K ₃ | Körner, Johann - |
| | | | | K ₄ | Krafft, E. P. 1780-1856 |
| | | | | L | Lang, H. 1838-1891 |
| | | | | L ₂ | Lier [Landscape] 1827-1882 |
| | | | | M ₂ | Meyer, J. G. 1813- |
| | | | | M ₃ | Meyerheim, Eduard 1808-1879 |
| | | | | R ₃ | Rahl 1812-1865 |
| | | | | R ₄ | Ritter 1816-1853 |
| | | | | R ₅ | Rotermund 1826-1859 |
| | | | | S | Schleich [Land- scape] 1812-1874 |
| | | | | S ₂ | Schreyer, Adolf 1828-1899 |
| | | | | S ₃ | Speckter 1806-1835 |
| | | | | S ₄ | Spitzweg [Genre] 1808-1885 |
| | | | | S ₅ | Steffeck 1818-1890 |
| | | | | W | Waldmüller 1793-1865 |
| | | | | W ₂ | Weber, August 1817-1873 |
| | | | | See also Tiedemann N. 2. T | |

PAINTING

Table 9

Including Austria-Hungary and Allied Countries

4

5

6

7

| COLORISTS IN MUNICH AND ELSEWHERE | | INDIVIDUALISTS | REALISTS | IMPRESSIONISTS (Secessionists) |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Munich | | | | |
| I | Makart 1840-1884 | B Bücklin [Swiss] 1827-1901 | D Defregger 1835- | K Kalckreuth, Graf Stanislaus 1821-1894 |
| | Piloty [The first great colorist] 1826-1886 | F Feuerbach 1829-1880 | G Gebhardt, von 1838- | L Leistikow 1865- |
| | | K Klinger, Max 1857- | G ₂ Gussow 1843- | L ₂ Liebermann 1849- |
| | | M Marées, von 1837-1887 | K Kaulbach, Friedrich August von 1850- | P Piglheim 1848-1894 |
| | | | L Leibl 1846-1900 | S Skarbina 1849- |
| | | | L ₂ Lenbach [Portrait] 1836- | S ₂ Stuck 1863- |
| | | | M Menzel 1815-1904 | T Thoma 1839- |
| | | | M ₂ Munkácsy (M. Lieb) [Hungarian] 1846-1900 | U Uhde, von 1848- |
| | | | W Werner, von 1843- | |
| Berlin | | | | |
| I | Henneberg 1825-1876 | | | |
| R | Richter, Gustav 1823-1884 | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| I | Benczur [Hungarian] 1844- | B ₂ Brandt 1841- | D ₂ Diez 1839- | A Andri - |
| | Bracht 1842- | F ₂ Franz-Dreber 1822-1875 | G ₃ Grütznér 1846- | B Baum 1859- |
| | Brozik [A Bohemian Czech] 1851- | G Greiner 1871- | H Haider, Karl [Independent] - | B ₂ Bautzer - |
| | Faber du Faur 1828-1901 | P Pidoll, von 1847-1901 | K ₂ Kauffmann, Hugo 1844- | C Corinth 1858- |
| | Gentz 1822-1890 | S Sandreuter 1850-1901 | K ₃ Kurzbauer 1840-1879 | D Dettmann 1865- |
| | Gysis [A Greek artist] 1842-1901 | S ₂ Stauffer-Bern 1857-1891 | L ₃ Löfftz 1845- | D ₂ Dill 1846- |
| | Hildebrandt, E. 1817-1868 | | M ₃ Meyer, Klaus 1856- | E Exter 1863- |
| | Hoffmann, Ludwig von 1861- | | M ₄ Meyerheim, Paul 1842- | F Firle 1859- |
| | Knille 1832-1898 | | P Pettenkofen 1821-1889 | H Habermann 1849- |
| | Kretzschmer 1811-1890 | | S Schmid 1835- | H ₂ Haug 1857- |
| | Liezen-Mayer [Hungarian] 1839-1898 | | S ₂ Sperl [Independent] - | H ₃ Höcker 1854- |
| | Lindenschmit, W. the Elder 1806-1848 | | T Trübner 1851- | K ₂ Kalckreuth, Graf Leopold 1855- |
| | Lindenschmit, W. the Younger 1829-1895 | | | K ₃ Kamecke, von 1829-1899 |
| | Matejko [A Polish painter, pupil of Piloty] 1838-1893 | | | K ₄ Kampf 1864- |
| | Max, Gabriel [Bohemian] 1840- | | | K ₅ Keller, Albert 1844- |
| | Müller, Victor 1829-1871 | | | K ₆ Klimt 1864-1892 |
| | Plockhorst 1825- | | | K ₇ Kühl 1851- |
| | Schrader, Julius 1815- | | | M Mach, Miss Hildgard von 1873- |
| | Spangenberg 1843-1874 | | | M ₂ Moll 1861- |
| | | | | P ₂ Pepino 1863- |
| | | | | R Reiniger 1863- |
| | | | | S ₃ Schönleber 1851- |
| | | | | S ₄ Schuster-Woldan, Raffael - |
| | | | | S ₅ Schuster-Woldan - |
| | | | | S ₆ Slevogt - |
| | | | | V Vogel 1855- |
| | | | | W Weisshaupt 1848- |
| | | | | Z Zimmermann, Ernst 1852- |
| | | | | Z ₂ Zügel 1850- |

The XVth and

| I.—THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY AND EARLIER | | | II.—THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY 1 | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | | History and Figure | |
| E | Hubert van Eyck | ?-1426 | M | Quenten Massys (Matsys) | 1460-1530 |
| E ₂ | Jan van Eyck | 1381-1440 | | | |
| | | | C | Joost van Cleef (Cleve) | fl. 1530-1550 |
| W | Rogier van der Weyden | 1400-1464 | M ₂ | Antonis Mor (Antonio Moro) | 1512-1576 |
| | | | P | Peeter Pourbus | 1510-1584 |
| M | Hans Memling | 1425-1495 | | | |
| ----- | | | | | |
| B | Bouts, Dierick (Stuerbouts or Dick van Harlem) | 1410-1475 | C ₂ | Cleef, Marten van | ?-1570 |
| B ₂ | Broederlam | fl. 1390 | C ₃ | Coninxlo, Jan van | 1489-? |
| C | Cristus, Petrus | 1400-1472 | C ₄ | Coxcyen (Cocxie), Michiel van, the Elder | 1499-1592 |
| D | David, Gheeraerdt | 1450-1523 | F | Floris, Frans | 1518-1570 |
| G | Goes, Hugo van der | 1430-1482 | F ₂ | Francken, Ambrosius | 1544-1618 |
| J | Justus (Jodocus) of Ghent | fl. end xvth century | F ₃ | Francken, Frans, the Elder | 1540-1616 |
| M ₂ | Master of Flemalle | fl. 1450 | F ₄ | Francken, Hans or Jan | 1581-1624 |
| M ₃ | Meire, Gerard van der | 1427-1474 | F ₅ | Francken, Hieronymus, the Elder | 1542-1610 |
| | | | F ₆ | Francken, Hieronymus, the Younger | 1578-1623 |
| | | | F ₇ | Francken, Johannes (after 1550 in Naples) | 1500-? |
| | | | G | Geerarts, Marcus, the Elder | ?-1604 |
| | | | G ₂ | Geldorp, Gortzius | 1533-1618 |
| | | | H | Heere, de | 1534-1584 |
| | | | H ₂ | Hemissen, Jan van | 1500-1556 |
| | | | K | Key, Adriaan Thomasz | 1544-1590 |
| | | | K ₂ | Key, Willem | 1520-1568 |
| | | | L | Lombard, Lambert (Susterman) | 1505-1566 |
| | | | M ₃ | Mabuse, Jan (Gossaert) van | 1470-1541 |
| | | | M ₄ | Mander, Karel van, the Elder | 1548-1606 |
| | | | M ₅ | Massys, Cornelis | 1511-1580 |
| | | | M ₆ | Massys, Jan | 1509-1575 |
| | | | M ₇ | "Master of the Half-figures of Women" | fl. 1520 |
| | | | M ₈ | Mostaert, Gillis | 1534-1598 |
| | | | N | Neuchatel (Nutschiedel), Nicolaus | 1527-1595 |
| | | | O | Orley, Bernaert (Barend van Brussel) | 1491-1542 |
| | | | P ₂ | Pourbus, Frans, the Elder | 1545-1581 |
| | | | P ₃ | Pourbus, Frans, the Younger | 1570-1622 |
| | | | S | Spranger, Bartholomeus | 1546-1627 |
| | | | V | Vermeyen (Vermay, Vermayen) | 1500-1559 |
| | | | V ₂ | Vos, Marten de | 1532-1603 |
| | | | W | Witte, Peeter de (Candido) [Died in Munich] | 1548-1628 |
| | | | | See also Calvaert | Fl. II. 3. C |
| | | | | Valckenborch, Lucas | Fl. II. 3. V ₂ |
| | | | | Valckenborch, Marten | Fl. II. 3. V ₃ |

PAINTING

Table 10

XVIth Centuries

II.—THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

2

3

Genre

Landscape and Architecture

Peeter Brueghel the Elder (Peasant Brueghel) 1525-1570

M Cornelis Molenaer 1540-1591

C Denis Calvaert (called in Italy "Dionisio Fiammingo") 1540-1619

B Jan Brueghel the Elder (Velvet Brueghel) 1568-1625

Bles, Henry (Hendrik) de 1480-1550
Roymerswale 1497-1567

B₂ Blondeel, Lancelot [Architecture] 1495-1561

B₃ Bol, Hans 1534-1593

B₄ Bril, Mattheus 1550-1584

B₅ Bril, Pauwel (Paul) 1554-1626

C₂ Cleef, Hendrik van ?-1589

C₃ Coninxlo, Gillis van 1544-1604

G Gassel 1500-1550

M₂ Mostaert (Mostert), Frans 1534-1560

P Patinir (Patenier), Joachim de 1490-1524

S Steenwyck, Hendrik van, the Elder [Architecture] 1550-1604

V Valckenborch, Frederik van 1570-1623

V₂ Valckenborch, Lucas van 1530-1625

V₃ Valckenborch, Marten van 1553-?

See also Valkenborch, Frederik
Valckenborch, Marten

Fl. II. 3. V
Fl. II. 3. V₃

See also Mostaert, Gillis

Fl. II. 1. M₃

XVIIIth Centuries

| III.—THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY | | | IV.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 4 | | 5 | | | |
| OF THE DIRECT INFLUENCE OF RUBENS | | | | | |
| Landscape and Architecture | | Animal and Still Life | | | |
| A | Denis van Alsloot | fl. 1599-1630 | | | |
| N | Peeter Neeffs the Elder | 1578-1656 | S | Frans Snyders | 1579-1657 |
| A ₂ | Jacques d'Arthois | 1613-1684 | | | |
| H | Cornelis Huysmans | 1648-1727 | | | V |
| | | | | | Pierre Joseph Verhagen |
| | | | | | 1728-1811 |
| B | Brueghel, Jan, the Younger | 1601-1677 | C | Coninck, David de | 1636-1687 |
| H ₂ | Huysmans, Jan Baptist | 1654-1716 | F | Fyt, Jan | 1609-1661 |
| K | Kessel, Ferdinand van | 1648-1696 | K | Kessel, Jan van, the Elder | 1626-1679 |
| M | Millet, François (Frans Mille) | 1642-1679 | M | Monnoyer | 1634-1699 |
| M ₂ | Momper, Frans de | ?-1661 | S ₂ | Seghers (Segers, Zeghers), Daniel | 1590-1661 |
| M ₃ | Momper, Jodocus (Joost) de | 1564-1635 | U | Utrecht, Adriaen van | 1599-1652 |
| M ₄ | Meulen, Adam Frans van der | 1632-1690 | V | Vos, Paulus de | 1590-1678 |
| M ₅ | Meulener (Molenaer), Peeter | 1602-1654 | | | |
| N ₂ | Neeffs, Peeter, the Younger | 1620-1675 | | | O ₂ |
| R | Ryckaert, Marten | 1587-1631 | | | Orley, Jan van |
| S | Savery, Roelant | 1576-1639 | | | 1665-1735 |
| S ₂ | Siberechts, Jan | 1627-1703 | | | O ₃ |
| S ₃ | Steenwyck, Hendrik van, the Younger [Painter of archi- tecture] | 1580-1649 | | | Orley, Richard van |
| W | Witte, Gaspar de | 1624-1681 | | | 1663-1732 |
| | | | | | S |
| | | | | | Snyers, Peeter |
| | | | | | 1681-1752 |
| | See also Francken, Frans | Fl. III. 2. F ₂ | | | |
| | Snayers | Fl. III. 2. S | | | |
| | Teniers the Elder | Fl. III. 2. T | | | |
| | Teniers the Younger | Fl. III. 3. T | | | |

The XIXth Century

1

2

| CLASSICISTS | | | COLORISTS — ROMANTICISTS | | |
|-------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|-----------|
| N | Navez, François | 1787-1869 | B | Braekeleer, Ferdinandus de | 1792-1883 |
| | | | G | Gallait, Louis | 1810-1887 |
| | | | L | Leys, Hendrik | 1815-1869 |
| | | | M | Madou, Jean Baptiste | 1796-1877 |
| | | | W | Wiertz, Antoine [Holds a unique position] | 1806-1865 |
| ————— | | | ————— | | |
| B | Bree, Matthias van | 1773-1839 | B ₂ | Bièfve, Édouard de | 1809-1882 |
| | | | B ₃ | Block, Eugène de | 1812- |
| | | | C | Coene, Jean Henri de | 1798-1866 |
| | | | D | Decaisne, Henri | 1799-1852 |
| | | | D ₂ | Dillens, Adolf | 1821-1877 |
| | | | K | Keyser, Nicaise de | 1813-1887 |
| | | | P | Pauwels, Ferdinand | 1830- |
| | | | P ₂ | Portaels, Jean François | 1818- |
| | | | R | Regemorter, Ignatius van | 1785-1873 |
| | | | S | Slingeneyer, Ernest | 1823- |
| | | | S ₂ | Swerts, Jan | 1825-1879 |
| | | | W ₂ | Wappers, Gustave | 1803-1874 |
| | | | W ₃ | Willems, Florent | 1823- |

Belgian Painting

3

THE MODERN PAINTERS

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| A | Artan, Louis | 1837-1890 | M | Meunier, Constantin | 1831- |
| B | Baron, Théodore [Landscape] | 1840-1899 | S | Stevens, Alfred | 1828- |
| B ₂ | Boulenger, Hippolyte | 1838-1874 | V | Verwee, Alfred [Cattle] | 1838-1895 |
| B ₃ | Braekeleer, Henri de | 1830-1888 | | | |
| C | Clays, Paul Jean [Marine] | 1819-1900 | | | |
| D | Dubois, Louis | 1830-1880 | | | |
| D ₂ | Dyckmans ("The Belgian Gerard Dou") | 1811- | | | |
| F | Frédéric, Léon | 1856- | | | |
| G | Groux, Charles de | 1825-1870 | | | |
| H | Heymans, Adrien-Joseph | 1839- | | | |
| ----- | | | | | |
| B ₄ | Baertsoen, Albert | 1865- | M ₂ | Mertens, Charles | - |
| B ₅ | Baugniet, Charles | 1814- | M ₃ | Motte, Émile | - |
| C ₂ | Claus, Émile | 1781-1840 | N | Nys, Carl | 1858- |
| C ₃ | Courtens, Frans | 1853- | R | Rops, Félicien | 1845-1898 |
| E | Evenepoel, Henri | - | R ₂ | Rosseels, Jacques | 1828- |
| F ₂ | Fourmois, Théodore | 1814-1871 | S ₂ | Schampheler, Edmond de | 1824-1899 |
| G ₂ | Gilsoul, Victor | - | S ₃ | Smits, Eugène | - |
| G ₃ | Guffens, Godfroid | 1823- | S ₄ | Speekhaert, Leopold | - |
| II ₂ | Hermans, Charles | 1839- | S ₅ | Stevens, Gustave Max | - |
| J | Jonghe, Gustave de | 1828-1893 | S ₆ | Stevens, Joseph [Dogs] | 1822-1892 |
| J ₂ | Jonghe, Jean Baptiste de | 1785-1844 | S ₇ | Stobbaert, Jan | 1838- |
| K | Khnopff, Fernand | 1858- | S ₈ | Struys, Alexandre | 1852- |
| K ₂ | Kindermans, Jean Baptiste | 1805-1876 | V ₂ | Van Hove | - |
| L | Laermans, Eugène | - | V ₃ | Verboeckhoven, Eugène | 1799-1881 |
| L ₂ | Leemans, Égide François [Marine] | 1839-1876 | V ₄ | Verhas, Frans | 1827- |
| L ₃ | Leempoels, Jeff | 1867- | V ₅ | Verhas, Jan | 1834- |
| L ₄ | Leemputten, Frans van | 1850- | V ₆ | Verlat, Charles | 1824-1890 |
| L ₆ | Luyten, Henri | 1859- | V ₇ | Verstraate, Théodore | 1852- |
| | | | W | Wauters, Émile | 1846- |
| | | | W ₂ | Willaert, Fernand | - |

The XVth and

I.—THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

| | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| B | Bosch (Hieronymus van Aeken) [History and Genre] | 1460-1516 |
| E | Cornelis Engelbrechtsen [Figure] | 1468-1533 |
| L | Lucas van Leyden [History and Genre] | 1494-1533 |

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| G | Geertgen van Sint-Jans [History] | fl. 1475 |
| J | Joest of Calcar, Jan [History] | 1460-1519 |
| M | Mostaert, Jan [History] | 1474-1556 |
| O | Ouwater, Albert van [History and Landscape] | fl. xvth century |

XVIth Centuries

II.— THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

| | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|
| C | Jacob Cornelisz (Oostsaanen van Amsterdam) [History, Portrait, and Landscape] | 1475-1560 |
| S | Jan Scorel (Schoreel) [History and Genre] | 1495-1562 |
| A | Pieter Aertsz (Lange-Pier) [History and Portrait] | 1507-1573 |
| C ₂ | Cornelis Corneliszen van Harlem [History, Portrait, and Landscape] | 1562-1638 |
| ————— | | |
| B | Barentz, Dirk [History and Portrait] | 534-1592 |
| B ₂ | Beukelaer, Joachim [Figure] | ?-1575 |
| D | Delft, Jacob Willemszen [Portrait] | 1550-1601 |
| G | Goltzius, Hendrik [History, Portrait, and Landscape] | 1558-1616 |
| H | Heemskerk, Marten (van Veen) [History] | 1498-1574 |
| J | Jacobsz, Dirk | ?-1567 |
| K | Ketel, Cornelis [Portrait] | 1548-1616 |
| U | Utrecht, Jacob van [Portrait] | fl. 1523 |

XVIIth Century

1a

1b

1c

1a

SCHOOL OF AMSTERDAM

| History and Portrait | | Genre | Landscape, Animals, and Architecture | Marine |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | P Paulus Potter 1625-1654 | |
| F | Govaert Flinck 1615-1660 | M Gabriel Metsu 1630-1667 | | |
| R | Rembrandt van Ryn (born in Leyden) 1607-1669 | | N Aart van der Neer 1603-1677 | C Jan van der Cappelle ?-1680 |
| H | Bartholomeus van der Helst 1613-1670 | II Pieter de Hooghe (Hooch) 1632-1681 | | V Willem van de Velde, the Younger 1633-1707 |
| B | Ferdinand Bol 1611-1680 | M ₂ Nicolaas Maes 1632-1693 | II Meyndert Hobbema 1638-1709 | B Ludolf Backhuisen, 1631-1708 |
| | | | H ₂ Jan van der Heyden [Famous as painter of architecture] 1637-1712 | |
| B ₂ | Backer, Adriaen 1636-1686 | B Bourse, Esaias 1630-? | A Asselyn 1610-1660 | B ₂ Beerstraaten, Jan 1622-1687 |
| B ₃ | Backer, Jacob 1608-1651 | B ₂ Bronchorst (Bronckhorst), Jan van 1603-1678 | B Beerstraaten, A. fl. after 1650 | D Dubbels 1620-1676 |
| E | Eeckhout, Gerbrand van 1621-1674 | C Codde, Pieter 1610-1660 | B ₂ Breenbergh (Breenborch) 1599-1663 | V ₂ Velde, Willem van de, the Elder 1610-1693 |
| E ₂ | Eliasz 1590-1646 | D Duyster 1599-1635 | D Dujardin, Karel 1625-1678 | V ₃ Vlieger, Simon de 1600-1660 |
| G | Gelder 1645-1727 | L Lundens fl. 1652-1673 | H ₃ Hackaert (Hakkert) 1636-1699 | Z Zeeman, Reimer (Remigius Nooms) 1612-1663 |
| K | Keyser, Thomas de 1596-1679 | P Potter, Pieter [Also well known for his pictures of animals] 1587-1650 | II ₄ Hondecoeter, Gillis d' ?-1637 | |
| K ₂ | Kneller 1646-1723 | | K Kessel 1641-1690 | |
| K ₃ | Koninck, Salomon 1609-1663 | | K ₂ Koninck, Jacob de 1616-1708 | |
| L | Lairesse 1640-1711 | | K ₃ Koninck, Philip de 1619-1688 | |
| L ₂ | Lastman 1583-1649 | | L Lingelbach 1622-1674 | |
| L ₃ | Loo, Jacob van 1614-1670 | | M Moucheron, F. de 1633-1686 | |
| L ₄ | Loo, Louis van 1641-1713 | | M ₂ Moucheron, I. de 1670-1744 | |
| L ₅ | Lyon, Jacob 1586-1651 | | P ₂ Pynacker 1621-1673 | |
| M | Moyaert (Moeijaert) 1600-1659 | | S Seghers, Hercules 1589-1650 | |
| N | Neer, Eglon Hendrik van der (died in Düsseldorf) 1643-1703 | | V Velde, Adriaan van de 1635-1672 | |
| O | Olis 1610-1655 | | W Witte, Emanuel de [Well known as painter of architecture] 1607-1692 | |
| V | Valckert fl. 1622-1627 | | | |
| V ₂ | Verkolje, Jan 1650-1693 | | | |
| V ₃ | Victors, Jan 1620-1672 | | | |
| V ₄ | Voort, Cornelis van der 1576-1624 | | | |
| W | Wet, Jan de (Johann Düwett) 1617-? | | | |

PAINTING

Table 14

Part I

1e

2

3

4

| | SCHOOL OF DELFT | SCHOOL OF DORDRECHT | SCHOOL OF THE HAGUE |
|---|---|--|---|
| Still Life, Flowers, Fruit, Game, etc. | | | |
| | F Karel Fabritius [Portrait] 1624-1654 | | |
| V Jan Baptista Weenix 1621-1664 | D Jacobus Delft (Delft) [Portrait] 1619-1661 | | |
| | V Jan Vermeer (van der Meer) [Portrait, Genre, Landscape] 1632-1675 | | N Caspar Netscher [Genre and Portrait] 1639-1684 |
| I Melchior d' Hondcoeter, [Noted for his birds] 1636-1695 | | C Aelbert Cuyp [Landscape, Animals, and Marines] 1620-1691 | |
| 2 Jan Weenix 1640-1719 | | | |
| | | | |
| I ₂ Hondcoeter, Gysbert d' 1604-1653 | A Aelst, Evert van [Dead birds and Weapons] 1602-1658 | C ₂ Cuyp, Benjamin Gerritsz [Landscape and Biblical Subjects] 1612-1652 | B Beijeren [Still Life] 1620-1674 |
| I ₃ Huysum, Justus van 1659-1716 | A ₂ Aelst, Willem van [Dead birds and Weapons] 1629-1679 | C ₃ Cuyp, Jacob Gerritsz [Portrait and Animals] 1575-1649 | D Does 1623-1673 |
| Kalf, Willem 1630-1693 | B Bramer [History and Allegory] 1596-1667 | H Hoogstraaten, Samuel van [Portraits; later Landscapes and Marines] 1627-1678 | H Hagen, Joris van (Verhagen) [Landscape] ?-1669 |
| | D ₂ Delft, Willem Jacobsz [Portrait] 1580-1638 | S Schalcken [Genre] 1643-1706 | H ₂ Hannemann 1601-1669 |
| | D ₃ Duck [Genre and Portrait] fl. 1630-1650 | | H ₃ Hoecgeest fl. 1610-1615 |
| | L Loo, Jan van [Genre] 1585-1661 | | M Mytens, Daniel, the Elder [Portrait] 1590-1658 |
| | M Mander, Karel van, the Younger 1579-1665 | | M ₂ Mytens, Johannes [Portrait] ?-1671 |
| | M ₂ Mander, Karel van, III 1610-1672 | | P Porcellis, Jan [Marine] [Also active in Harlem] 1597-1632 |
| | M ₃ Mierevelt, Michiel Janszen van [Portrait] 1567-1641 | | Q Quast, Pieter [Genre] 1602-1646 |
| | M ₄ Mierevelt, Pieter van [Portrait] 1595-1623 | | R Ravestyn, Anthony van [Portrait] } century |
| | P Palamedez (Stevaerts) [Battle scenes] 1607-1638 | | R ₂ Ravestyn, Arent van [Portrait] 1645-1687 |
| | P ₂ Poel [Genre and Landscapes] 1621-1664 | | R ₃ Ravestyn, Jan van [Portrait] 1575-1657 |
| | V ₂ Vliet [Genre, Portrait, and Architecture] 1611-1675 | | U Uitenbroeck [Landscape and Figure] 1590-1648 |
| | | | V Venne [Landscape, Genre, Portrait] 1589-1662 |
| | | | V ₂ Verelst [Genre and Portrait] fl. 1643-1668 |
| | | | V ₃ Vries, Abraham de, (born in Rotterdam) [Portrait] ?-1662 |
| | | | V ₄ Vries, Adriaan de [Portrait] 1601-1643 |

XVIIIth Century

5 a

5 b

5 c

5 d

SCHOOL OF HARLEM

| History and Portrait | | Genre | Landscape, Animals, Architecture, Marine | Still Life, Flowers, Fruit, Game, etc. |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | L Pieter van Laer 1590-1658 | G Jan van Goyen 1596-1656 | |
| H | Frans Hals, the Elder 1584-1666 | M Jan Miense Molenaer ?-1668 | W Philips Wouverman 1619-1668 | |
| | | T Gerard Terburg (Ter Boch) 1614-1681 | R Salomon van Ruysdael (Ruisdael) 1600-1670 | |
| | | O Adriaan van Ostade 1610-1685 | W ₂ Jan Wynants 1615-1679 | |
| | | See also Frans Hals, the Elder D. III. 5a | R ₂ Jacob van Ruysdael 1625-1682 | |
| B | Bray, Jan de ?-1697 | B Bega 1620-1664 | B Berchem (Berghem) 1620-1683 | C Claasz, Pieter (Claesz van Harlem) 1595-1660 |
| E ₂ | Bray, Salomon de 1597-1664 | D Dusart 1660-1704 | B ₂ Berck-Heyde, Gerrit 1638-1698 | H Heda, Willem Claasz 1594-1678 |
| E | Everdingen, Cesar van (of Alkmar) 1606-1679 | H Hals, Dirk [Also Portrait] 1600-1656 | B ₃ Berck-Heyde, Job, 1630-1693 | M Meer, Barend van der 1659-? |
| G | Grebber, Frans Pietersz de 1579-1649 | H ₂ Hals, Frans, the Younger 1617-1669 | D Decker 1600-1678 | |
| G ₂ | Grebber, Pieter de 1600-1665 | H ₃ Heemskerk, Egbert van, the Elder 1610-1680 | D ₂ Deelen (of Arnemuyden) 1607-1673 | |
| P | Poorter, Willem de fl. 1635-1645 | H ₄ Heemskerk, Egbert van, the Younger 1645-1704 | D ₃ Dubois, Guillam ?-1680 | |
| P ₂ | Pynas, Jan 1580-1621 | H ₅ Hughtenburgh (Huchtenburg), Jan van, [Best known for his battle scenes] 1646-1733 | E Everdingen, Allart van 1621-1675 | |
| S | Soutman 1580-1657 | O ₂ Ostade, Isaac van 1621-1649 | H Hughtenburgh (Huchtenburg), Jacobus van 1639-1670 | |
| V | Verspronck (Versprong), Jan 1597-1662 | P Palamedesz (Stevaerts), Antonis 1601-1674 | L Lys (Pan) 1600-1657 | |
| W | Wet, Jacob de fl. 1636-1671 | W Wyck, Thomas 1616-1677 | M Meer, Jan van der, the Elder 1628-1691 | |
| | | | M ₂ Meer, Jan van der, the Younger 1656-1705 | |
| | | | M ₃ Molenaer, Nicolaas (Klaas) ?-1676 | |
| | | | M ₄ Molyn, Pieter de, the Elder 1600-1661 | |
| | | | M ₅ Molyn, Pieter de, the Younger (Pieter de Mulieribus or Il Cavaliere Tempesta) 1637-1701 | |
| | | | P Post [Brazilian Landscapes] 1612-1680 | |
| | | | R ₃ Romeyn 1624-1693 | |
| | | | R ₄ Rombouts, J. fl. 1660 | |
| | | | R ₅ Rombouts, Salomon fl. 1650 | |
| | | | S Saenredam [Architecture] 1597-1665 | |
| | | | V Velde, Esaias van de [Entered the Guild at Harlem in 1612; in Amsterdam, 1618] 1590-1630 | |
| | | | V ₂ Velde, Jan van de 1598-? | |
| | | | V ₃ Vries, R. de, fl. xviiith century | |
| | | | V ₄ Vroom, Cornelis 1620-1661 | |
| | | | V ₅ Vroom, Hendrik Cornelisz 1566-1640 | |
| | | | W ₃ Wouverman, Jan 1629-1666 | |

5 c (continued)

PAINTING

Table 15

Part II

6

7

8 a

8 b

| SCHOOL OF LEYDEN | | SCHOOL OF ROTTERDAM | | SCHOOL OF UTRECHT | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | Figure | Landscape and Still Life |
| D | Gerard Dou (Dov, Dow, Douw) [Genre] 1613-1675 | | | B Abraham Bloemaert 1564-1651 | |
| S | Jan Steen [Genre] 1626-1679 | | | H Gerard van Honthorst 1590-1656 | |
| M | Frans van Mieris, the Elder [Genre] 1635-1681 | W | Adriaen van der Werff [History, Genre, Portrait] 1659-1722 | | H Jan Davidsz de Heem (died in Antwerp) [Best known for his fruit pieces] 1606-1683 |
| B | Brekelenkam (Breklinkam) [Genre] ?-1668 | B | Bloot [Genre] ?-1652 | B ₂ | Both, Andries fl. 1640 |
| F | Fabritius, Bernart [History and Portrait] 1620-1669 | O | Ochtervelt (Uchtervelt) [Genre] ?-1710 | B ₃ | Both, Jan 1610-1652 |
| L | Lievens, Jan [History and Portrait] 1607-1674 | O ₂ | Ossenbeeck [Landscape] 1627-1678 | B ₃ | G Glauber (died in Breslau) 1656-1703 |
| M ₂ | Mieris, Jan van [Genre and Portrait] 1660-1690 | S | Saftleven, Cornelis, [Genre, Landscape, and Animal] 1612-1682 | B ₄ | H ₂ Heem, Cornelis de (died in Antwerp) 1631-1695 |
| M ₃ | Moor, Karel de [History, Genre, and Portrait] 1656-1738 | S ₂ | Sorgh (Zorg) [Genre] 1611-1670 | B ₅ | H ₃ Heem, David de, the Elder 1570-1632 |
| S ₂ | Schooten, Joris van (Verschooten) [History] 1587-1650 | V | Vershuier [Marine] 1630-1686 | D | H ₄ Heusch, Jacob de 1657-1701 |
| S ₃ | Slingeland [Genre] 1640-1691 | | | K | H ₅ Heusch, Willem de 1638-1669 |
| S ₄ | Swanenburgh (First teacher of Rembrandt) [History] 1580-1639 | | | M | S Saftleven, Herman, 1609-1685 |
| T | Toorenvliet, [History, Genre, and Portrait] 1641-1719 | | | P | S ₂ Swanevelt 1610-1655 |
| | | | | T | V Verschuringh [Best known for his battle scenes] 1627-1690 |
| | | | | U | |
| | | | | | See also Mignon, G. III. M ₃ |

The XVIIIth and

| IV.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY | | | V.—THE NINETEENTH CENTURY | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|
| | | | 1 | | | 2 | | |
| | | | TRANSITION PAINTERS | | | FIGURE PAINTERS | | |
| H | Huysum, Jan van | 1682-1749 | B | Bosboom, Jan | 1817-1891 | A | Artz [Also Landscape] | 1837-1890 |
| | | | K | Kate, ten | 1822-1891 | B | Bisschop, Christoffel | 1828- |
| R | Ruysch, Rachel | 1664-1750 | R | Rochussen [Battle pictures] | 1814-1894 | B ₂ | Blommers, Bernardus J. | 1845- |
| | | | P | Pieneman, Nicolaas | 1810-1860 | I | Israels, Joseph | 1824- |
| ----- | | | | | | | | |
| D | Dyck, Philip van | 1683-1753 | B ₂ | Bles, David | 1821-1899 | H | Henkes | 1844- |
| M | Mieris, Frans the Younger | 1689-1763 | E | Eeckhout, Jacob Joseph | 1793-1861 | H ₂ | Howe | 1814-1867 |
| M ₂ | Mieris, Willem van | 1662-1747 | K ₂ | Koekkoek | 1803-1862 | K | Kaemmerer | 1850- |
| N | Netscher, Constantin | 1668-1722 | K ₃ | Korff | 1824-1882 | N | Neuhuys | 1844- |
| O | Os, Jan van | 1744-1808 | O | Offermans | 1796- | S | Sadé | 1837- |
| S | Spaendonck, Cornelis van | 1756-1840 | P ₂ | Pieneman, Jan Willem | 1779-1853 | S ₂ | Schwartz, Thérèse | 1851- |
| S ₂ | Spaendonck, Gerardus van | 1746-1822 | S | Sande-Bakhuysen, van | 1795-1860 | T | Trigt, van | 1829- |
| S ₃ | Stry | 1756-1815 | S ₂ | Schendel, van | 1806-1870 | W | Waay, van der | 1855- |
| T | Troost | 1697-1750 | | | | | | |
| V | Verkolje, Nicolaas | 1673-1746 | | | | | | |
| W | Wit, Jacob de | 1695-1754 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | See also Alma-Tadema | Br. II. 1. |

XIXth Centuries

V.—THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

| 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--|-----------|
| LANDSCAPE AND ANIMAL | | MARINE | | INDIVIDUALISTS | | | | |
| J | Jongkind, Johan Barthold | 1819-1891 | M | Mesdag, Hendrik Willem | 1831- | B | Breitner, G. H. | 1857- |
| M | Maris, Jacob | 1837-1899 | | | | S | Schwartz, Johan Georg | 1814-1874 |
| M ₂ | Maris, Willem | 1815- | | | | T | Toorop, Jan | 1860- |
| M ₃ | Mauve, Anton | 1838-1888 | | | | V | Veth, Jan | 1864- |
| S | Schelfhout, Andreas | 1787-1870 | | | | | | |
| W | Weissenbrugh | 1822-1880 | | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | |
| A | Apol | 1850- | H | Haas, W. F. de | 1830-1880 | A | Allebé | 1838- |
| B | Bakhuysen, Hendrik | 1795-1860 | S | Schotel, Jan Christiaan | 1787-1838 | B ₂ | Bauer | 1767-1820 |
| B ₂ | Bilders | 1811-1890 | S ₂ | Schotel, Pieter Jan | 1808-1865 | B ₃ | Bock, Théophile de | - |
| B ₃ | Bilders-van Bosse, Mrs. | 1837-1900 | | | | E | Essen, van | 1854- |
| C | Chattel, du | 1856- | | | | H | Haverman | 1857- |
| G | Gabriel, Paul Joseph C. | 1828- | | | | I | Israels, Isaac | 1865- |
| H | Haas, J. H. L. de | 1832-1880 | | | | J | Josselin de Jong (or Yong). Pieter de | 1861- |
| K | Klinkenberg | 1852- | | See also De Haas, M. F. H. | A. H. 2. D | K | Karpen | - |
| M ₄ | Meulen, F. P. ter [Also Figure] | 1834- | | | | M | Maris, Matthys | 1835- |
| N | Nakken | 1835- | | | | M ₂ | Maris, Willem | 1815- |
| O | Os, Georgius Jacobus Johannes | 1782-1861 | | | | M ₃ | Martens | 1838-1895 |
| R | Roelofs | 1822-1897 | | | | M ₄ | Mesdag-van Houten, Mrs. S. | - |
| R ₂ | Ronner, Mme. Henriette | 1821- | | | | P | Poggenbeek | 1853- |
| S ₂ | Stortenbeker | 1828- | | | | P ₂ | Prikker, Thorn | - |
| V | Valkenburg | 1826-1896 | | | | T ₂ | Tholen, W. B. | 1850- |
| V ₂ | Vrolijk | 1845-1894 | | | | V ₂ | Voerman, J. | - |
| | | | | | | W | Wijsmuller, J. H. | - |

| I.—THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES | | | II.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| CASTILIAN SCHOOL | ANDALUSIAN SCHOOL | VALENCIAN SCHOOL | |
| R Antonio del Rincon [The only important artist of the xvth century] 1446-1500 | V Luis de Vargas 1502-1568 | J Juan de Juanes (Vicente) 1523-1579 | |
| S Alonso Sánchez Coello 1515-1590 | | R Francisco de Ribalta 1550-1628 | R Pedro de Rodríguez de Miranda 1696-1766 |
| P Juan Pantoja della Cruz 1551-1609 | H Francisco de Herrera the Elder 1576-1656 | See also Lo Spagnoletto (Ribera) [It. IV. 3. S] 1588-1656 | S Mariano Ramon Sánchez 1740-1822 |
| V Diego de Silva y Velásquez 1599-1660 | Z Francisco de Zurbaran 1598-1662 | | G Francisco Goya y Lucientes 1746-1828 |
| M Juan Bautista Martínez Mazo 1610-1667 | M Bartolomé Esteban Murillo 1618-1682 | | |
| C Claudio Coello 1635-1693 | | | |
| A Alfaro y Gámez 1640-1680 | A Alesio 1547-1600 | R ₂ Ribalta, Juan de 1597-1628 | P Paret de Alcázar 1747-1799 |
| A ₂ Antolínez 1639-1676 | C Campaña 1503-1580 | S Santa Leocadia, Pablo de - | |
| B Becerra 1520-1570 | C ₂ Cano 1601-1667 | Y Yáñez, Hemando fl. xvth century | |
| B ₂ Berruguete, Alonso 1480-1561 | C ₃ Castillo, Agustín del 1565-1626 | | |
| B ₃ Berruguete, Pedro ?-1504 | C ₄ Castillo, Juan de 1584-1640 | | |
| C ₂ Carreño de Mirando 1614-1685 | C ₅ Castillo y Saavedra, Antonio 1603-1667 | | |
| C ₃ Castello, Fabricio ?-1617 | C ₆ Céspedes 1538-1608 | | |
| C ₄ Castello, Félix 1602-1656 | F Fernández Vasco (the Great) [of Portugal] 1552-? | | |
| C ₅ Castello, Nicolás Granelo ?-1593 | G Gómez 1646-1690 | | |
| C ₆ Caxés 1577-1642 | H ₂ Herrera, Francisco de, the Younger 1622-1685 | | |
| C ₇ Cerezo 1635-1675 | I Iriarte 1620-1685 | | |
| C ₈ Collantes 1599-1656 | L Llanos, Sebastian de 1602-1668 | | |
| C ₉ Correa, Diego fl. xvth century | L ₂ Llorente 1685-1757 | | |
| G Gallegos 1475-1550 | M ₂ Moya 1610-1666 | | |
| G ₂ González 1564-1627 | P Pacheco 1571-1654 | | |
| L Leonardo 1616-1656 | R Roelas 1558-1625 | | |
| M ₂ Martínez, Jusepe 1612-1682 | S Sánchez Cotán, Fray Juan 1561-1627 | | |
| M ₃ Morales [of Badajoz] 1510-1586 | S ₂ Sánchez de Castro, Juan ?-1516 | | |
| M ₄ Muñoz 1654-1690 | V ₂ Villavicencio 1635-1700 | | |
| N Navarrete (El Mudo) 1526-1579 | | | |
| O Orrente 1570-1644 | | | |
| P ₂ Palomino de Castro 1653-1725 | | | |
| P ₃ Pareja 1606-1670 | | | |
| P ₄ Pereda 1599-1669 | | | |
| R ₂ Rizi, Francisco 1608-1685 | | | |
| R ₃ Rizi, Fray Juan 1595-1675 | | | |
| T Theotocópuli 1548-1625 | | | |
| T ₂ Toledo 1611-1665 | | | |
| T ₃ Tristán 1586-1640 | | | |
| See also Carducci It. IV. 1.C Zuccherro It. IV. 1.Z ₂ | Here may be added Sequeira [An artist of Portugal] 1768-1837 | | |

PAINTING

Table 17

III.—THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
|----------------|--|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| HISTORY | | GENRE | | PORTRAITURE | | LANDSCAPE | |
| A | Álvarez, Luis 1841-1901 | F | Fortuny, Mariano 1838-1874 | M | Madrazo, Frederico de 1815-1894 | R | Rico, Martín 1850- |
| M | Madrazo, José de 1781-1859 | J | Jiménez, Luis 1845- | | | | |
| P | Pradilla, Francisco 1847- | V | Villegas, José 1848- | | | | |
| A ₂ | Américo, Francisco - | B | Bastida, Joaquín Sorolta y 1863- | E | Eguiquipa - | H | Haes, Carlos de - |
| B | Benliure y Gil, José 1855- | D | Domingo, Francisco 1842- | P | Pescador 1836-1872 | M | Masriera, J. - |
| C | Carbonero, Mor- eno 1860- | F ₂ | Fernández y Bal- denes - | | | M ₂ | Morero y Galicia - |
| C ₂ | Casado 1832-1886 | G | González, Juan Antonio - | | | U | Urgel, Modesto - |
| C ₃ | Casanova y Estorach, Antonio 1847-1896 | J ₂ | Jiménez y Aranda, José 1832- | | | V | Valdivia, de - |
| C ₄ | Checa 1860- | L | Leczano, Ángel - | | | | |
| C ₅ | Cubello, Martínez - | M | Madrazo, Don Rai- mundo de 1841- | | | | |
| M ₂ | Meneses 1820- | M ₂ | Mas y Fondevilla - | | | | |
| R | Ramírez, Manuel - | S | Sala y Francés, Emilio 1850- | | | | |
| R ₂ | Rosales, Eduardo 1837-1873 | V | Viniegra y Laso 1862- | | | | |
| T | Tejedor, Alcázar 1852- | Z | Zamacois 1842-1871 | | | | |
| V | Vera 1834- | Z ₂ | Zuloaga, Ignacio - | | | | |
| V ₂ | Villodas, Ricardo 1846- | | | | | | |

Early Period. The XVIIth

| I.—EARLY PERIOD. THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES | | II.—THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | HISTORY AND FIGURE | GENRE | LANDSCAPE |
| | | F Martin Fréminet 1567-1619 | | |
| C | Jehan Clouet 1485-1541 | V Simon Vouet 1590-1649 | | |
| | | L Eustache Le Sueur 1616-1655 | | P Nicolas Poussin [Also figure painter] 1593-1665 |
| C ₂ | François Clouet 1500-1572 | C Jacques Courtois (Le Bourguignon or Il Borgognone) [Painter of battle scenes] 1621-1676 | | L Claude Lorrain (Gellée) 1600-1682 |
| C ₃ | Jean Cousin 1500-1589 | L ₂ Charles Le Brun 1619-1690 | | |
| | | M Pierre Mignard (Le Romain) 1610-1695 | | |
| | | V ₂ Joseph Vivien 1657-1735 | | |
| | | R Hyacinthe Rigaud 1659-1743 | | |
| B | Bourdichon 1457-1521 | B Boullongne, Bon 1649-1717 | C Callot 1592-1635 | P ₂ Patel, Pierre, the father fl. 1625 |
| D | Dubreuil 1561-1602 | B ₂ Boullongne, Louis, the Elder 1609-1674 | G Gillot 1673-1722 | P ₃ Patel, Pierre, the son 1605-1676 |
| F | Fouquet, Jean 1415-1485 | B ₃ Boullongne, Louis, the Younger 1654-1733 | J Jeaurat 1699-1789 | P ₄ Poussin, Gaspard (Dughet) 1613-1675 |
| P | Perréal, Jean (Jehan de Paris) 1455-1528 | L ₂ Le Nain, Antoine 1588-1648 | L Le Nain, Louis 1593-1648 | |
| R | René of Anjou 1408-1480 | L ₃ Le Nain, Matthieu 1607-1677 | | |
| | | C ₂ Champagne [of Flemish origin] 1602-1674 | | |
| | | C ₃ Coypel, Antoine 1661-1722 | | |
| | | C ₄ Coypel, Noel 1628-1707 | | |
| | | H Hire, de la 1606-1656 | | |
| | | J Jouvenet 1644-1717 | | |
| | | L ₃ La Fosse 1636-1716 | | |
| | | L ₄ Largillière 1656-1746 | | |
| | | L ₅ Lefèvre, Claude 1632-1675 | | |
| | | M ₂ Mignard, Nicolas 1606-1668 | | |
| | | S Santerre 1658-1717 | | |
| | | S ₂ Stella 1595-1657 | | |
| | | T Troy, François de 1645-1730 | | |
| | | V ₃ Valentin, Le, called Jean de Boullongne 1591-1634 | | |
| | | V ₄ Verdier 1651-1730 | | |
| | | See also Louis van Loo D. III. 1 _A L ₄ Romanelli It. IV. 2.R | | |

and XVIIIth Centuries

III.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| HISTORY AND FIGURE | GENRE AND DECORATION | LANDSCAPE, MARINE, ANIMALS, etc. | PASTEL |
| | W Antoine Watteau 1684-1721 | | |
| | P Jean Baptiste Pater [Pupil of Watteau] 1695-1736 | | |
| P Antoine Pesne 1683-1757 | L François Le-moyne 1688-1737 | | |
| | L ₂ Nicholas Lancret [Pupil of Watteau] 1690-1743 | O Jean Baptiste Oudry 1686-1755 | |
| | B François Boucher [Prolific painter not only of Genre] 1703-1770 | | |
| | C Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin [Also famous for Still Life] 1699-1779 | V Claude Joseph Vernet 1712-1789 | L Jean Étienne Liotard 1702-1789 |
| | G Jean Baptisté Greuze 1725-1805 | | |
| C Callet 1741-1823 | B ₂ Baudoin [Pupil of Watteau] 1723-1769 | B Bachelier [Flowers] 1724-1806 | L ₂ La Tour, de 1704-1788 |
| C ₂ Casanova, François 1727-1805 | F Fragonard 1732-1806 | D Desportes [Animal and Still Life] 1661-1743 | |
| C ₃ Coypel, Charles Antoine 1694-1752 | H Hutin 1715-1776 | L Lantara 1729-1778 | |
| D Doyen 1726-1806 | L ₃ Le Prince [Pupil of Watteau] 1733-1781 | M Manglard 1695-1760 | |
| D ₂ Drouais, F. H. 1727-1775 | N Natoire 1700-1777 | M ₂ Marne [Animal and Still Life] 1754-1829 | |
| L Lefèvre, Robert 1756-1830 | R Raoux 1677-1734 | R Robert, Hubert 1733-1808 | |
| L ₂ Loo, Charles Amédée Philippe van 1719-1790 | T Troy, Jean François de 1679-1752 | | |
| L ₃ Loo, Charles André van (Carle van Loo) 1705-1765 | | | |
| L ₄ Loo, Jean Baptiste van 1684-1745 | | | |
| N Nattier 1685-1766 | | | |
| R Ranc, Jean 1674-1735 | | | |
| R ₂ Restout 1692-1768 | | | |
| R ₃ Rivaltz [Follower of Poussin] 1667-1735 | | | |
| S Silvestre, Louis 1675-1760 | | | |
| S ₂ Subleyras [Follower of Poussin] 1699-1749 | | | |

The XIXth Century

1

2

3

| CLASSICISTS | | | SEMICLASSICISTS | | | ROMANTICISTS | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|-----------|----------------|---|------------------|
| D | David | 1748-1825 | B | Baudry | 1828-1886 | B | Boulanger, Louis | 1806-1867 |
| G | Gros | 1771-1835 | B ₂ | Bouguereau | 1825-1905 | D | Decamps [First to visit the Orient] | 1803-1860 |
| G ₂ | Guérin | 1774-1833 | C | Cabanel | 1823-1889 | D ₂ | <u>Delacroix</u> [Leader of the Movement] | <u>1799-1863</u> |
| I | Ingres | 1780-1867 | G | Gérôme | 1824-1904 | D ₃ | Delaroche | 1797-1856 |
| | | | | | | F | Fromentin | 1820-1876 |
| | | | | | | S | Scheffer | 1797-1858 |
| | | | | | | | See also Pasini | It. V. 2. P. |
| A | Abel de Pujol | 1785-1861 | H | Hébert | 1817- | B ₂ | Barrias | 1822-1905 |
| A ₂ | Aligny [Landscape] | 1798-1871 | H ₂ | Henner | 1829-1905 | B ₃ | Bertin, Édouard | 1797-1871 |
| A ₃ | Aubert | 1781-1857 | L | Lefebvre | 1834- | C | Champfartin | 1797-1883 |
| B | Bertin, Victor [Landscape] | 1775-1842 | | | | C ₂ | Cogniet | 1794-1880 |
| B ₂ | Bidault | 1745-1813 | | | | D ₄ | Devéria | 1805-1865 |
| B ₃ | Bouchot | 1800-1842 | | | | D ₅ | Doré, Gustave | 1833-1883 |
| D ₂ | Drouais, G. J. [Pupil of David] | 1763-1788 | | | | F ₂ | Frère, Édouard | 1819- |
| G ₃ | Gérard | 1770-1837 | | | | F ₃ | Frère, Théodore | 1815-1888 |
| G ₄ | Girodet | 1766-1824 | | | | G | Gendron | 1817-1881 |
| G ₅ | Granet | 1775-1849 | | | | G ₂ | Géricault | 1791-1824 |
| L | Lami | 1800- | | | | G ₃ | Gigoux | 1806- |
| L ₂ | Leroux | 1829-1900 | | | | G ₄ | Guillaumet | 1840- |
| L ₃ | Lethière | 1760-1832 | | | | H | Herbsthoffer | 1821-1876 |
| L ₄ | Lévy, Émile | 1826- | | | | H ₂ | Huet | 1745-1811 |
| M | Manvoisin | 1794-1870 | | | | H ₃ | Hugo, Victor | 1802-1885 |
| M ₂ | Mayer, Constance | 1778-1821 | | | | I | Isabey | 1804-1886 |
| M ₃ | Michallon [Landscape] | 1796-1822 | | | | J | Jalabert | 1819- |
| P | Picot | 1786-1868 | | | | L | Lévy, Léopold | 1840- |
| R | Regnault, Jean B. | 1754-1829 | | | | M | Marilhat | 1811-1847 |
| R ₂ | Rouget | 1784-1869 | | | | P | Philippoteaux | 1815-1884 |
| V | Valenciennes | 1750-1819 | | | | R | Robert-Fleury | 1797-1890 |
| V ₂ | Vien | 1716-1809 | | | | R ₂ | Roqueplan | 1800-1855 |
| V ₃ | Vincent | 1746-1816 | | | | S ₂ | Sigalon | 1788-1837 |
| W | Watelet [Landscape] | 1780-1866 | | | | Z | Ziem | 1821- |
| | | | | | | | See also Bonington | B. II. 3. B |

Part I

4

5

6

INFLUENCED BY DRAWING OF CLASSICISTS AND COLOR OF ROMANTICISTS

PAINTERS OF HISTORICAL MANNERS, HUMOROUS ANECDOTES, AND PICTURES WITH A SOCIAL PURPOSE

MILITARY PICTURE AND GENRE

C Couture 1815-1879
M Michel, Georges [Landscape] 1763-1843

C Charlet 1792-1845
M Meissonier 1815-1891
N Neuville, de 1836-1885
R Raffet 1804-1860
R₂ Regamey 1837-1876
V Vernet, Horace 1789-1863

A Aubert 1824-
B Benouville 1815-1891
B₂ Berge, de la 1807-1842
B₃ Boulanger, Gustave 1824-1888
C₂ Cabat 1812-1893
C₃ Chassériau 1819-1856
C₄ Chenavard 1808-1895
C₅ Curzon 1820-1895
F Flandrin [Religious painter] 1809-1864
G Gleyre 1806-1874
H Hamon 1821-1874
P Picou 1822-
S Schnetz 1788-1870

A Antigna 1818-1878
B Biard 1801-1882
J Jeanron 1810-1877
L Leleux 1818-1885
T Tassaert 1800-1874

See also Jules Breton Fr. IV. 11. B
Delacroix Fr. N. 3. D₂
Meissonier Fr. IV. 6. M

See also Gérôme Fr. IV. 2. G

B Baader, Louis Marie [Genre] 1828-
B₂ Bague [Genre] ?-1883
B₃ Bellangé, Eugène { [Mili-] 1837-1895
B₄ Bellangé, Hippolyte { tary } 1800-1866
B₅ Berne-Bellecour { Genre] 1838-1898
B₆ Brillouin { [Followers of } 1817-
C₂ Chavet { Meissonier] } 1822-
D Détaille [Military Genre] 1848-
F Fauvelet [Follower of Meissonier] 1818-
L Leloir [Genre] 1843-1884
M₂ Morot, Aimé- { [Military] 1850-
P Pils { Genre] } 1815-1875
P₂ Protais { } 1826-1890
T Toulmouche [Genre] 1829-1890
V₂ Vibert [Follower of Meissonier] 1840-
Y Yvon [Military Genre] 1817-

The XIXth Century

7

8

9

10

| PORTRAIT AND FIGURE (Artists holding Independent Positions and therefore not easily classified) | | | REALISTS | | INFLUENCED BY THE SCHOOLS OF BARBIZON | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | LANDSCAPE | | ANIMAL PAINTERS | | | | |
| D | Delaunay | 1828-1892 | B | Bonnat | 1833- | C | Corot | 1796-1875 | B | Bonheur, Rosa | 1822-1899 |
| L | Laurens | 1838- | C | Courbet | 1819-1878 | D | Daubigny | 1817-1878 | J | Jacque | 1813-1894 |
| L ₂ | Mme Lebrun | 1755-1842 | D | Carolus Duran | 1837- | D ₂ | Diaz | 1808-1876 | T | Troyon | 1810-1865 |
| P | Prud'hon | 1758-1823 | R | Ribot | 1823-1891 | D ₃ | Dupré | 1812-1889 | V | Van Marcke | 1827-1890 |
| R | Regnault, Henri | 1843-1871 | V | Vollon [Still Life] | 1833-1900 | R | Rousseau, Théodore | 1812-1867 | | | |
| R ₂ | Roche-grosse | 1859- | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | See also Stevens, A. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Fl. V. 3. S | | | | | | | |
| B | Benjamin-Constant | 1845- | B ₂ | Bonvin | 1817-1887 | A | Archard | 1807- | B ₂ | Bonheur, Auguste | 1824-1884 |
| C | Cormon | 1845- | C ₂ | Chaplin | 1825-1891 | B | Brascassat | 1805-1867 | J ₂ | Jadin | 1805- |
| L ₃ | Luminais | 1822- | D ₂ | Dubois | 1829-1905 | B ₂ | Breton, Émile | 1831- | L | Lambert, L. E. | 1825- |
| S | Sylvestre | 1847- | D ₃ | Dupré, Julien | 1851- | C ₂ | Chintreuil | 1814-1873 | V ₂ | Veyrassat | 1828-1893 |
| | | | H | Hanoteau | 1823- | D ₄ | Debrosses | 1835- | | | |
| | | | L | Lansyer | 1835- | F | Français | 1814-1897 | | | |
| | | | M | Mettling | 1847-1904 | H | Harpignies | 1819- | | | |
| | | | R ₂ | Ricard | 1823-1872 | L | Lacroix | 1810-1878 | | | |
| | | | R ₃ | Rousseau, Philippe | 1816-1887 | P | Pelouse | 1845-1891 | | | See also Palizzi It. V. 6. P |
| | | | R ₄ | Roybet | 1840- | Y | Von | 1836-1897 | | | |
| | | | T | Tissot | 1836-1902 | | | | | | |

Part II

11

12

13

14

| AND FONTAINEBLEAU | | PIONEERS OF "IMPRESSIONISM" — "LUMINISTS" | INDIVIDUALISTS (Largely under Influence of Impressionism) | NEW IDEALISTS | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|----------------|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| PAINTERS OF PEASANT LIFE | | | | | | | |
| B | Breton, Jules 1827- | B | Boudin [Marine] 1825-1898 | B | Bastien-Lepage 1848-1884 | A | Aman-Jean 1856- |
| M | Millet 1814-1875 | D | Degas 1834- | B ₂ | Boldini 1844- | B | Besnard 1849- |
| | | M | Manet 1833-1883 | D | Dagnan-Bouveret 1852- | C | Carrière 1849- |
| | | M ₂ | Monet [Landscape] 1840- | L | L'hermitte 1844- | C ₂ | Cazin 1841-1901 |
| | | M ₃ | Montenard [Marine] 1849- | R | Raffaelli 1850- | M | Monticelli 1824-1886 |
| | | P | Pissarro, Camille 1831- | S | Seurat 1859-1891 | M ₂ | Moreau 1826-1898 |
| | | S | Sisley [Landscape] 1840-1899 | | | P | Puvis de Chavannes 1824-1898 |
| B ₂ | Billet 1836- | B ₂ | Brown, John Lewis 1829-1890 | A | Angrand [Landscape] 1854- | A ₂ | Agache 1843- |
| B ₃ | Brion 1824-1877 | C | Caillebotte - | A ₂ | Anquetin [Landscape] - | C ₃ | Cazin, M ^{me} - |
| L | Legros 1837- | C ₂ | Cézanne 1839 - | A ₃ | Aublet 1851- | D | Denis 1855- |
| L ₂ | Lerolle 1851- | F | Forain - | B ₃ | Barau 1851- | G | Gandara 1862- |
| M ₂ | Marchal, Charles 1825-1877 | R | Renoir 1841- | B ₄ | Baskirtschef, Miss Marie 1860-1884 | M | Martin - |
| | | | See also Cassatt, Miss Mary Am. III. 1. C ₄ | B ₅ | Béraud 1849- | P ₂ | Picard, Louis 1850- |
| | | | | B ₆ | Billote 1846- | R | Redon 1862- |
| | | | | B ₇ | Binet 1849- | R ₂ | Renan 1855-1900 |
| | | | | B ₈ | Blanche 1861- | S | Schwabe - |
| | | | | B ₉ | Butin 1838-1883 | | |
| | | | | D ₂ | Damoye 1847- | | |
| | | | | D ₃ | Dantan 1848-1897 | | |
| | | | | D ₄ | Dauphin 1857- | | |
| | | | | D ₅ | Duez 1843-1896 | | |
| | | | | D ₆ | Dumoulin - | | |
| | | | | F | Fantin-Latour 1836- | | |
| | | | | F ₂ | Fiant 1863- | | |
| | | | | G | Gervez 1852- | | |
| | | | | G ₂ | Goeneutte - | | |
| | | | | H | Heilbuth 1829-1889 | | |
| | | | | M | Monchablou 1854- | | |
| | | | | N | Nittis, de 1846-1884 | | |
| | | | | P | Pissarro, Lucien [Landscape] - | | |
| | | | | P ₂ | Pointelin 1839- | | |
| | | | | R ₂ | Renouard 1845- | | |
| | | | | R ₃ | Roll 1847- | | |
| | | | | R ₄ | Rosset-Granget 1853- | | |
| | | | | S ₂ | Signac [Landscape] 1863- | | |

The Early Period and the

| I.—THE EARLY PERIOD | | II.—THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| | | HISTORY AND FIGURE | PRE-RAPHAELITE BROTHERHOOD AND ARTISTS INFLUENCED BY IT | LANDSCAPE AND MARINE | |
| | <i>See the following foreign artists who painted in England.</i> | A Alma-Tadema [4th period] 1836— | B Brown, Ford | B Bonington 1801—1828 | |
| | Mabuse [Fl. II. 1. M ₃] 1470—1541 | B Blake [1st period] 1757—1827 | Madox 1821—1893 | C Constable 1776—1837 | |
| | Holbein the Younger [G. II. 3. H ₂] 1497—1543 | E Eastlake [2d period] 1793—1865 | B ₂ Burne-Jones, Sir Edward 1833—1898 | C ₂ Cotman [Pupil of Old Crome] 1782—1842 | |
| | Mor (Moro) [Fl. II. 1. M ₂] 1512—1576 | G Gainsborough [1st period] 1727—1788 | C Crane, Walter 1845— | C ₃ Cox, David, of Birmingham 1783—1859 | |
| | Rubens [Fl. III. 1. R.] 1577—1640 | II Herkomer [4th period] 1849— | H Hunt, Holman 1827— | C ₄ Crome, John, the Elder (Old Crome) [Founder of Norwich School] 1769—1821 | |
| | Van Dyck [Fl. III. 1. D.] 1599—1641 | H ₂ Hogarth [1st period] 1697—1764 | M Millais 1829—1896 | T Turner, J. M. W. 1775—1851 | |
| | Hannemann [D. III. 4. H ₂] 1601—1669 | L Lawrence [1st period] 1769—1830 | R Rossetti 1828—1882 | W Wilson, Richard 1713—1782 | |
| | Sir Peter Lely [Fl. III. 2. L.] 1617—1680 | L ₂ Leighton [4th period] 1830—1896 | | See also Gainsborough Br. II. 1. G | |
| | Soest [G. III. S ₃] ?—1681 | M Mason [4th period] 1818—1872 | See also Watts Br. II. 1. W | Graham, Peter Br. II. 6b. G | |
| | Heemskerck, E. van, the Younger [D. III. 5b. H ₃] 1645—1704 | M ₂ Moore, Albert [4th period] 1841—1892 | Albert Moore Br. II. 1. M ₂ | Mason Br. II. 1. M | |
| | Kneller [D. III. 1a. K ₂] 1646—1723 | O Oules [4th period] 1848— | | | |
| | Ricci, Marco [It. IV. 4. R.] 1679—1729 | P Poynter [4th period] 1836— | | | |
| | Ricci, Sebastiano [It. IV. 4. R ₂] 1659—1734 | R Raeburn [1st period] 1756—1823 | A Ansdell 1815—1885 | | |
| | Zuccarelli [It. IV. 5. Z.] 1702—1788 | R ₂ Reynolds [1st period] 1723—1792 | H ₂ Holiday 1839— | | |
| | | R ₃ Romney [1st period] 1734—1802 | H ₃ Hughes 1832— | | |
| | | W Watts [4th period] 1817—1904 | M ₂ Morris, William 1834— | | |
| | | See also Shannon Am. III. 1. S ₂ | R ₂ Richmond 1843— | | |
| | | Millais Br. II. 2. M | S Shaw, Byam — | | |
| | | | S ₂ Spartali-Stillman, Mrs. 1844— | | |
| | | | S ₃ Stanhope — | | |
| | | | S ₄ Strudwick 1849— | | |
| | | | W Waterhouse 1849— | | |
| O | Oliver, Isaac 1556—1617 | A ₂ Armitage 1817—1896 | | A Aumonier — | |
| O ₂ | Oliver, Peter 1601—1660 | B ₂ Barry 1741—1806 | See also Dyce Br. II. 6. D | B ₂ Brett 1830— | |
| T | Thornhill, Sir James 1676—1734 | B ₃ Beechey 1753—1839 | | C ₅ Callcott 1779—1844 | |
| | | B ₄ Boughton 1834—1905 | | C ₆ Cole, Vicat 1833—1893 | |
| | | B ₅ Bramley, Frank — | | C ₇ Cooke 1811—1880 | |
| | | B ₆ Butler, Elizabeth 1844— | | C ₈ Corbett —1902 | |
| | | C Calderon 1833—1898 | | C ₉ Creswick 1811—1869 | |
| | | C ₂ Clausen 1852— | | C ₁₀ Crome, John B. jr. 1792—1842 | |
| | | D Devis 1763—1822 | L ₆ Long, Edwin 1829— | D Dawson 1811—1878 | |
| | | E ₂ Elty 1787—1849 | M ₃ MacIse 1806—1870 | E East 1849— | |
| | | F Forbes 1837— | M ₄ MacNee 1806—1882 | F Fixter — | |
| | | F ₂ Furse 1868—1904 | M ₅ Morris, P. R. 1838— | G Goodall 1822— | |
| | | F ₃ Fuseli 1741—1825 | N Northcote 1746—1831 | H Hook 1819— | |
| | | H ₃ Haydon 1786—1846 | O ₂ Opie 1761—1807 | H ₂ Hunter 1842— | |
| | | H ₄ Herbert 1810— | O ₃ Owen, William 1769—1825 | I Ibbetson 1759—1817 | |
| | | H ₅ Holl 1845—1888 | P ₂ Prinsep 1836— | I ₂ Inchbold 1830—1888 | |
| | | H ₆ Hoppner 1758—1810 | R ₄ Reid, J. R. 1851— | L Ladbroke 1758—1840 | |
| | | H ₇ Horsley 1817— | R ₅ Russel 1744—1806 | L ₂ Lawson 1851—1882 | |
| | | J Jackson 1778—1831 | S Sant 1820— | L ₃ Leader 1831— | |
| | | K Knight, John Prescott 1803—1881 | S ₂ Shee 1769—1850 | L ₄ Linnell 1792—1882 | |
| | | L ₃ Lance [Famed also for his pictures of Still Life] 1802—1864 | T Tenniel 1820— | M Moore, Henry 1831—1895 | |
| | | L ₄ La Thangue 1860— | T ₂ Tuke 1858— | M ₂ Müller, William 1786—1865 | |
| | | L ₅ Leslie, G. D. 1835— | W ₂ Wright, Ethel — | P Parsons, Alfred 1847— | |
| | | | See also the artists listed under Am. I. 1. and Br. II. 6. Figure | S Stanfield 1793—1867 | |
| | | | | S ₂ Stark 1794—1856 | |
| | | | | V Vincent 1796—1851 | |

XVIIIth and XIXth Centuries

II.—THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

4

5

6

| 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|----------------|--|
| GENRE AND ANIMALS | | WATER COLORISTS | | THE SCOTCH SCHOOL | | | |
| | | | | a | b | | |
| | Landseer, Sir Edwin 1802-1873 | C | Cox, David, of London 1809-1885 | A | Figure Allan, Sir William 1782-1850 | C | Landscape, Marine, Animals Crawford, Edmund Th. - |
| I | Morland 1736-1804 | C ₂ | Cozens 1752-1799 | C | Cameron, D. Y. - | G | Graham, Peter 1836- |
| V | Rivière, Briton 1840- | F | Fielding 1787-1855 | C ₂ | Chalmers 1836-1878 | G ₂ | Guthrie 1859- |
| | Wilkie 1785-1841 | H | Hunt, Wm. Henry 1790-1864 | II | Harvey 1806-1876 | M | Macallum 1841-1896 |
| | | O | Owen, Samuel - | M | Melville - | N | Nasmyth, Patrick 1787-1831 |
| | | P | Prout 1783-1852 | O | Orchardson 1835- | R | Reid, Sir George 1842- |
| | | | | P | Parton 1845- | | |
| | | | | P ₂ | Pettie 1839-1893 | | |
| | | | | P ₃ | Phillip 1817-1867 | | |
| | | | | R | Ramsay 1713-1784 | | |
| | | | See also Cox, David Br. II. 3. C ₃ Turner Br. II. 3. T | | | | |
| | | | | | See also Raeburn Br. II. 1. R Wilkie Br. II. 4. W | | See also Cameron Br. II. 6a. |
| B | Barker 1769-1847 | C ₃ | Clennel 1781-1840 | A ₂ | Allan, David 1744-1796 | A | Adam, Denovan 1842-1896 |
| C | Collins 1788-1847 | C ₄ | Cottermole 1800-1868 | A ₃ | Archer, James 1824- | B | Brown, T. Austen - |
| D | Douglas 1822-1891 | D | Dewint 1784-1849 | D | Dyce 1806-1864 | C ₂ | Cameron, Hugh 1835 |
| F | Frith 1819- | E | Edridge 1769-1821 | F | Faed, John 1820- | C ₃ | Crawhall 1860- |
| H | Herring 1795-1865 | G | Girtin 1775-1802 | F ₂ | Faed, Thomas 1826-1900 | G ₃ | Gauld, David 1866- |
| L ₂ | Landseer, Charles 1799-1879 | H ₂ | Heaphy 1775-1835 | G | Good 1789-1872 | G ₄ | Graham, Thomas - |
| L ₃ | Leslie, Charles R. 1794-1859 | H ₃ | Hills, Robert 1769-1844 | H ₂ | Henry - | K | Kennedy 1860- |
| M ₂ | Mulready 1786-1863 | H ₄ | Howitt 1765-1822 | H ₃ | Hornell - | M ₂ | Macbeth 1848- |
| S | Stubbs 1724-1806 | L | Lewis 1805-1876 | L | Lauder 1803-1869 | M ₃ | Macgregor - |
| W ₂ | Ward, James 1769-1859 | R | Ruskin 1819-1900 | L ₂ | Lavery 1858- | M ₄ | MacWhirter 1839- |
| W ₃ | Webster 1800-1886 | S | Stothard 1755-1834 | N | Nicol, Erskine 1825- | N ₂ | Nasmyth, Alexander 1758-1814 |
| W ₄ | Wootton ?-1765 | W | Westall 1765-1836 | R ₂ | Roche 1863- | P | Paterson 1854- |
| | | | | R ₃ | Runciman, Alexander 1736-1785 | P ₂ | Paton 1821- |
| | See also Walker, Frederick Br. II. 3. W ₂ | | | R ₄ | Runciman, John 1744-1766 | S | Stevenson 1864- |
| | | | | S | Scott 1806-1849 | | |
| | | | | W | Wilson, P. MacG. - | | |
| | 3 (continued) | | | | | | |
| W ₂ | Walker, Frederick 1840-1875 | | | | | | |
| W ₃ | Walton 1835-1867 | | | | | | |
| | See also Dewint Br. II. 5. D Wylie Am. II. 1. W ₄ | | | | | | |

First Period — The Early Painters

1

2

| FIGURE | | | LANDSCAPE, MARINE, etc. | |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| C | Copley | 1737-1815 | | |
| W | West | 1738-1820 | | |
| S | Stuart | 1755-1828 | | |
| T | Trumbull | 1756-1843 | | |
| A | Allston | 1779-1843 | | |
| S ₂ | Sully | 1783-1872 | | |
| M | Malbone [Miniatures] | 1787-1807 | | |
| ————— | | | | |
| B | Blackburn, J. B. | 1700-1760 | B | Birch, Thomas |
| E | Earl, Ralph | 1751-1801 | | 1779-1851 |
| F | Feke, Robert | 1724-1769 | | |
| F ₂ | Frothingham, James | 1786-1864 | | |
| G | Greenwood, John | 1726- | | |
| J | Jarvis | 1780-1834 | | See also Leslie, Charles Robert |
| J ₂ | Jouett, Matthew Harris | 1788-1827 | | Br. II. 4. L ₃ |
| N | Newton, Gilbert Stuart | 1795-1835 | | |
| O | Otis, Bass | 1784-1861 | | |
| P | Peale, C. W. | 1741-1827 | | |
| P ₂ | Peale, Rembrandt | 1787-1860 | | |
| P ₃ | Pine, R. E. | 1742-1790 | | |
| P ₄ | Pratt, M. | 1734-1805 | | |
| Q | Quidor, John | -ca. 1875 | | |
| S ₃ | Savage, Edward | 1761-1817 | | |
| S ₄ | Sharpless, James | 1751-1811 | | |
| S ₅ | Smibert | 1684-1751 | | |
| V | Vanderlyn, John | 1775-1852 | | |
| W ₂ | Watson | 1685-1768 | | |
| W ₃ | White, John Blake | 1781-1859 | | |
| W ₄ | Wright, Joseph | 1756-1793 | | |

PAINTING

Table 22

Second Period — From about 1825 to 1876

1

2

| FIGURE | | | LANDSCAPE, MARINE, etc. | | |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| H | Harding | 1792-1866 | C | Cole, Thomas | 1801-1848 |
| H ₂ | Hunt, William Morris | 1824-1879 | K | Kensett | 1818-1872 |
| F | Fuller, George | 1822-1884 | G | Gifford, Sandford R. | 1823-1880 |
| | | | W | Wyant | 1836-1892 |
| | | | I | Inness | 1825-1894 |
| | | | C ₂ | Church, Frederick Edwin | 1826-1900 |
| | | | B | Bierstadt | 1830-1902 |
| | | | | See also Enneking Martin | Am. III. 2. E Am. III. 2. M |
| ————— | | | | | |
| A | Alexander, Francis | 1800-1880 | B ₂ | Bradford [Marine] | 1830-1892 |
| A ₂ | Ames, Joseph | 1816-1872 | B ₃ | Bristol | 1826- |
| B | Babcock, William P. | 1825-1899 | C ₃ | Casilear | 1811-1893 |
| B ₂ | Baker, George A. | 1821-1880 | C ₄ | Cropsey, Joseph F. | 1823-1900 |
| E | Elliott, Charles L. | 1812-1868 | D | De Haas, M. F. H. [Marine] | 1832-1895 |
| G | Gray, Henry P. | 1819-1877 | D ₂ | Doughty | 1793-1856 |
| G ₂ | Guy, Seymour [Genre] | 1824- | D ₃ | Durand, Asher Brown | 1796-1886 |
| H ₃ | Healy | 1808-1894 | G ₂ | Gifford, R. Swain | 1840-1905 |
| H ₄ | Henry, Edward L. | 1841- | H | Hamilton, James [Marine] | 1819-1878 |
| H ₅ | Hicks | 1823-1890 | H ₂ | Hart, James M. | 1828-1901 |
| H ₆ | Huntington | 1816- | H ₃ | Haseltine | 1835-1900 |
| I | Ingham | 1796-1863 | H ₄ | Hill, Thomas | 1829- |
| I ₂ | Inman | 1801-1846 | H ₅ | Hubbard | 1817-1888 |
| I ₃ | Irving, John B. | 1826-1877 | J | Johnson, David | 1827- |
| J | Jewett, W. S. | 1795-1873 | M | Moran, Edward [Marine] | 1829-1901 |
| J ₂ | Johnson, Eastman | 1824- | M ₂ | Moran, Thomas | 1837- |
| L | Lawson | 1807-1888 | N | Norton, W. E. [Marine] | 1843- |
| L ₂ | Lazarus | 1823-1891 | Q | Quartley, Arthur [Marine] | 1839-1886 |
| L ₃ | Leutze | 1816-1868 | R | Richards, W. T. [Marine] | 1833-1905 |
| L ₄ | Linen, George | 1802-1888 | W ₂ | Whittredge, Worthington | 1820- |
| M | May, Edward Harrison | 1824-1887 | | See also Haas, J. H. L. de Haas, Wm. F. de | D. V. 3. H D. V. 4. H |
| M ₂ | Mooney, Edward | 1813- | | | |
| M ₃ | Morse, S. F. B. | 1791-1872 | | | |
| M ₄ | Mount, W. S. | 1807-1868 | | | |
| N | Neagle | 1799-1865 | | | |
| P | Page, William | 1811-1885 | | | |
| P ₂ | Perry, E. Wood | 1831- | | | |
| P ₃ | Powell, Wm. H. | 1824-1879 | | | |
| R | Read, Th. B. | 1822-1872 | T | Thompson, C. G. | 1809-1888 |
| R ₂ | Rothermel | 1817-1895 | W | Waldo | 1783-1861 |
| S | Schuessle | 1824-1879 | W ₂ | Weir, R. W. | 1803-1889 |
| S ₂ | Staigg | 1820-1881 | W ₃ | White, Edwin | 1817-1877 |
| S ₃ | Stone, Wm. O. | 1830-1875 | W ₄ | Wylie, Robert | 1839-1877 |

1 (continued)

Third Period —

1

FIGURE

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|
| A | Abbey | 1852- | D | Dannat, | | M | McEwen, | |
| A ₂ | Alexander, | | | Wm. T. | 1853- | | Walter | 1860- |
| | John W. | 1856- | D ₂ | De Camp | 1858- | M ₂ | Marr, Carl | 1858- |
| B | Beaux, Cecilia | - | D ₃ | Dewing | 1851- | M ₃ | Melchers | 1860- |
| B ₂ | Benson | 1862- | D ₄ | Duveneck | 1848- | R | Reid, Robert | 1863- |
| B ₃ | Blashfield | 1848- | G | Gay, Walter | 1856- | S | Sargent | 1856- |
| B ₄ | Brush | 1855- | | | | S ₂ | Shannon | 1863- |
| C | Chase | 1849- | H | Hassam | 1859- | T | Tarbell | 1862- |
| C ₂ | Cox, Kenyon | 1856- | H ₂ | Hills, Miss | | T ₂ | Thayer | 1849- |
| C ₃ | Currier, J. | | | Laura C. | 1859- | V | Vedder, Elihu | 1838- |
| | Frank | 1843- | H ₃ | Hitchcock, G. | 1850- | V ₂ | Vinton | 1846- |
| | | | L | La Farge | 1835- | W | Weir, Julian | |
| | | | | | | | Alden | 1852- |
| | | | | | | W ₂ | Whistler | 1834-1903 |
| B ₅ | Barse, G. R. | 1861- | K | Kappes | 1850-1894 | R ₂ | Reinhart, B. F. | 1829-1885 |
| B ₆ | Beckwith | 1852- | K ₂ | Kendall, Wm. Ser- | | R ₃ | Rolshoven, Julius | 1858- |
| B ₇ | Blum | 1857-1903 | | geant | 1869- | R ₄ | Ross, Denman | 1853- |
| B ₈ | Bohm | 1868- | K ₃ | Klumpke, Miss | 1856- | R ₅ | Ryder, Albert P. | 1847- |
| B ₉ | Boughton, G. H. | 1834-1905 | K ₄ | Knight, D. R. | 1845- | S ₃ | Sartain, Wm. | 1843- |
| B ₁₀ | Brandegee, Robert | - | K ₅ | Köhler, Robert | 1850- | S ₄ | Schmitt, Albert F. | 1873- |
| B ₁₁ | Bridgman, F. A. | 1847- | K ₆ | Koopman, | | S ₅ | Sears, Sarah C. | 1858- |
| B ₁₂ | Brown, J. G. | 1831- | | Augustus | 1869- | S ₆ | Shirlaw | 1838- |
| C ₄ | Cassatt, Miss Mary | - | K ₇ | Kronberg, Louis | 1872- | S ₇ | Simmons, Edward | 1852- |
| C ₅ | Church, F. S. | 1842- | L ₂ | Lathrop, Francis | 1849- | S ₈ | Smedley, W. T. | 1858- |
| C ₆ | Couse, E. Irving | 1866- | L ₃ | Lockwood, W. | 1861- | S ₉ | Smith, J. Lindon | 1863- |
| C ₇ | Curran, C. C. | 1861- | L ₄ | Loeb, Louis | 1866- | S ₁₀ | Stetson, Chas. W. | 1858- |
| C ₈ | Cutler, C. G. | 1873- | L ₅ | Low, W. H. | 1853- | S ₁₁ | Stewart, Julius L. | 1855- |
| D ₅ | Daingerfield | 1859- | M ₁ | McChesney, Clara | 1861- | S ₁₂ | Story, G. H. | 1835- |
| D ₆ | Dickson, Miss M. E. | - | M ₅ | Macomber, Miss | | S ₁₃ | Story, Julian | 1857- |
| D ₇ | Dodge, W. de L. | 1867- | | M. L. | 1861- | T ₃ | Tanner, H. O. | - |
| D ₈ | Du Mond, F. V. | 1865- | M ₆ | Marsh, F. D. | 1872- | T ₄ | Thomas, S. S. | 1868- |
| E | Eakins, Thomas | 1844- | M ₇ | Maynard, G. W. | 1843- | T ₅ | Tompkins, F. H. | 1847- |
| E ₂ | Eaton, Wyatt | 1849-1896 | M ₈ | Merrit, Mrs. A. L. | 1844- | T ₆ | Turner, C. V. | 1850- |
| E ₃ | Emmet, Miss Ellen | - | M ₉ | Millet, Francis D. | 1846- | U | Ulrich, Chas. F. | 1858- |
| F | Fromuth | 1861- | M ₁₀ | Mosler, Henry | 1841- | V ₃ | Volk, Douglas | 1856- |
| F ₂ | Fuller, Henry B. | 1867- | M ₁₁ | Mowbray | 1858- | V ₄ | Vonnoh, R. W. | 1858- |
| G | Gardner, Miss (Mme. | | M ₁₂ | Murphy, | | | | |
| | Bouguereau) | 1851- | | Herman D. | 1867- | | | |
| G ₂ | Gaugengigl | 1855- | N | Nourse, Miss | | | | |
| G ₃ | Gauley, R. D. | 1875- | | Elizabeth | - | | | |
| G ₄ | George, Vesper L. | 1865- | P | Pape, Eric | 1870- | | | |
| H ₄ | Hallowell, G. H. | 1872- | P ₂ | Parrish, Maxfield | 1870- | | | |
| H ₅ | Hamilton, | | P ₃ | Paxton | 1869- | | | |
| | Hamilton | 1847- | P ₄ | Pearce, Chas. S. | 1851- | | | |
| H ₆ | Hamilton, J. | | P ₅ | Pepper, Chas. H. | 1864- | | | |
| | McClure | 1853- | P ₆ | Perry, Mrs. L. C. | - | | | |
| H ₇ | Hazard | 1872- | P ₇ | Peters, Clinton | 1865- | | | |
| H ₈ | Henri, R. | 1865- | P ₈ | Porter, B. C. | 1845- | | | |
| H ₉ | Herter, Albert | 1871- | P ₉ | Prendergast | - | | | |
| H ₁₀ | Hovenden | 1840-1895 | P ₁₀ | Pyle, Howard | 1853- | | | |
| I | Isham | 1855- | | | | | | |
| J | Johnston, John H. | 1857- | | | | | | |
| W ₃ | Walden, L. | 1862- | | | | | | |
| W ₄ | Walker, Henry O. | 1843- | | | | | | |
| W ₅ | Ward, Edgar M. | 1849- | | | | | | |
| W ₆ | Waterman, Marcus | 1834- | | | | | | |
| W ₇ | Watrous, H. W. | 1857- | | | | | | |
| W ₈ | Weeks, E. Lord | 1849-1903 | | | | | | |
| W ₉ | Weir, J. F. | 1841- | | | | | | |
| W ₁₀ | Wentworth, | | | | | | | |
| | Mrs. C. de | - | | | | | | |
| W ₁₁ | Whitmore, | | | | | | | |
| | Wm. R. | 1861- | | | | | | |
| W ₁₂ | Whittemore, | | | | | | | |
| | Wm. J. | 1860- | | | | | | |
| W ₁₃ | Wiles, Irving R. | 1861- | | | | | | |
| W ₁₄ | Wilmarth, L. E. | 1835- | | | | | | |
| W ₁₅ | Wood, | | | | | | | |
| | Thomas W. | 1823-1903 | | | | | | |
| W ₁₆ | Woodbury, Marcia | | | | | | | |
| | (Mrs. Chas. H.) | 1865- | | | | | | |

PAINTING

Table 23

From 1876 to the Present

2

3

LANDSCAPE, etc.

MARINE

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|-----------|
| B | Bisbing | 1849- | M | Martin, Homer | 1836-1897 | T | Tryon, D. W. | 1849- | H | Harrison, Thomas | |
| B ₂ | Bogert | 1864- | M ₂ | Minor | 1840-1904 | T ₂ | Twachtman | 1853-1902 | | Alexander | 1853- |
| D | Davis, Chas. H. | 1856- | M ₃ | Murphy, J. F. | 1853- | W | Walker, | | H ₂ | Homer, | |
| E | Eaton, Chas. | | R | Ranger, H. W. | 1858- | | Horatio | 1858- | | Winslow | 1836- |
| E | Warren | 1857- | | | | | | | W | Woodbury, | |
| E ₂ | Enneking | 1841- | | | | | | | | Chas. H. | 1864- |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | Allen, Thomas | 1849- | H | Harrison, L. Birge | 1854- | R ₂ | Redfield | 1868- | B | Bunce, W. G. | 1840- |
| B ₃ | Barlow, J. N. | 1861- | H ₂ | Hayden, Chas. H. | 1856-1901 | R ₃ | Rix | 1851-1903 | C | Chapman, C. T. | 1860- |
| B ₄ | Barnard, E. H. | 1855- | H ₃ | Howe, W. H. | 1846- | R ₄ | Robinson, Theo- | | D | Dana, W. P. W. | 1833- |
| B ₅ | Bellows, Albert | 1830-1883 | I | Inness, George, Jr. | 1854- | R ₅ | dore | 1852-1896 | | | |
| B ₆ | Blakelock | 1847- | J | Johnston, John B. | 1847-1886 | R ₆ | Robinson, Thomas | 1835-1888 | F | Fitzgerald, H. | 1847- |
| B ₇ | Brown, J. | | J ₂ | Jones, Francis C. | 1857- | S | Rogers, Frank W. | 1854- | L | Lee, Homer | 1856- |
| | Appleton | 1844-1902 | J ₃ | Jones, Hugh | | S ₂ | Schofield, W. | | R | Rehn | 1848- |
| B ₈ | Bunner, Andrew F. | 1841-1897 | | Bolton | 1848- | | Elmer | 1867- | S | Snell, H. B. | 1858- |
| B ₉ | Butler, Howard R. | 1856- | K | Kaula | 1871- | T ₃ | Shurtleff, R. M. | 1838- | T | Tuckerman, S. S. | 1830-1904 |
| C | Carlsen | 1848- | K ₂ | Kost | 1861- | T ₄ | Taber, Edward M. | 1863- | | | |
| C ₂ | Coffin, W. A. | 1855- | L | Lathrop, W. L. | 1859- | T ₅ | Taber, I. W. | - | | | |
| C ₃ | Cole, J. Foxcroft | 1837-1892 | L ₂ | Lie, Jonas | 1880- | T ₆ | Talcott, Allen | 1867- | | | |
| C ₄ | Coleman, C. C. | | M ₄ | McKnight, Dodge | 1860- | V | Tiffany, Louis C. | 1848- | | | |
| | [lives in Italy] | 1840- | M ₅ | MacMonnies, Mrs. | | V ₂ | Vail, Eugene | 1856- | | | |
| C ₅ | Colman, Samuel | 1833- | | Mary F. | - | V ₃ | Van Boskerck | 1855- | | | |
| C ₆ | Crane, R. Bruce | 1857- | M ₆ | Metcalf, W. L. | 1858- | V ₄ | Van der Weyden | 1868- | | | |
| D ₂ | Davies | - | M ₇ | Monks, J. A. S. | 1850- | W ₂ | Van Laer, A. T. | 1857- | | | |
| D ₃ | Dearth | 1863- | M ₈ | Moran, Peter | 1841- | W ₃ | Wendel, Theodore | 1857- | | | |
| D ₄ | De Haven, Frank | 1856- | M ₉ | Muhrman | 1854- | W ₄ | Wiggins, Carleton | 1848- | | | |
| D ₅ | De Longpre | | N | Needham, | | | Wiles, Lemuel | 1826-1905 | | | |
| | [Flowers] | 1855- | | Chas. A. | 1844- | | | | | | |
| D ₆ | Dessar | 1867- | N ₂ | Nichols, Mrs. | | | | | | | |
| D ₇ | Dewey, C. M. | 1851- | | Rhoda H. | - | | | | | | |
| D ₈ | Donoho | 1857- | O | Ochtman, L. | 1854- | | | | | | |
| F | Fisher, Mark | 1841- | P | Palmer, W. L. | 1854- | | | | | | |
| F ₂ | Foster, Ben | 1825-1899 | P ₂ | Peirce, H. W. | 1850- | | | | | | |
| G | Garrison | 1850- | P ₃ | Picknell, Wm. L. | 1852-1897 | | | | | | |
| | | | P ₄ | Platt, Chas. A. | 1861- | | | | | | |
| | | | P ₅ | Poore, H. R. | 1859- | | | | | | |

See also Butler Am. III. 2. B₈
Kost Am. III. 2. K₂

| EARLY FIGURE PAINTERS | | | LANDSCAPE AND MARINE | | | ACADE- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|--|
| K | Kiprenski | 1783-1836 | A | Ayvazovski | 1817-1900 | B | Bruni, Fidelio | |
| L | Levitski | 1735-1822 | S | Shchedrin, Silvestr | 1791-1830 | | | |
| O | Orlovski | 1777-1832 | | | | | | |
| T | Tolstoy, Count | 1783-1828 | | | | | | |
| V | Venetsianov | 1779-1845 | | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | |
| A | Akimov | 1764-1814 | A ₂ | Aleksyeev | 1755-1824 | B ₂ | Beidemann | |
| A ₂ | Antropov | 1716-1795 | K | Klodt, Baron | 1832- | L | Lebedev | |
| B | Borovikovsky, Vladimir | 1758-1826 | P | Prichetnikov | 1767-1809 | M | Markov | |
| C | Chistyakov | 1832- | S ₂ | Shchedrin, Semen | 1745-1804 | N | Neff, von | |
| I | Ivanov, Andrey | 1775-1848 | S ₃ | Shishkin | 1831-1898 | R | Rabus, Karl | |
| I ₂ | Ivanov, Mikhail | 1748-1823 | V | Vasilev | 1850-1873 | S | Semiradski | |
| L ₂ | Losenko | 1737-1773 | | | | T | Tropinin | |
| M | Moschkov | -1839 | | | | V | Varnek | |
| R | Rokotov | 1732-1810 | | | | V ₂ | Villevaude | |
| U | Ugryumov | 1764-1823 | | | | V ₃ | Vorobev | |
| Z | Zaryanko | 1818-1870 | | | | | | |

4

5

MICIANS

ROMANTICISTS

REALISTS

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|----------|-----------|---|--------------------|-----------|
| 1800-1875 | B | Bryullov | 1799-1852 | F | Fedotov | 1815-1852 |
| | | | | I | Ivanov, Aleksander | 1806-1858 |
| | | | | P | Perov | 1833-1882 |
| | | | | R | Ryepin | 1844- |
| | | | | S | Syerov | 1865- |
| | | | | V | Vereshchagin | 1842-1904 |

See also Baskirtsheff, Miss Marie Fr. IV. 13. B₄

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|-----------|
| 1826-1869 | B ₂ | Bogolyubov [Marine] | 1824-1896 | K | Kramskoy | 1837-1887 |
| 1815-1837 | B ₃ | Bronnikov | 1827- | M | Makovski, Konstantin | 1839- |
| 1802-1878 | L | Lagorio | 1826- | M ₂ | Makovski, Vladimir | 1846- |
| 1805-1877 | M | Meshcherski | 1834- | P ₂ | Pelenov | - |
| 1800-1857 | | | | S ₂ | Sternberg | 1818-1845 |
| 1843- | | | | | | |
| 1780-1857 | | | | | | |
| 1782-1843 | | | | | | |
| 1818- | | | | | | |
| 1787-1855 | | | | | | |

SWEDISH PAINTING

| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
|----------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| THE PIONEERS | | UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF DÜSSELDORF | | ACQUIRERS OF AN ARTISTIC STYLE IN PARIS AND MUNICH | | NATIONAL a | |
| | | | | | | Landscape, Animals, Marine | |
| B | Blommér, Nils Johan 1816-1858 | | | B | Bergh, Johan Edvard 1828-1880 | A | Arsenius [Animals] 1818- |
| B ₂ | Breda 1759-1818 | | | B ₂ | Birger 1854-1887 | E | Eckström, Per - |
| F | Fahlkrantz 1774-1861 | | | B ₃ | Bocklund, Johan Kristoffer 1817-1880 | E ₂ | Eugen, Prince of Sweden 1865- |
| L | Lindholm 1819- | | | C | Cederström 1845- | K | Krüger, Nils - |
| L ₂ | Lundgren 1815-1875 | | | F | Fosberg 1842- | N | Nordström, Karl 1855- |
| R | Roslin 1718-1793 | | | G | Gegerfelt, van 1844- | | |
| | See also Peter Krafft G. V. 3. K ₄ | | | H | Hagborg 1852-1875 | | |
| | | | | H ₂ | Hellquist 1851-1890 | | |
| | | | | H ₃ | Höckert, Johan Frederik 1826-1866 | | |
| | | | | K | Kronberg, Julius 1850- | | |
| | | | | R | Rosen, Georg von 1843- | | |
| | | | | S | Salmson 1843-1894 | | |
| A | Anderson 1817-1865 | E | Eskilson 1820-1872 | L | Larsson, Marcus 1825-1864 | J | Johansson, Karl - |
| B ₃ | Brandelius 1833-1884 | F | Fagerlin 1825- | M | Malmström 1829- | K ₂ | Kindborg 1861- |
| D | Dahlström ?-1869 | J | Jernberg, August 1826-1896 | R ₂ | Rydberg 1835- | K ₃ | Kronthén 1858- |
| H | Hilleström - | J ₂ | Jernberg, Olaf 1855- | S ₂ | Skånberg 1850-1883 | L | Liljefors [Animals] 1860- |
| L ₃ | Lafrensen 1737-1808 | K | Koskull 1831- | W | Wahlberg 1834- | L ₂ | Lindmann 1848- |
| L ₄ | Lindgreen 1814-1891 | N | Nordenberg 1822- | W ₂ | Winge 1825- | L ₃ | Lundström 1853- |
| L ₅ | Lundberg 1695-1786 | S | Södermark, Johan Per 1822-1889 | | | N ₂ | Nordling 1840-1888 |
| M | Marées, de 1697-1776 | U | Uncker, Karl d' 1828-1866 | | | T | Thegerström 1854- |
| M ₂ | Martin, Elias 1740-1804 | W | Wallander, Josef 1821-1888 | | | T ₂ | Thörne 1850- |
| P | Palm, Gustav Wil- helm (also called Palma Vecchio) 1810-1890 | Z | Zoll 1818-1860 | | | T ₃ | Tirén 1853- |
| P ₂ | Plagemann 1805- | | | | | | |
| S | Sandberg 1782-1854 | | | | | | |
| S ₂ | Södermark, Olaf 1790-1848 | | | | | | |
| W | Wahlborn 1810-1858 | | | | | | |
| W ₂ | Wenneberg - | | | | | | |
| W ₃ | Westin - | | | | | | |
| W ₄ | Wickenberg 1808-1846 | | | | | | |
| | See also Meytens G. IV. 1. M | | | | | | |

| | | NORWEGIAN AND FINNISH PAINTING | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ART | b | THE PIONEERS | TRAINED IN FOREIGN LANDS | FOUNDERS OF A NATIONAL ART |
| Figure | | | | |
| B | Bergh, Richard 1858- | D Dahl, Johan | G Gude, Hans | H Heyerdahl 1857- |
| L | Larsson, Carl 1855- | Christian 1788-1857 | [Landscape] 1825- | K Krohg 1852- |
| Z | Zorn, Andreas 1860- | | S Sinding, Otto | M Munthe, Ger- |
| | | | [Landscape] 1842- | hard 1849- |
| | | | T Tidemand, Adolf | N Nielsen, Amal- |
| | | | [Genre] 1814-1876 | dus 1838- |
| | | | | P Peterssen 1852- |
| | | | | S Skredsvig, |
| | | | | Christian 1854- |
| | | | | T Thaulow, Fritz 1847- |
| | | | | W Wentzel 1859- |
| | | | | W ₂ Werenskiold, |
| | | | | Erik 1855- |
| | | | | In Finland |
| | | | | E Edelfelt, Albert 1854-1905 |
| | | | | G Gallén, Axel - |
| B ₂ | Borg 1847- | B Baade 1808-1879 | A Arbo 1831-1892 | B Backer, Harriet 1845- |
| B ₃ | Björck, Oscar 1860- | F Feamley 1802-1842 | B Benetter 1822- | B ₂ Berg 1863-1893 |
| J | Josephson 1851- | F ₂ Frich 1810-1858 | B ₂ Böe 1820- | D Diriks 1855- |
| K | Kulle 1846- | G Görbitz 1782-1853 | B ₃ Björnsen-Möller, | D ₂ Disen 1844- |
| N | Nyberg 1855- | | Niels - | E ₂ Ender, Axel 1853- |
| O | Oesterlind 1853- | | C Cappelen 1827-1852 | F Frithjof 1859- |
| P | Pauli 1855- | | D Dahl, Sigvald 1827- | G ₂ Glöersen 1852- |
| W | Wallander, Alf 1862- | | E Eckersberg, Johan | G ₃ Grimelund 1842- |
| | | | Frederik 1822-1870 | H ₂ Hansteen, Nils 1855- |
| | | | E ₂ Ekenaes, J. 1847- | J Jørgensen 1861- |
| | | | G Grönvold 1845- | K ₂ Kielland, Kitty 1844- |
| | | | H Hansen, Carl | K ₃ Kolstoe 1860- |
| | | | Sundt- 1841- | M ₂ Munch 1863- |
| | | | H ₂ Hansteen, Aasta 1824- | P ₂ Peters 1851- |
| | | | M Müller, Morten 1828- | R Ross, Christian 1843- |
| | | | M ₂ Munthe, Ludvig 1841-1896 | S ₂ Skramstadt 1855- |
| | | | N Normann 1848- | S ₃ Ström 1863- |
| | | | S ₂ Sinding, Elizabeth 1846- | U Uckermann, Karl 1855- |
| | | | S ₃ Stoltenberg- | W ₃ Wergeland 1844- |
| | | | Lerche 1837-1892 | |

1

2

| CLASSICISTS | | | CRUDE INDEPENDENTS | | |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| A | Abildgård | 1742-1809 | D | Dalsgård, Christen [Genre] | 1824- |
| J | Juel | 1745-1802 | E | Eckersberg, Christoffer Vilhelm | 1783-1853 |
| | | | E ₂ | Exner [Genre] | 1825- |
| | | | K | Kyhn [Landscape] | 1819- |
| | | | L | Lundbye [Animals] | 1818-1848 |
| | | | M | Marstrand [Genre] | 1810-1873 |
| | | | S | Sonne [Battle and Low Life] | 1801-1890 |
| | | | S ₂ | Skovgård, Peter Kristian [Landscape] | 1817-1875 |
| | | | V | Vermehren, Frederik [Genre] | 1823- |
| | See also Carstens | G. IV. 5. C | | | |
| G | Gebauer | 1777-1831 | B | Bendsz | 1804-1832 |
| L | Lorentzen | 1749-1828 | E ₃ | Eddelien | 1803-1852 |
| P | Paulssen, Erik | 1749-1790 | H | Hansen, Constantin | 1804-1880 |
| | | | H ₂ | Hansen, Henrik | 1821- |
| | | | K ₂ | Köbke | 1810-1848 |
| | | | K ₃ | Krafft, Johan August | 1798-1829 |
| | | | K ₄ | Küchler | 1803- |
| | | | L ₂ | Larsen, Emanuel [Marine] | 1823-1859 |
| | | | L ₃ | Lund | 1826- |
| | | | M ₂ | Melbye, Anton [Marine] | 1818-1875 |
| | | | M ₃ | Melbye, Vilhelm [Marine] | 1824- |
| | | | M ₄ | Meyer, Ernst [Genre] | 1797-1861 |
| | | | M ₅ | Müller, Adam August | 1811-1844 |
| | | | P | Petzholdt [Landscape] | 1805-1838 |
| | | | R | Röd, Jörgen | 1808- |
| | | | R ₂ | Rörbye | 1803-1848 |
| | | | R ₃ | Rump [Landscape] | 1816-1880 |
| | | | S ₃ | Sörensen [Marine] | 1818-1879 |

3

4

COSMOPOLITANS

NATIONAL INDIVIDUALISTS

| | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|--|-------|
| B | Bloch, Karl [Genre] | 1834-1890 | A | Ancher, Mrs. Anna [Figure] | 1859- |
| | | | A ₂ | Ancher, Michael [Figure and Marine] | 1849- |
| | | | H | * Hammershøy | 1864- |
| | | | J | Jerndorff, August [Landscape] | 1846- |
| | | | J ₂ | Johansen, Viggo [Landscape and Figure] | 1851- |
| | | | K | Krøyer [Figure] | 1851- |
| | | | L | * Locher [Marine] | 1851- |
| | | | P | * Paulsen, Julius [Landscape] | 1860- |
| | | | S | * Skovgård, Joachim | 1856- |
| | | | V | * Villumsen | - |
| <hr/> | | | <hr/> | | |
| B ₂ | Bache [Animal and Figure] | 1839- | C | * Christensen | 1845- |
| G | Gertner [Portrait] | 1818-1871 | E | Engelsted | 1852- |
| H | Helsted [Genre] | 1847- | F | * Fröhlich | 1820- |
| J | Jerichau-Baumann, Mrs. Elizabeth | 1819-1881 | H ₂ | Hansen, Hans Nicolai | 1853- |
| L | La Cour [Landscape] | - | H ₃ | Haslund, Otto | 1842- |
| R | Rosenstand [Genre] | 1838- | H ₄ | Henningsøn | 1855- |
| Z | Zahrtmann [History] | 1843- | I | Irminger | 1850- |
| | | | J ₃ | * Jensen, Carl | 1851- |
| | | | P ₂ | * Philipsen | 1840- |
| | | | R | Ring, Lauritz | 1854- |
| | | | R ₂ | * Rohde | 1856- |
| | | | S ₂ | * Seligman | 1866- |
| | | | S ₃ | * Skovgård, Niels | 1858- |
| | | | S ₄ | * Slott-Møller, Mrs. Agnes | 1862- |
| | | | S ₅ | * Slott-Møller, Harold | 1864- |
| | | | S ₆ | Syberg, Fritz | 1862- |
| | | | T | Thomsen, Carl | 1847- |
| | | | T ₂ | Tuxén | 1853- |
| | | | Z | * Zachø | 1843- |

* Those marked with an asterisk are painters of open air.

I. — SCHOOLS OF PAINTING LITTLE INFLUENCED BY FOREIGN ART

| 1 | | | 2 | | | 3 | | |
|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------|
| THE EARLY SECULAR SCHOOL | | | THE BUDDHIST SCHOOL | | | THE YAMATO AND TOSA SCHOOLS (The Native School) | | |
| K | Kana-oka | fl. 850 A.D. | K | Kō-bo Daishi See also Kana-oka | 774-834 A.D. Jap. I. 1. K | M | Moto-mitsu | fl. xith century |
| H | Hiro-taka | fl. xth century | | | | T | Tosa Tsuné-taka | fl. 1240 A.D. |
| | | | | | | F | Fujiwara no Nobu-zané | 1177-1265 |
| | | | C | Chō Densu | 1351-1427 | M ₂ | Mitsu-nobu | 1445-1543 |
| | | | | | | S | Son-kai | fl. xvth century |
| | | | | | | M ₃ | Mitsu-shigé | fl. 1532-1560 |
| | | | | | | S ₂ | Sō-tatsu | 1623-1685 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | J | Ji-kaku Daishi | 784-854 A.D. | | | |
| A | Ai-mi | fl. xth century A.D. | | | | | | |
| K ₂ | Kin-mochi | fl. xth century | | | | | | |
| K ₃ | Kin-tada | fl. xth century | | | | | | |
| S | Sō-ken | fl. xth century | | | | | | |
| T | Tada-hira | fl. xth century | | | | | | |
| T ₂ | Tsuné-nori | fl. xth century | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | C | Chō-ga | fl. xiith century |
| | | | | | | G | Go-kio-goku | fl. xiith century |
| | | | Y | Yoshi-hidé | fl. xivth century | | | |
| | | | | | | M ₄ | Mitsu-ōki | ?-1691 |
| | | | K ₂ | Kan Densu | fl. xvth century | | | |
| | | | | | | M ₅ | Mitsu-yoshi | 1701-1772 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | H | Hiro-tsura | 1794-1864 |

II.—SCHOOLS OF PAINTING BASED ON THE STUDY OF CHINESE ART

1

2

3

THE CHINESE SCHOOL

THE SESHU SCHOOL

THE KANO SCHOOL

J Ja-soku, Soga fl. xvth century
 J₂ Jo-not-ō —
 J₃ Jō-setsu fl. early xvth century
 S **Shiū-bun** fl. xvth century
 S₂ Sun-nō (Nō-a-mi) fl. xvth century

 B Bun-chō (Tani) or Sha-san-rō 1763-1840

 K Kei-sai, Ō-nishi fl. sixth century
 N Nam-mei, Haru-ki fl. sixth century
 S₃ Sō-rin fl. sixth century

S **Sesshiū** 1420-1507
 S₂ Shiū-getsu fl. late xvth century
 S₃ Sesson fl. xvith century
 T To-haku fl. late xvith century

M Masa-nobu 1424-1520
 M₂ **Moto-nobu** 1477-1559

 S San-Raku (Kimura) 1559-1635
 S₂ **San-setsu** 1592-1654
 T **Tan-yu** 1602-1674
 See also Sō-tatsu Jap. I. 3. S₂

K Kadzu-nobu fl. sixth century

K₂ Ka-wō, Nen fl. xivth century
 S₄ Shiū-bun, Soga fl. xvth century

 S₅ Shin-sō (Sō-a-mi) fl. xvith century
 S₆ Sō-tan fl. xvith century

 I I-fu-kiū [A Chinese Immigrant] fl. xviiith century
 T Tai-ga-dō 1722-1775

 C Chiku-den 1777-1835

K Kei-shōki fl. late xvth century
 S₄ Sōyen fl. late xvth century

 R Riō-kai fl. xvith century
 S₃ Sei-mo fl. xvith century
 S₆ Settei fl. xvith century
 S₇ Shiu-kō fl. xvith century
 T₂ Tō-gan fl. xvith century

G Gioku-raku fl. xvith century
 K₂ Kai-hoku 1534-1617
 N Naga-mitsu fl. xvith century
 Y Yuki-nobu (Uta-no-suké) 1513-1575
 Y₂ Yei-toku 1545-1592

 M₃ Mori-kagé fl. xviiith century
 N₂ Nao-nobu 1603-1650
 R Ritsu-wō fl. xviiith century
 S₃ Shō-kwa-dō 1582-1639
 T₂ Tsuné-nobu 1636-1713
 Y₃ Yasu-nobu 1613-1685

 M₄ Michi-nobu fl. xviiith century

III.—INDIVIDUAL TENDENCIES IN JAPANESE ART SINCE THE EARLY

| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| THE POPULAR SCHOOL (Ukiyo-yé Riu) | | THE KŌ-RIN SCHOOL | | THE SHIJŌ SCHOOL | |
| M | Mata-hei fl. 1600 | | | | |
| M ₂ | Moro-nobu, Hishi-gawa ?-1711 | K | Kō-rin 1660-1716 | | |
| C | Chō-kō, Taga (Itchō) 1651-1724 | | | | |
| M ₃ | Mori-kuni 1670-1748 | | | | |
| K | Kiyo-naga fl. 1765-1780 | | | | |
| K ₂ | Katsu-gawa Shun-shō fl. 1765-1785 | H | Hō-itsu fl. xviiiith century | O | Ō-kio 1733-1795 |
| | | | | G | Gen-ki 1751-1798 |
| | | | | G ₂ | Gekkei (Go-shun) 1742-1811 |
| | | | | H | Ho-yen fl. late xviiiith century |
| | | | | S | So-sen 1747-1821 |
| II | Hoku-sai 1760-1849 | | | K | Keibun 1780-1844 |
| I | I-sai fl. 1860-1870 | | | S ₂ | Shō-Gaku fl. sixth century |
| K ₃ | Kiō-sai 1831- | | | T | Tessan (Mori) fl. sixth century |
| | | | | Y | Yō-sai 1787-1878 |
| | | | | I | Ippo (Mori) fl. sixth century |
| M ₄ | Masa-taka fl. xviiiith century | | | | |
| M ₅ | Moro-fusa fl. xviiiith century | | | | |
| T | Tō-shiu-ki fl. xviiiith century | | | | |
| B | Bun-cho, Ippitsu-sai fl. xviiiith century | | | | |
| C ₂ | Chiu-wa fl. xviiiith century | | | | |
| G | Gō-kan 1747-1818 | | | | |
| H ₂ | Haru-nobu fl. xviiiith century | | | R | Ro-setsu 1755-1799 |
| K ₄ | Kiyo-nobu (Shō-bei) fl. xviiiith century | | | T ₂ | Tō-rei fl. xviiiith century |
| H ₃ | Han-bei, Shō-kō-sai fl. 1800 | H ₂ | Hō-ni fl. early sixth century | G ₃ | Gi-tō 1780-1819 |
| II ₄ | Hiro-shigé 1797-1858 | | | O ₂ | Ō-shin 1791-1840 |
| K ₅ | Katsu-gawa Shun-chō fl. 1810 | K ₂ | Ki-itsu ?-1858 | O ₃ | Oka-moto Hōken (Toyō-hiko) 1768-1845 |
| K ₆ | Kei-sai Yei-sen fl. sixth century | | | S ₃ | Shiū-hō fl. sixth century |
| U | Uta-marō fl. 1800 | | | Z | Zai-chiu ?-1837 |

| SEVENTEENTH CENTURY 4 | | CHINA | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| THE GAN-KU OR KISHI SCHOOL | | BRIEF LIST OF IMPORTANT CHINESE PAINTERS WHOSE ART INFLUENCED THAT OF THE JAPANESE | |
| | | First Period | Third Period — 960-1206 |
| | | T Tsao Fuh-hing (Sō-futsu-kō*) fl. iiii century A.D. | L Li Lung-yen (Ri-riu-min or Ri-ko-riu) fl. xith century |
| | | C Chang San-yiu (Chō-sō-yu) fl. vith century A.D. | |
| | | Second Period — 618-960 A.D. | Fourth Period — 1206-ca. 1450 |
| | | H Han Kan (Kan-kan) fl. viiith century | H Hia Kwei (Kakei) fl. xiith century |
| | | W Wu Tao-tsz' (Go Dōshi) fl. viiith century | M Ma Yüen (Ba-yen) fl. xiith century |
| | | W ₂ Wang Wei (Ō-i) fl. viiith century | N Ngan Hwui (Gan-ki) fl. early xiiiith century |
| G R B | Gan-ku (Kishi Dō-kō) 1749-1838 Ren-zan ?-1859 Bun-riu ?-1877 | K Kwoh Hi (Kwakki) fl. xth century | L ₂ Lin Liang (Rin-riō) fl. xvth century |
| | | * The Japanese names for Chinese artists are added in parentheses. | |
| B ₂ | Bum-pei (Matsu-moto) fl. sixth century | | |
| B ₃ | Bum-pō fl. sixth century | | |
| G ₂ | Gan-tai 1793-1863 | | |



OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF PAINTING

PART TWO

LIST OF ARTISTS AND
PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY

NOTE

No elaborate system of diacritical signs has been employed in this List of Artists, because people who command a knowledge of foreign tongues have no need of a pronouncing key, and those who lack it are best served by simple transliterations. Names which in their proper spelling suggest the correct sounds fairly accurately are not transliterated. Russian and Japanese names are commonly spelled as they are intended to be pronounced. For Russian names the advice of Professor Wiener has been followed, and for Japanese names that of Mr. Morimoto. In the transliterations of French and Belgian names accents are not marked, because in French there is no decided stress on any one syllable. Neither long nor short vowels are marked where there seems to be little danger of misunderstanding.

The values of the letters in the transliterations are as follows :

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>ä as in father. ā " " äle. ě " " bět. ē " " hē. ĭ " " ĭt. ī " " fīne. ō " " shōrt (never as in hōt). ō " " hōle. ou " " house. oo as ū in rŭle, or oo in boot. ů as in fŭll (never as in bŭt).</p> | <p>ch as in chin. ĝ { as in garden. This letter appears dotted (ğ̣) wherever there seems to be danger of pro- nouncing it soft, as in gem. j as in joke. s " " sand. th " " thou (never as in thin). y " " yard. It is always a consonant, even at the end of a word, and never a vowel, as in fully.</p> |
|---|--|

The following letters indicate sounds which have no equivalents in English.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>å is Danish sound similar to English aw in paw. ö is pronounced like French eu in deux, or German ö in Höhe. ü is pronounced like French u in tu, or German ü in Tür. ä-oo is a Dutch sound similar to ou in house, with the emphasis on the oo sound.</p> | <p>čj (German characters for ch) is pronounced like the Scotch ch in loch, or like the German ch in ach or in ich. The various fine distinctions in the pronunciation of this sound have not been marked. ñ at the end of a syllable gives the preceding vowel a nasal sound, but the n itself is not pronounced. ž is pronounced similar to z in azure.</p> |
|--|--|

LIST OF ARTISTS

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-----------------|-------|---|---------------|-------|
| Aachen (Achen), Hans von (ä'čfen) | 1562-1615 | 7 | Alunno, Niccolo (Niccolo da Foligno) | | |
| Abbate, Niccolò dell' (äbbä'tä) | 1512-1570 | 4 | (älün'no) | 1430-1502 | 3 |
| Abbey, Edwin A. | 1852- | 23 | Álvarez, Luis (äl'värëth) | 1841-1901 | 17 |
| Abel de Pujol, Alexandre Denis (äbël dü püjöl) | 1785-1861 | 19 | Alvise, see Vivarini, Luigi | | |
| Abildgård, Nicolai Abraham (ä'bïlgär) | 1742-1809 | 26 | Amalteo, Pomponio (ämältä'o) | 1505-1584 | 5 |
| Aachen, see Aachen | | | Aman-Jean, Edmond (ämän-žän) | 1856- | 20 |
| Aachenbach, Andreas (ä'čfënbäčf) | 1815- | 9 | Amberger, Christoph (äm'bërgër) | fl. 1530-1561 | 7 |
| Aachenbach, Oswald (ä'čfënbäčf) | 1827- | 9 | Amérigo, Francisco (ämë'rigo) | - | 17 |
| Adam, Albrecht (ä'däm) | 1786-1862 | 9 | Amerling, Friedrich | 1803-1887 | 9 |
| Adam, Denovan (ä'däm) | 1842-1896 | 21 | Ames, Joseph | 1816-1872 | 22 |
| Adam, Franz (ä'däm) | 1815-1886 | 9 | Amigoni, Jacopo (ämïgö'në) | 1675-1752 | 5 |
| Aeken, Hieronymus van (ä'kën), see Bosh | | | Amsterdam, Jacob van, see Cornelisz | | |
| Aelst, Evert van (älst) | 1602-1658 | 14 | Ancher, Mrs. Anna (née Brondum) (än'čjër) | 1859- | 26 |
| Aelst, Willem van (älst) | 1620-1679 | 14 | Ancher, Michael Peter (än'čjër) | 1849- | 26 |
| Aertszen, Pieter (ä'rtsen) | 1507-1573 | 13 | Anderson, Nils | 1817-1865 | 25 |
| Agache, Alfred Pierre (ägäsh) | 1843- | 20 | Andrea da Firenze (ändrä'ä dä fëren'tsā) fl. 1380 | | 2 |
| Aimé-Morot (ämā-moro), see Morot, Aimé | | | Andrea da Florentia, see Andrea da Firenze | | |
| Ai-mi | fl. xth century | 27 | Andrea da Salerno (Sabbatini) (ändrä'ä dä sälër'nō) | 1480-1545 | 4 |
| Ajvazovski, see Ayvazoski | | | Andrea Michieli, called Vicentino, see Michieli | | |
| Akimov, Ivan Akimovich (ä'kïmov) | 1764-1814 | 24 | Andreotti, Federico (ändräöt'të) | 1847- | 6 |
| Albani, Francesco (älbänë) | 1578-1660 | 5 | Andri (än'drë) | - | 9 |
| Albertinelli, Mariotto (älbërtinël'lë) | 1474-1515 | 4 | Anemolo, see Aniemolo | | |
| Aldegrevier, Heinrich (äl'dëgrävër) | 1502-1558 | 7 | Angelico, Fra (Giovanni da Fiesoli, Guido di Piero) (änjël'liko) | 1387-1455 | 3 |
| Aleksyeev, Fedor Jakovlevich (älë'xyäff) | 1755-1824 | 24 | Angermeyer, Johann Albert (än'gërmjër) | 1674-1740 | 8 |
| Alemanno, see Justus de Allamagna | | | Angrand, Charles (ängrän) | 1854- | 20 |
| Alemannus, Giovanni (älëmän'nūs) | fl. 1444-1451 | 3 | Anguisiola, Sofonisba (ängwïshō'lä) | 1535-1622 | 4 |
| Aleni, Tommaso, called Il Fadino (älänë) fl. 1500-1515 | | 4 | Aniemolo (Anemolo, Ainemolo), Vincenzo (änïä'molo) | -1540 | 5 |
| Alesio (Allecio), Matteo Terey (älë'thïo) | 1547-1600 | 17 | Anquetin (änkëtëtü) | | 20 |
| Alexander, Francis | 1800-1880 | 22 | Ansano (Sano) di Pietro di Mencio (änsänō) | 1405-1481 | 3 |
| Alexander, John W. | 1856- | 23 | Ansdell, Richard | 1815-1885 | 21 |
| Alexeyev, see Aleksyeev | | | Anselmi, Michelangelo (änsël'më) | 1491-1554 | 4 |
| Alfaro y Gámez, Juan (äl'fä'ro ë gä'mëth) | 1640-1680 | 17 | Antigna, Jean Pierre Alexandre (äntënyä) | 1818-1878 | 19 |
| Aligny, Claude François Théodore Car- nelle d' (älïnyë) | 1798-1871 | 19 | Antolínez, José (äntölë'nëth) | 1639-1676 | 17 |
| Allan, David | 1744-1796 | 21 | Antonello da Messina (äntönël'lo dä mës- së'nä) | 1444-1493 | 3 |
| Allan, Sir William | 1782-1850 | 21 | Antonello da Saliba (äntönël'lo dä sälë'bä) | 1490- | 3 |
| Allebé, August (ällëbä) | 1838- | 16 | Antonio da Canale, see Canaletto, Il | | |
| Allecio, see Alesio | | | Antonio da Murano (Vivarini, Antonio) (äntönïo dä moorä'no) | ?-1470 | 3 |
| Allegrì, Antonio, see Correggio | | | Antonio Veneziano (äntönïo vänätsiä'no) | 1312-1388 | 2 |
| Allegrì, Pomponio (ällä'grë) | 1521-1593 | 4 | Antropov, Aleksyey Petrovich (än'tropoff) | 1716-1795 | 24 |
| Allen, Thomas | 1849- | 23 | Apol, Lodewijk Franciscus Hendrik (ä'pol) | 1850- | 16 |
| Allori, Alessandro (ällörë) | 1535-1607 | 5 | Appiani, Andrea (äppiänë) | 1754-1817 | 6 |
| Allori, Cristofano (ällörë) | 1577-1621 | 5 | | | |
| Allston, Washington | 1779-1843 | 22 | | | |
| Alma-Tadema, Laurenz (äl'mä-tädämä) | 1836- | 21 | | | |
| Alovigi, see Ingegno, L' | | | | | |
| Alsloot, Denys van (äl'slöt) | fl. 1599-1630 | 11 | | | |
| Altdorfer, Albrecht | 1480-1538 | 7 | | | |
| Altichiero da Zevio (ältëkëärō) | fl. 1350 | 2 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------|-------|---|-----------------------|-------|
| Appiani, Francesco (äppiä'nē) | 1704-1792 | 5 | Barlow, John Noble | 1861- | 23 |
| Apt, Ulrich | fl. 1486-1532 | 7 | Barnard, Edward H. | 1855- | 23 |
| Arbo, Nicolai | 1831-1892 | 25 | Barocci, see Baroccio | | |
| Archard, Jean Alexis (ärshär) | 1807- | 20 | Baroccio (Barocci), Federigo (bäröt'chō) | 1528-1612 | 5 |
| Archer, James | 1824- | 21 | Baron, Théodore (bärōñ) | 1840-1899 | 12 |
| Armitage, Edward | 1817-1896 | 21 | Barrias, Félix Joseph (bärreä) | 1822-1905 | 19 |
| Arpino, Cavaliere d', see Cesare, Giuseppe | | | Barry, James | 1741-1806 | 21 |
| Arsenius, Johann Georg (arsä'nūs) | 1818- | 25 | Barse, George R. | 1861- | 23 |
| Artan, Louis | 1837-1890 | 12 | Bartoli, Taddeo (di Bartolo) (bartō'lē) | 1363-1422 | 2 |
| Arthois, Jacques d' (ärtwä) | 1613-1684 | 11 | Bartoli, Taddeo di, see Bartoli, Taddeo | | |
| Artz, David Adolf Constant | 1837-1890 | 16 | Bartolo di Fredi (bärtō'lō) | 1330-1409 | 2 |
| Asam, Cosmas (ä'zäm) | 1686-1742 | 8 | Bartolommeo, Fra (bartolommé'o) | 1475-1517 | 4 |
| Asper, Hans | 1499-1571 | 7 | Bartolommeo, Suardi, see Bramantino | | |
| Aspertini, Amico (äspertē'nē) | 1475-1552 | 4 | Bartolommeo, Veneto (bärtolommé'o) fl. xvth century | | 3 |
| Asselyn, Jan, called Krabbetje (äs'sälīn) | 1610-1660 | 14 | Bartolotti, Antonio (bärtolot'tē) | 1450-1527 | 4 |
| Aubert, Augustin Raymond (öbär) | 1781-1857 | 19 | Basaiti, Marco (bäsäe'tē) | 1450-1521 | 3 |
| Aubert, Ernest Jean (öbär) | 1824- | 19 | Bashkirtsev, see Baskirtsheff | | |
| Aublet, Albert (öblä) | 1851- | 20 | Baskirtsheff (Bashkirtsev), Marie | 1860-1884 | 20 |
| Aumonier, M. J. | - | 21 | Bassano, Francesco da Ponte (bässä'no) | 1550-1591 | 4 |
| Avanzi, Jacopo d' (Davanzi), (ävänt'sē) fl. 1375 | | 2 | Bassano, Giovanni Battista da Ponte (bäs-sä'no) | fl. late xvth century | 4 |
| Avanzii, Jacopo degli (ävänt'sē) | fl. 1375 | 2 | Bassano, Girolamo da Ponte (bässä'no) | fl. late xvth century | 4 |
| Ayvazovski, Ivan Constantinovich (äyvä-zovs'kē) | 1817-1900 | 24 | Bassano, Jacopo da Ponte the Elder (bäs-sä'no) | 1510-1592 | 4 |
| Azeglio, Massimo d' (ädzē'lyo) | 1798-1866 | 6 | Bassano, Leandro da Ponte (bässä'no) | 1558-1623 | 4 |
| Baade, Knud (bä'dē) | 1808-1879 | 25 | Bassano, Pedro, see Orrente, Pedro | | |
| Baader, Louis Marie (bädär) | 1828- | 19 | Bastiani, Lazzaro (bästia'nē) | 1450-1508 | 3 |
| Babcock, William | 1825-1899 | 22 | Bastida, Joaquin Sorolta y (bästē'dä) | 1863- | 17 |
| Bacchiacca, Il, see Verdi, Francesco Uber-tini dei (bäkkēäk'kä) | 1494-1557 | 4 | Bastien-Lepage, Jules (bästien-löpäs) | 1848-1884 | 20 |
| Bache, Otto (bä'ðē) | 1839- | 26 | Batoni, Pompeo Girolamo (bätō'nē) | 1708-1787 | 5 |
| Bachelier, Jean Jacques (bähēliä) | 1724-1806 | 18 | Baudoin, Pierre Antoine (bödweñ) | 1723-1769 | 18 |
| Backer, Adriaen (bäk'kēr) | 1636-1686 | 14 | Baudry, Paul (bödrē) | 1828-1886 | 19 |
| Backer, Harriet (bäk'kēr) | 1845- | 25 | Bauer, Nicolaas (bou'er) | 1767-1820 | 16 |
| Backer, Jacob (bäk'kēr) | 1608-1651 | 14 | Baugniet, Charles (bönyä) | 1814- | 12 |
| Backhuisen, Ludolf (bäk'hoizen) | 1631-1708 | 14 | Baum, Paul (boum) | 1859- | 9 |
| Badalocchio, Sisto (bädälök'kió) | 1581-1647 | 5 | Bautzer (bout'sēr) | - | 9 |
| Badile, Antonio (bädē'lä) | 1516-1560 | 4 | Ba-yen, see Ma Yüen | | |
| Baertsoen, Albert (bärt'zoon) | 1865- | 12 | Bazzaro, Leonardo (bätsä'ro) | 1853- | 6 |
| Bagnacavallo, Bartolommeo (bänyäkä-väl'lo) | 1484-1542 | 4 | Beaux, Cecilia (bö) | - | 23 |
| Baker, George A. | 1821-1880 | 22 | Beccafumi, Domenico (bëkkäfoo'mē) | 1486-1551 | 4 |
| Bakhuyzen, Hendrik van de Sande (bäk'-hoizen) | 1795-1860 | 16 | Beccaruzzi, Francesco (bëkkäroot'sē) | fl. 1527-1544 | 4 |
| Bakhuysen, see Backhuisen, Ludolf | | | Becerra, Gaspar (bëthēr'rá) | 1520-1570 | 17 |
| Baldovinetti, Alesso (bäldövenēt'tē) | 1427-1499 | 3 | Becker, Jacob | 1810-1872 | 9 |
| Baldung, Hans (Grien) | 1476-1545 | 7 | Beckwith, J. Carroll | 1852- | 23 |
| Balen, Hendrik van (bäl'lēn) | 1575-1632 | 11 | Beechey, Sir William | 1753-1839 | 21 |
| Bamboccio, see Laar, Pieter van | | | Beerstraaten, A. (bär'strätēn) | fl. after 1650 | 14 |
| Barabino, Niccolò (bäräbē'no) | 1832-1891 | 6 | Beerstraaten, Jan (bär'strätēn) | 1622-1687 | 14 |
| Barau, Émile (bärō) | 1851- | 20 | Bega, Cornelis Pietersz (bägä) | 1620-1664 | 15 |
| Barbalonga, Il, see Vermejen | | | Beham, Barthel (bähäm) | 1502-1540 | 7 |
| Barbarelli, Giorgio, see Giorgione | | | Beham, Hans Sebald (bähäm) | 1500-1550 | 7 |
| Barbari, Jacopo de (bär'bärē) | 1440-1516 | 3 | Beich, Joachim Franz (bēđ) | 1665-1748 | 8 |
| Barbieri, Giovanni Francesco, see Guer-cino, Il | | | Beidemann, Alexander Jegorovich (bī-dēmän) | 1826-1869 | 24 |
| Barend van Brussel, see Orley, Bernaert | | | Beijeren, Abraham van (bī'ären) | 1620-1674 | 14 |
| Barentz, Dirk (Barent, Berendsen) (bä'rents) | 1534-1592 | 13 | Bellangé, Eugène (bëllänžä) | 1837-1895 | 19 |
| Bargue, Charles (bärg) | -1883 | 19 | Bellangé, Hippolyte (bëllänžä) | 1800-1866 | 19 |
| Barker, Thomas | 1769-1847 | 21 | Bellini, Gentile (bëllē'nē) | 1426-1507 | 3 |
| | | | Bellini, Giovanni (bëllē'nē) | 1428-1516 | 3 |
| | | | Bellini, Jacopo (bëllē'nē) | 1400-1464 | 3 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-----------|-------|---|-------------------|-------|
| Bellows, Albert F. | 1830-1883 | 23 | Bisbing, Henry Singlewood | 1849- | 23 |
| Belotto, Bernardo (II Canaletto, the nephew) (bělōt'oto) | 1720-1780 | 5 | Biset, Karel Emanuel (bězā) | 1633-1680 | 11 |
| Beltraffio (Boltraffio), Giovanni Antonio (běl'tráf'fio) | 1467-1516 | 4 | Bisschop, Christoffel (bīs'sčjop) | 1828- | 16 |
| Bembo, Bonifazio | ?-1500 | 3 | Bissolo, Pietro Francesco (bēs'sōlo) | 1464-1528 | 3 |
| Bembo, Gian Francesco | ?-1526 | 3 | Björk, Oscar (byörk) | 1860- | 25 |
| Benczur, Gyula (bent'soor) | 1844- | 9 | Björnson-Möller, Niels (byörn'sen) | - | 25 |
| Bendemann, Eduard | 1811-1889 | 9 | Blackburn, J. B. | 1700-1760 | 22 |
| Bendsz, Vilhelm Ferdinand | 1804-1832 | 26 | Blake, William | 1757-1827 | 21 |
| Benetter, Jacob (běnět'tēr) | 1822- | 25 | Blakelock, Ralph Albert | 1847- | 23 |
| Benjamin-Constant, Jean Joseph (běnjä-měň-koňstän) | 1845- | 20 | Blanche, Jacques Émile | 1861- | 20 |
| Benliure y Gil, José (běnlēoo'rā ē hīl) | 1855- | 17 | Blashfield, Edwin Howland | 1848- | 23 |
| Benouville, Achille (běnoovēl) | 1815-1891 | 19 | Blechen, Karl Eduard (blē'čjēn) | 1798-1840 | 9 |
| Benson, Frank W. | 1862- | 23 | Bles, David | 1821-1899 | 16 |
| Benvenuti, Giovanni Battista, see Ortolano, L' | | | Bles, Henry (Hendrik) de (called also Civetta) | 1480-1550 | 10 |
| Benvenuti, Pietro (běnvėnoo'tē) | 1769-1844 | 5 | Bloch, Karl Heinrich (blok) | 1834-1890 | 26 |
| Benvenuto, see Girolamo di Benvenuto | | | Block, Eugenius Frans de | 1812- | 12 |
| Béraud, Jean (bārō) | 1849- | 20 | Bloemaert, Abraham (bloo'märt) | 1564-1651 | 15 |
| Berchem (Berghem), Claas (Nicolaas) Pietersz (bēr'čjēm) | 1620-1683 | 15 | Bloemaert, Adrian (bloo'märt) | fl. xviih century | 15 |
| Berck-Heyde, Gerrit (běrk-hī'dē) | 1638-1698 | 15 | Bloemaert, Cornelis (bloo'märt) | 1603-1688 | 15 |
| Berck-Heyde, Job (běrk-hī'dē) | 1630-1693 | 15 | Bloemaert, Hendrik (bloo'märt) | fl. xviih century | 15 |
| Berendsen, see Barentz | | | Blommér, Nils Johan (blommār') | 1816-1858 | 25 |
| Berettini, Pietro da Cortona (běrēttē'nē) | 1596-1669 | 5 | Blommers, Bernardus J. | 1845- | 16 |
| Berg, Gunnar | 1863-1893 | 25 | Blondeel, Lancelot (blon'däl) | 1495-1561 | 10 |
| Berge, Charles de la (berč) | 1807-1842 | 19 | Blot, Pieter de (blōt) | ?-1652 | 15 |
| Bergh, Johan Edvard (bārg) | 1828-1880 | 25 | Blum, Robert | 1857-1903 | 23 |
| Bergh, Richard (bārg) | 1858- | 25 | —Boccaccino, Boccaccio (bokkätčē'no) | 1460-1518 | 3 |
| Berghem, see Berchem | | | Bock, Théophile de | - | 16 |
| Berne-Bellecour, Étienne Prosper (běm-bēl'koor) | 1838-1898 | 19 | Bockhorst, Jan van | 1610-1668 | 11 |
| Berruguete, Alonso (běrroogā'tē) | 1480-1561 | 17 | Böcklin, Arnold (böklēn') | 1827-1901 | 9 |
| Berruguete, Pedro (běrroogā'tē) | ?-1504 | 19 | Böcklund, Johan Kristoffer | 1817-1880 | 25 |
| Bertin, Édouard François (běrtēh) | 1797-1871 | 19 | Bocksberger, Hans | 1540- | 7 |
| Bertin, Jean Victor (běrtēh) | 1775-1842 | 19 | Böe, Frans (bō'ē) | 1820- | 25 |
| Bertini, Giuseppe (běrtē'nē) | 1825-1899 | 6 | Bogert, George H. | 1864- | 23 |
| —Besnard, Paul Albert (bānār) | 1849- | 20 | Bogolyubov, Aleksyey | 1824-1896 | 24 |
| Beukelaer, Joachim (bök'ēlār) | ?-1575 | 13 | Bohm, Max | 1868- | 23 |
| Bezzi, Bartolommeo (bēt'sē) | 1851- | 6 | Bol, Ferdinand | 1611-1680 | 14 |
| Bezzuoli, Giuseppe (bětswō'lē) | 1784-1855 | 6 | Bol, Hans | 1534-1593 | 10 |
| Bianchi, Francesco (bēän'kē) | 1447-1510 | 3 | Boldini, Giovanni (boldē'nē) | 1844- | 20 |
| Bianchi, Moïse (bēän'kē) | 1840- | 6 | Boltraffio, see Beltraffio | | |
| Biard, François (bēār) | 1801-1882 | 19 | Bompiani, Roberto (bompīā'nē) | 1821- | 6 |
| Bidault, Xavier (bēdō) | 1745-1813 | 19 | Bonfigli, see Bonfiglio | | |
| Biéfv, Édouard de (bēēf) | 1809-1882 | 12 | Bonfiglio (Bonfigli), Benedetto (bonfēl'yo) | 1425-1496 | 3 |
| Bierstadt, Albert | 1830-1902 | 22 | Bonheur, Auguste (bōnōr) | 1824-1884 | 20 |
| Bigio, Francia, see Franciabigio | | | Bonheur, Rosa (bōnōr) | 1822-1899 | 20 |
| Bigordi, see Ghirlandajo | | | Bonifazio I (Veronese) the Elder (bōnifā'tsio) | 1490-1540 | 4 |
| Bilders, Johannes Warnardus | 1811-1890 | 16 | Bonifazio II (Veronese) the Younger (bōnifā'tsio) | ?-1533 | 4 |
| Bilders-van Bosse, Mrs. | 1837-1900 | 16 | Bonifazio III (Veneziano) (bōnifā'tsio) | 1555-1579 | 4 |
| Billet, Pierre-Célestin (bēyā) | 1836- | 20 | Bonington, Richard Parkes | 1801-1828 | 21 |
| Billotte, René (bēyōtt) | 1846- | 20 | Bonnat, Léon (bonnā) | 1833- | 20 |
| Binck, Jacob | 1490-1569 | 7 | Bonone, Carlo (Carracci of Ferrara) (bō-nō'nā) | 1569-1632 | 5 |
| Binet, Victor Jean Baptiste Barthelemey (bēnā) | 1849- | 20 | Bonsignori, Francesco di Alberto (bonsinyō'rē) | 1455-1519 | 3 |
| Birch, Thomas | 1779-1851 | 22 | Bonvin, François (bonvēn) | 1817-1887 | 20 |
| Birger, Hugo (bīr'gēr) | 1854-1887 | 25 | Bordone, Paris (bordō'nā) | 1500-1570 | 4 |
| | | | Borg, Axel | 1847- | 25 |
| | | | Borgognone, Ambroggio (borgonyō'nā) | 1445-1523 | 3 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|--|---------------------|-------|
| Borgognone, Il, see Courtois, Jacques | | | Brett, John | 1830- | 21 |
| Borovikovsky, Vladimir (bōrov'ikov'skē) | 1758-1826 | 24 | Breu, Jörg (Brew, Prew), (broi) | ?-1536 | 7 |
| Bosboom, Jan (bos'bōm) | 1817-1891 | 16 | Breuil, du, see Dubreuil | | |
| Bosch, Jan (Hieronymus van Aeken) (bōs) | 1460-1516 | 13 | Brew, see Breu | | |
| Boschaert (Boskaert), Thomas (bōs'čhárt) | 1613-1664 | 11 | Bridgman, Frederic Arthur | 1847- | 23 |
| Both, Andries (bōt) | fl. 1640 | 15 | Bril, Matthens | 1550-1584 | 10 |
| Both, Jan (bōt) | 1610-1652 | 15 | Bril, Pauwel | 1554-1626 | 10 |
| Botticelli, Alessandro (bōttiččē'līē) | 1446-1510 | 3 | Brillouin, Louis Georges (brīyooēñ) | 1817- | 19 |
| Botticini, Francesco (bōttiččē'nē) | 1446-1497 | 3 | Brión, Gustave (brēōñ) | 1824-1877 | 20 |
| Boucher, François (booshā) | 1703-1770 | 18 | Bristol, John Bunyan | 1826- | 22 |
| Bouchot, François (booshō) | 1800-1842 | 19 | Broederlam, Melchior (broo'derlām) | fl. 1390 | 10 |
| Boudin, Eugène (boodēñ) | 1825-1898 | 20 | Bronchorst (Bronckhorst), Jan (bron- čhorst) | 1603-1678 | 14 |
| Boughton, George Henry | 1834-1905 | 21 | Bronckhorst, see Bronchorst | | |
| Bouguereau, Mme., see Gardner, Miss E. J. | | | Bronnikov, Fedor | 1827- | 24 |
| Bouguereau, Guillaume Adolphe (boo- gērō) | 1825-1905 | 19 | Bronzino, Agnolo (brontsē'no) | 1502-1572 | 5 |
| Bou langer, Gustave (boolānžā) | 1824-1888 | 19 | Brouwer, Adriaen (brā-oo'wēr) | 1606-1638 | 11 |
| Bou langer, Louis (boolānžā) | 1806-1867 | 19 | Brown, Ford Madox | 1821-1893 | 21 |
| Bou lenger, Hippolyte (boolānžā) | 1838-1874 | 12 | Brown, J. Appleton | 1844-1902 | 23 |
| Boullongne, Bon (boolōny) | 1649-1717 | 18 | Brown, J. G. | 1831- | 23 |
| Boullongne, Jean de, see Valentin, Le | | | Brown, John Lewis | 1829-1890 | 20 |
| Boullongne, Louis the Elder (boolōny) | 1609-1674 | 18 | Brown, Thomas Austen | - | 21 |
| Boullongne, Louis the Younger (bool- ōny) | 1654-1733 | 18 | Brozik, Wenzel (bro'tsik) | 1851- | 9 |
| Bourdichon, Jean (boordīshōñ) | 1457-1521 | 18 | Brueghel, Jan the Elder (Fluweelen, i.e. Velvet Brueghel) (brō'čhél) | 1568-1625 | 10 |
| Bourdon, Sebastien (boordoñ) | 1616-1671 | 18 | Brueghel, Jan the Younger (brō'čhél) | 1601-1677 | 11 |
| Bourguignon, Le, see Courtois, Jacques | | | Brueghel, Peeter the Elder (Boeren, i.e. Peasant Brueghel) (brō'čhél) | 1525-1570 | 10 |
| Bourse, Esaias (bā-oo'rsā) | 1630-? | 14 | Brueghel, Peeter the Younger (Höllén, i.e. Hell Brueghel) (brō'čhél) | 1564-1637 | 11 |
| Bouts, Dierick (Huerbouts, or Dick van Harlem) (bā-oots) | 1410-1475 | 10 | Bruni, Fidelio (broo'nē) | 1800-1875 | 24 |
| Boyer mans, Theodor (bō'jērmāns) | 1620-1678 | 11 | Brusaroci the Elder (Domenico Riccio) (broosāsōr'chē) | 1494-1567 | 4 |
| Bracht, Felix Prosper Eugen (brāčht) | 1842- | 9 | Brusaroci the Younger (Felice Riccio) (broosāsōr'chē) | 1540-1605 | 4 |
| Bradford, William | 1830-1892 | 22 | Brush, George de Forest | 1855- | 23 |
| Braekeleer, Ferdinandus de (brā'kēlār) | 1792-1883 | 12 | Bruyn, Arnold (brün) | fl. 1550 | 7 |
| Braekeleer, Henri de (brā'kēlār) | 1830-1888 | 12 | Bruyn, Barthel the Elder (Bartholomäus) (brün) | 1494-1557 | 7 |
| Bramantino (Bartolommeo Suardi), (brā- māntē'no) | 1450-1526 | 3 | Bruyn, Barthel the Younger (brün) | fl. 1550 | 7 |
| Bramer, Leonard (brā'mēr) | 1596-1667 | 14 | Bruzzi, Stefano (brū'tsē) | - | 6 |
| Bramley, Frank | - | 21 | Bryullov (Brulleau), Karl (brü'l'loff) | 1799-1852 | 24 |
| Brancaccio (brānkāt'chō) | - | 6 | Bugiardini, Giuliano (boo'jārdē'nē) | 1475-1554 | 4 |
| Brand, Christian Hilfgott | 1695-1756 | 8 | Bum-peí (Matsu-moto) | fl. sixth century | 28 |
| Brand, Johann Christian | 1723-1795 | 8 | Bum-pō | fl. sixth century | 28 |
| Brandegge, Robert | - | 23 | Bunce, W. Gedney | 1840- | 23 |
| Brandelius, Gustaf (brandā'liūs) | 1833-1884 | 25 | Bun-chō, Ippitsu-sai | fl. xviiith century | 28 |
| Brandt, Joseph von | 1841- | 9 | Bun-chō (Tani) or Sha-san-rō | 1763-1840 | 27 |
| Brascassat, Jacques Raymond (brākässä) | 1805-1867 | 20 | Bunner, Andrew F. | 1841-1897 | 23 |
| Bray, Jan de (brī) | -1697 | 15 | Bun-riu | ?-1877 | 28 |
| Bray, Salomon de (brī) | 1597-1664 | 15 | Buonconsiglio, Giovanni (Il Marescalco) (boo-ōnkōnsil'yo) | fl. 1497-1550 | 4 |
| Breda, Karl Frederik von (brā'dä) | 1759-1818 | 25 | Burckmair, Hans the Elder (bür'kmīr) | 1473-1531 | 7 |
| Bree, Matthens Ignatius van (brā) | 1773-1839 | 12 | Burckmair, Toman (bür'kmīr) | fl. 1460-1523 | 7 |
| Breenbergh (Brenborch), Bartholomeus (brān'bērd) | 1599-1663 | 14 | Bürkel, Heinrich | 1802-1869 | 9 |
| Breitner, G. H. (brī'tner) | 1857- | 16 | Burne-Jones, Sir Edward | 1833-1898 | 21 |
| Brekelenkam (Breklinkam), Quiryñ (brēč- kēlenkām) | -1668 | 15 | Butin, Ulysse (bü'tēñ) | 1838-1883 | 20 |
| Breklinkam, see Brekelenkam | | | Butler, Elizabeth | 1844- | 21 |
| Brenborch, see Breenbergh | | | Butler, Howard Russell | 1856- | 23 |
| Breton, Émile Adélar (brētōñ) | 1831- | 20 | Buttinone, Bernardino (boottīnō'nā) | 1436-1507 | 3 |
| Breton, Jules Adolphe (brētōñ) | 1827- | 20 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|---|------------------|-------|
| Bylert, Jan van (bī'lért) | 1603-1671 | 15 | Carracci, Agostino (kärät'chē) | 1557-1602 | 5 |
| Byss, Johann Rudolf (biss) | 1660-1738 | 8 | Carracci, Annibale (kärät'chē) | 1560-1609 | 5 |
| Cabanel, Alexandre (kábänél) | 1823-1889 | 19 | Carracci, Francesco (kärät'chē) | 1595-1622 | 5 |
| Cabat, Louis (kábä) | 1812-1893 | 19 | Carracci, Ludovico (kärät'chē) | 1555-1619 | 5 |
| Cagliari, Benedetto (Veronese) (kälyä'rē) | 1538-1598 | 4 | Carracci of Ferrara, see Bonone | | |
| Cagliari, Carletto (Veronese) (kälyä'rē) | 1570-1596 | 4 | Carreño de Miranda, Don Juan (kär-rän'yō) | 1614-1685 | 17 |
| Cagliari, Gabriele (Veronese) (kälyä'rē) | 1568-1631 | 4 | Carriera, Rosalba (kärriä'rä) | 1675-1757 | 5 |
| Cagnacci (Guido Canlassi) (känyä'chē) | 1601-1681 | 5 | Carrière, Eugène (kärriär) | 1849- | 20 |
| Caillebotte (käyböt) | - | 20 | Carstens, Asmus Jacob | 1754-1798 | 8 |
| Calderon, Philip Hermogenes | 1833-1898 | 21 | Casado del Alisal (käsä'do) | 1832-1886 | 17 |
| Caliari, see Cagliari | | | Casanova, Francesco (käsänö'vä) | 1727-1805 | 18 |
| Callcott, Sir Augustus Wall | 1779-1844 | 21 | Casanova y Estorach, Antonio (käsänö'vä) | 1847-1896 | 17 |
| Callet, Antoine François (källä) | 1741-1823 | 18 | Caselli, Cristoforo (käsäl'lē) | fl. 1489-1507 | 4 |
| Callot, Jacques (källö) | 1592-1635 | 18 | Casilear, John W. | 1811-1893 | 22 |
| Caluwaert, see Calvaert | | | Cassatt, Miss Mary | - | 23 |
| Calvaert (Caluwaert), Denis (Dionisio Fiammingo) (kälvärt) | 1540-1619 | 10 | Cassoli, Amos (kässil'le) | 1832-1891 | 6 |
| Cambiaso, Luca, of Genoa (kämbiä'so) | 1527-1585 | 5 | Castagno, Andrea del (kästän'yo) | 1390-1457 | 3 |
| Cameron, D. Y. | - | 21 | Castello (Castelli), Bernardo (kästäl'lo) | 1557-1629 | 5 |
| Cameron, Hugh | 1835- | 21 | Castello, Castellino (kästäl'lo) | 1579-1649 | 5 |
| Campagnola, Domenico (kämpänyö'lä) | 1490-1564 | 4 | Castello, Fabricio (kästäl'yo) | ?-1617 | 17 |
| Campaña, Pedro (Champagne, Pierre) (kämpän'yä) | 1503-1580 | 17 | Castello, Félix (kästäl'yo) | 1602-1656 | 17 |
| Camphausen, Wilhelm (kämp'housen) | 1818-1885 | 9 | Castello, Nicolás Granelo (kästäl'yo) | ?-1593 | 17 |
| Campi, Bernardino (käm'pē) | 1522-1590 | 4 | Castiglione, Giovanni Benedetto (kästil-yö'nä) | 1616-1670 | 5 |
| Campi, Galeazzo (käm'pē) | 1477-1536 | 4 | Castillo, Agustín del (kästäl'yo) | 1565-1626 | 17 |
| Campi, Giulio (käm'pē) | 1500-1572 | 4 | Castillo, Juan de (kästäl'yo) | 1584-1640 | 17 |
| Campriani, Alcesto (kämpriä'nē) | 1848- | 6 | Castillo y Saavedra, Antonio del (kästäl'yo ē sävä'drä) | 1603-1667 | 17 |
| Camuccini, Vincenzo Cavaliere (kämoot-chē'nē) | 1775-1844 | 6 | Catena, Vincenzo (kätä'nä) | 1465-1531 | 3 |
| Canaletto, Il (Antonio da Canale) (känäl'ēt'to) | 1697-1768 | 5 | Cavaliere d'Arpino, see Cesare, Giuseppe | | |
| Canaletto, Il (the nephew) (känäl'ēt'to), see Belotto, Bernardo | | | Cavazzola, see Morando, Paolo | | |
| Candido, see Witte, Peter de | | | Cavedone, Giacomo (kävädö'nä) | 1577-1660 | 5 |
| Canlassi, see Cagnacci | | | Caxés, Eugenio (käxēs') | 1577-1642 | 17 |
| Cano, Alonso (kä'no) | 1601-1667 | 17 | Cazin, Jean Charles (küzēn) | 1841-1901 | 20 |
| Capelle, Jan van der (kápäl'lē) | ?-1680 | 14 | Cazin, Mme. Marie (küzēn) | - | 20 |
| Cappelen, August (káp'pälēn) | 1827-1852 | 25 | Cederström, Gustav Olaf (sä'dērström) | 1845- | 25 |
| Capuccino, Il, see Strozzi, Bernardo | | | Celentano, Bernardo (chälēntiä'no) | 1835-1863 | 6 |
| Caracci, see Carracci | | | Cenni di Pepo, see Cimabue | | |
| Caravaggio, Michelangelo da (käräväd'jö) | 1569-1609 | 5 | Cerezo (Zerezo), Mateo (thērä'tho) | 1635-1675 | 17 |
| Caravaggio, Polidore da (käräväd'jö) | 1490-1543 | 4 | Césanne (sāzän) | - | 20 |
| Carbonero, Moreno (kärbö'nä'ro) | 1860- | 17 | Cesare, Giuseppe (Cavaliere d'Arpino) (chäsä'rē) | 1568-1640 | 5 |
| Carcano, Filippo (kärkä'no) | 1840- | 6 | Cesare da Sesto (chäsä'rē) | 1485-1523 | 4 |
| Carducci (Carduchio), Bartolommeo (kär-doot'chē) | 1560-1608 | 5 | Céspedes, Pablo de (thäs'pēdēs) | 1538-1608 | 17 |
| Carduchio, see Carducci | | | Chalmers, G. Paul | 1836-1878 | 21 |
| Cariani, Giovanni Busi (kärriä'nē) | 1480-1541 | 4 | Champagne, Philippe de (shänpän) | 1602-1674 | 18 |
| Carlandi, Onorato (kärän'dē) | 1848- | 6 | Champagne, Pierre, see Campaña | | |
| Carloni, Giambattista (kärilö'nē) | 1594-1680 | 5 | Champmartin, Charles Émile (shänmartēn) | 1797-1883 | 19 |
| Carloni, Giovanni (kärilö'nē) | 1591-1630 | 5 | Chang Sang-yiu (Chō-sō-yu) | fl. vith century | 28 |
| Carlotto, see Loth, Johann Karl | | | Chaplin, Charles Joshua (shäplēn) | 1825-1891 | 20 |
| Carlsen, Emil | 1848- | 23 | Chapman, Carlton T. | 1860- | 23 |
| Carnevale, Fra (kärnévä'lē) | fl. 1456 | 3 | Chardin, Jean Baptiste Siméon (shärdēn) | 1699-1779 | 18 |
| Carolus Duran (Charles Auguste Émile Durand) (kärölüs-dürän) | 1837- | 20 | Charlet, Nicolas Toussaint (shärlä) | 1792-1845 | 19 |
| Caroto, Giovan Francesco (kärö'to) | 1470-1546 | 3 | Chase, William Merritt | 1849- | 23 |
| Carpaccio, Vittore (kärpä'chö) | 1440-1522 | 3 | Chassériau, Théodore (shässäriö) | 1819-1856 | 19 |
| | | | Chastel, du, see Duchatel | | |
| | | | Chattel, Fredericus Jacobus van Rossun du (djät'täl) | 1856- | 16 |
| | | | Chavet, Victor Joseph (shävä) | 1822- | 19 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-------------------|-------|--|-------------------|-------|
| — Checa, Ulpiano (chā'kā) | 1890- | 17 | Colman, Samuel | 1833- | 23 |
| Chenavard, Paul Joseph (shānāvār) | 1808-1895 | 19 | Conca, Sebastiano (kon'kā) | 1679-1764 | 5 |
| Chialiva, Luigi (kiālē'vā) | - | 6 | Conegliano, see Cima da Conegliano | | |
| Chierici, Gaetano (kiērī'chē) | 1838- | 6 | Coninck, David de | 1636-1687 | 11 |
| Chiku-den | 1777-1835 | 27 | Coninxlo, Gillis van | 1544-1604 | 10 |
| Chintreuil, Antoine (shēntrōy) | 1814-1873 | 20 | Coninxlo, Jan van | 1489-? | 10 |
| Chirico, Giacomo di (kīrī'ko) | 1845- | 6 | Constable, John | 1776-1837 | 21 |
| Chistyakov, Pavel | 1832- | 24 | Contarini, Giovanni, Cavaliere (kontārē'nē) | 1549-1605 | 4 |
| Chiu-wa, Nishi-mura | fl. xviii century | 28 | Conti, Bernardino dei (kon'tē) | fl. 1490 | 4 |
| Chō Densu (Mei-chō) (the Fra Angelico of Japan) | 1351-1427 | 27 | Conti, Tito (kon'tē) | 1847- | 6 |
| Chodowiecki, Daniel Nicolaus (chōdōvē- ēk'kē) | 1726-1801 | 8 | Cooke, Edward William | 1811-1880 | 21 |
| Chō-ga, Takuma (Chōga Hōin) | fl. xiith century | 27 | Copley, John Singleton | 1737-1815 | 22 |
| Chō-kō, Taga (Itchō, Hanabusa) | 1651-1724 | 28 | Coques (Cocx), Gonzales (koks) | 1618-1684 | 11 |
| Chō-sō-yu, see Chang Sang-yiu | | | Corbett, M. R. | -1902 | 21 |
| Christensen, Godfred | 1845- | 26 | Corelli, Augusto (korē'lē) | 1855- | 6 |
| Church, Frederick Edwin | 1826-1900 | 22 | Corinth, Ludwig (kōrint') | 1858- | 9 |
| Church, Frederick Stuart | 1842- | 23 | Cormon, Fernand, called Piestre (kormōn) | 1845- | 20 |
| Cignani, Carlo, Count (chīnyā'nē) | 1628-1719 | 5 | Cornelisz, Jacob (Oostsaanen van Amster- dam) | 1475-1560 | 13 |
| Cima da Conegliano (chē'mā dā konēlyā'no) | 1460-1517 | 3 | Cornelisz, Cornelis, van Harlem | 1562-1638 | 13 |
| — Cimabue, Giovanni (Cenni di Pepo) (chē- mäboo'ā) | 1240-1302 | 2 | Cornelius, Peter von (kornā'līūs) | 1783-1867 | 9 |
| Cione, Andrea di, see Orcagna | | | Corot, Jean Baptiste Camille (korō) | 1796-1875 | 20 |
| Ciradi, Guglielmo (chār'dē) | - | 6 | Correa, Diego (korrā'ā) | fl. xvith century | 17 |
| Ciseri, Antonio (chīsār'rē) | 1821-1891 | 6 | — Correggio (Antonio Allegri) (korrēd'jō) | 1494-1534 | 4 |
| Civerchio, Vincenzo (chēvēr'kiō) | 1470-1540 | 4 | Cortese, Federigo (kortā'sā) | 1829- | 6 |
| Civetta, see Bles, Henry de | | | Cortona, Pietro da, see Berettini | | |
| Claasz, Pieter (Claesz van Harlem) (klās) | 1595-1661 | 15 | Cosimo, Piero di (kō'sīmō) | 1462-1521 | 3 |
| Claesz, see Claasz | | | Cosmé, see Tura, Cosimo | | |
| Claude Lorrain, see Lorrain, Claude | | | Cossa, Francesco (kos'sā) | fl. 1450-1470 | 3 |
| Claus, Émile (klō) | 1781-1840 | 12 | Costa, Lorenzo (kōs'tā) | 1460-1535 | 3 |
| Clausen, George | 1852- | 21 | Cotan, see Sanchez Cotan | | |
| Clays, Paul Jean (klī) | 1819-1900 | 12 | Cotman, John Sell | 1782-1842 | 21 |
| Cleef, Hendrik van (klāf) | ?-1589 | 10 | Cottermole | 1800-1868 | 21 |
| Cleef, Jan van (klāf) | 1646-1716 | 11 | Cottignola, Francesco da, see Zaganelli | | |
| Cleef (Cleve), Joost van (klāf) | fl. 1530-1550 | 10 | Courbet, Gustave (koorbā) | 1819-1878 | 20 |
| Cleef, Marten van (klāf) | ?-1570 | 10 | Courtens, Franz (kā-oor'tens) | 1853- | 12 |
| Clennel, Luke | 1781-1840 | 21 | Courtois, Jacques, named Le Bourguignon (koortwā) | 1621-1676 | 18 |
| Cleve, see Cleef | | | Couse, Eanger Irving | 1866- | 23 |
| Clouet, François (kloo-ā) | 1500-1572 | 18 | Cousin, Jean (koosēn) | 1500-1589 | 18 |
| Clouet, Jehan (kloo-ā) | 1485-1541 | 18 | Couture, Thomas (kootūr) | 1815-1879 | 19 |
| Cobergher (Coerberger) | 1560-1635 | 11 | Cox, David, of Birmingham | 1783-1859 | 21 |
| Cocx, see Coques | | | Cox, David, of London | 1809-1885 | 21 |
| Cockie, see Coxcyen | | | Cox, Kenyon | 1856- | 23 |
| Codde, Pieter | 1610-1660 | 14 | Coxcyen (Cockie), Michiel van, the Elder | 1499-1592 | 10 |
| Coerberger, see Cobergher | | | Coypel, Antoine (kwōpēl) | 1661-1722 | 18 |
| Coello, Claudio (kōēl'yo) | 1635-1693 | 17 | — Coypel, Charles Antoine (kwōpēl) | 1694-1752 | 18 |
| Coello, Sanchez, see Sanchez Coello | | | Coypel, Noel (kwōpēl) | 1628-1707 | 18 |
| Coene, Constantinus (koo'nē) | 1780-1841 | 11 | Cozens, John Robert | 1752-1799 | 21 |
| Coene, Jean Henri de (koo'nē) | 1798-1866 | 12 | Craesbecke, Joost van (krā'sbēkē) | 1606-1662 | 11 |
| Coffin, William Anderson | 1855- | 23 | Craeyer, Caspar de (krī'er) | 1582-1669 | 11 |
| Coghetti, Francesco (kogēt'tē) | 1804-1875 | 6 | Cranach, Lucas, the Elder (krā'nāč) | 1472-1553 | 7 |
| Cogniet, Léon (kōnyā) | 1794-1880 | 19 | Cranach, Lucas, the Younger (krā'nāč) | 1515-1586 | 7 |
| Cole, J. Foxcroft | 1837-1892 | 23 | Crandall, Joseph | 1860- | 21 |
| Cole, Thomas | 1801-1848 | 22 | Crane, R. Bruce | 1857- | 23 |
| Cole, Vicat | 1833-1893 | 21 | Crane, Walter | 1845- | 21 |
| Coleman, Charles Caryl | 1840- | 23 | Crawford, Edmund Thornton | - | 21 |
| Collantes, Francisco (kolyān'tēs) | 1599-1656 | 17 | Crawhall, Joseph | 1860- | 21 |
| Collins, William | 1788-1847 | 21 | Credi, Lorenzo di (krā'dē) | 1459-1537 | 3 |
| | | | Cremona, Tranquillo (krēmō'nā) | -1878 | 6 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|---|-----------|-------|
| Crespi, Daniele (krēs'pē) | 1590-1630 | 5 | Delleani, Lorenzo (dēllāā'nē) | 1840- | 6 |
| Creswick, Thomas | 1811-1869 | 21 | De Longpre, Paul | 1855- | 23 |
| Cristus, Petrus | 1400-1472 | 10 | Denis, Maurice (dōnē) | 1855- | 20 |
| Crivelli, Carlo (krivē'lē) | 1430-1493 | 3 | Denner, Balthasar | 1685-1749 | 8 |
| Crome, John the Elder (Old Crome) | 1769-1821 | 21 | Desmarées, see Marées, Georg de | | |
| Crome, John Bernay | 1792-1842 | 21 | Desportes, Alexandre François (dāpōrt) | 1661-1743 | 18 |
| Cropsey, Jaspas F. | 1823-1900 | 22 | Dessar, Louis Paul | 1867- | 23 |
| Cubello, Martinez (kübēl'yo) | - | 17 | Détaille, Édouard (dātāy) | 1848- | 19 |
| Curran, Charles Courtney | 1861- | 23 | Dettmann, Ludwig | 1865- | 9 |
| Currier, J. Frank | 1843- | 23 | Devéria, Eugène (dēvāria) | 1805-1865 | 19 |
| Curzon, Paul Alfred de (kürzōñ) | 1820-1895 | 19 | Devis, Arthur William | 1763-1822 | 21 |
| Cutler, Carl Gordon | 1873- | 23 | Dewey, Charles Melville | 1851- | 23 |
| Cuyp, Aelbert (koip) | 1620-1691 | 14 | Dewing, Thomas W. | 1851- | 23 |
| Cuyp, Benjamin Gerritz (koip) | 1612-1652 | 14 | Dewint (De Wint), Peter | 1784-1849 | 21 |
| Cuyp, Jacob Gerritz (koip) | 1575-1649 | 14 | De. For compound names with de, see also under the initial letter of the second part of the name. | | |
| Daddi, Bernardo (dād'dē) | -1380 | 2 | Diamante, Fra (diāmān'tē) | 1430-1492 | 3 |
| Dagman-Bouveret, Pascal Adolphe Jean (dānyāñ-boovērā) | 1852- | 20 | Diana, Benedetto (diā'nā) | ?-1500 | 3 |
| Dahl, Johan Christian (dāl) | 1788-1857 | 25 | Diaz de la Peña, Narciso Virgilio (dēā dē lä pēnyā) | 1808-1876 | 20 |
| Dahl, Johannes Siegwald (dāl) | 1827- | 25 | Dickson, Mary Estelle | - | 23 |
| Dahlström, Karl Andreas (dāl'ström) | -1869 | 25 | Diepenbeeck (dē'pēnbāk) | 1596-1675 | 11 |
| Daingerfield, Elliot | 1859- | 23 | Dietrich, Christian (dētrīd) | 1712-1774 | 8 |
| Dalbono, Eduardo (dālbō'no) | 1843- | 6 | Diez, Wilhelm von (dēts') | 1839- | 9 |
| Dall'Oca Bianca, Agnolo(dāl-ō'kā bēāñ'kā) | - | 6 | Dill, Ludwig | 1846- | 9 |
| Dalsgård, Christen (dāl'sgār) | 1824- | 26 | Dillens, Adolf | 1821-1877 | 12 |
| Damoye, Pierre Emmanuel (dāmwā) | 1847- | 20 | Dionisio Fiamningo, see Calvaert | | |
| Dana, W. P. W. | 1833- | 23 | Diriks, Karl Edvard | 1855- | 25 |
| Danhauser, Joseph (dāñ'hōuzēr) | 1805-1845 | 9 | Dissen, Andreas Edvard | 1844- | 25 |
| Dannat, William T. | 1853- | 23 | Dodge, W. de L. | 1867- | 23 |
| Dantan, Joseph Édouard (dāntāñ) | 1848-1897 | 20 | Does, Jacob van der (doos) | 1623-1673 | 14 |
| Da-soku-ken, see San-setsu | | | Dō-kō, Kishi, see Gan-ku | | |
| Daubigny, Charles François (dōbēnyē) | 1817-1878 | 20 | Dolci, Carlo (dōl'chē) | 1616-1686 | 5 |
| Dauphin, Eugène (dōfēñ) | 1857- | 20 | Domenichino (Domenico Zampieri) (dō-mēnikē'no) | 1581-1641 | 5 |
| Davanzi, see Avanzi | | | Domenico di Bartolo (dōmēnē'ko) | ?-1444 | 3 |
| David, Gheeraerd (dā'vīd) | 1450-1523 | 10 | Domenico Veneziano (dōmēnē'ko) | 1390-1461 | 3 |
| David, Louis (dāvēd) | 1748-1825 | 19 | Domingo, Francisco | 1842- | 17 |
| Davies, Arthur B. | - | 23 | Donoho, Gaines Ruger | 1857- | 23 |
| Davis, Charles Harold | 1856- | 23 | Doré, Gustave Paul (dōrā) | 1833-1883 | 19 |
| Dawson, Henry | 1811-1878 | 21 | Dosso Dossi, Giovanni | 1479-1542 | 4 |
| Dearth, Henry Golden | 1863- | 23 | Dou, Gerard (Douw, Dov, Dow) (dā'oo) | 1613-1675 | 15 |
| Debrosses, Jean (dābross) | 1835- | 20 | Doughty, Thomas | 1793-1856 | 22 |
| Decaisne, Henri (dēkāñ) | 1799-1852 | 12 | Douglas, William Fettes | 1822-1891 | 21 |
| De Camp, Joseph R. | 1858- | 23 | Douw, Dov, Dow, see Dou | | |
| Decamps, Alexandre Gabriel (dēkāñ) | 1803-1860 | 19 | Doyen, Gabriel François (dōwēñ) | 1726-1806 | 18 |
| Decker, Cornelis Gerritsz | 1600-1678 | 15 | Dreber, see Franz-Dreber | | |
| Deelen, Dirk van (dā'lēñ) | 1607-1673 | 15 | Drooch-Sloot, Joost Cornelisz (drōd)slōt) | ?-1666 | 15 |
| Defregger, Franz von (dē'frēgēr) | 1835- | 9 | Drouais, François Hubert (drooā) | 1727-1775 | 18 |
| Degas, Hilaire Germain (dāgā) | 1834- | 20 | Drouais, Germain Jean (drooā) | 1763-1788 | 19 |
| De Haas, Mauritz Frederic Hendrik | 1832-1895 | 22 | Dubbels, Hendrik (dōb'bēls) | 1620-1676 | 14 |
| De Haas, see Haas, de | | | Dubois, Guillam (dübwā) | ?-1680 | 15 |
| De Haven, Frank | 1856- | 23 | Dubois, Louis (dübwā) | 1830-1880 | 12 |
| De Jonghe, see Jonghe, de | | | Dubois, Paul (dübwā) | 1829-1905 | 20 |
| Delacroix, Eugène (dēlākřwā) | 1799-1863 | 19 | Dubreuil (Du Breuil), Toussaint (dübrōy) | 1561-1602 | 18 |
| Delaroche, Paul (dēlārosh) | 1797-1856 | 19 | Duc; Duc, Le; Duck, van, see Duck | | |
| Delaunay, Jules Élie (dēlōnā) | 1828-1892 | 20 | Duccio di Buoninsegna (doot'chō) | 1260-1339 | 2 |
| Delft, see Delft | | | Duchatel (du Chastel), Frans (düshätēl) | 1616-1694 | 11 |
| Delft (Delft), Jacob Willemszen (dē'lēft) | 1550-1601 | 13 | Duck (Duc, Le Duc, Van Duck) A. J. fl. | 1630-1650 | 14 |
| Delft (Delft), Jacobus (dē'lēft) | 1619-1661 | 14 | | | |
| Delft (Delft), Willem Jacobsz (dē'lēft) | 1580-1638 | 14 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|--|-------------------|-------|
| Duez, Ernest (düä) | 1843-1896 | 20 | Exner, Johann Julius (ĕ'ksner) | 1825- | 26 |
| Dughet, see Poussin, Gaspard | | | Exter, Julius | 1863- | 9 |
| Dujardin, Karel (düjärdĕn) | 1625-1678 | 14 | Eyck, Hubert van (ĭk) | -1426 | 10 |
| Du Mond, Frank Vincent | 1865- | 23 | Eyck, Jan van (ĭk) | 1381-1440 | 10 |
| Dumoulin (dümoolĕn) | - | 20 | | | |
| Dünwegge, Heinrich (dünvĕg'ĕĕ) | 1520- | 7 | Faber du Faur, Otto von (fä'ber dü fŏr') | 1828-1901 | 9 |
| Dünwegge, Victor (dünvĕg'ĕĕ) | fl. 1520 | 7 | Fabriano, Gentile da (fäbrĭä'no) | 1360-1428 | 3 |
| Dupré, Jules (düprä) | 1812-1889 | 20 | Fabritius, Bernart | 1620-1669 | 15 |
| Dupré, Julien (düprä) | 1851- | 20 | Fabritius, Karel | 1624-1654 | 14 |
| Durand, Asher Brown | 1796-1886 | 22 | Fadino, Il, see Aleni | | |
| Durand, Charles Auguste Émile, see Carolus Duran | | | Faed, John | 1820- | 21 |
| Dürer, Albrecht | 1471-1528 | 7 | Faed, Thomas | 1826-1900 | 21 |
| Dürer, Hans | 1490-? | 7 | Fagerlin, Ferdinand (fä'ĕrlĕn) | 1825- | 25 |
| Dusart, Cornelis (dü'zärt) | 1660-1704 | 15 | Fahlkrantz, Karl Johan | 1774-1861 | 25 |
| Duveneck, Frank | 1848- | 23 | Faistenberger, see Feistenberger | | |
| Duwett, Johann, see Wet, Jan de | | | Falconetto, Giovanni Maria (fä'konĕt'to) | 1458-1534 | 3 |
| Duyster, Willem Cornelisz (dois'tĕr) | 1599-1635 | 14 | Fantin-Latour, Henri (fäntĕn-lätöor) | 1836- | 20 |
| Dyce, William | 1806-1864 | 21 | Fa-Presto, see Giordano | | |
| Dyck, Antoon van (Sir Anthony van Dyck) (dik) | 1599-1641 | 11 | Farinati, Battista (fä'rinä'tĕ) | 1532-1592 | 4 |
| Dyck, Philip van (dik) | 1683-1753 | 15 | Farinati, Paolo (fä'rinä'tĕ) | 1524-1606 | 4 |
| Dyckmans, Joseph Laurens (the Belgian Gerard Dow) (dik'mäns) | 1811- | 11 | Fattore, Il, see Penni, Francesco | | |
| | | | Fattori, Giovanni, Cavaliere (fä'ttŏ'rĕ) | 1828- | 6 |
| Eakins, Thomas | 1844- | 23 | Fauvelet, Jean (fŏvĕlä) | 1818- | 19 |
| Earl, Ralys | 1751-1801 | 22 | Favretto, Giacomo (fävrĕt'to) | 1849-1887 | 6 |
| East, Alfred | 1849- | 21 | Feamley, Thomas | 1802-1842 | 25 |
| Eastlake, Sir Charles Lock | 1793-1865 | 21 | Fedotov, Pavel (fĕ'dotof) | 1815-1852 | 24 |
| Eaton, Charles Warren | 1857- | 23 | Feistenberger, Anton (fis'tĕnbĕrgĕr) | 1678-1722 | 8 |
| Eaton, Wyatt | 1849-1896 | 23 | Feistenberger, Joseph (fis'tĕnbĕrgĕr) | 1684-1735 | 8 |
| Eckersberg, Christoffer Vilhelm | 1783-1853 | 26 | Feke, Robert | 1724-1769 | 22 |
| Eckersberg, Johann Frederik | 1822-1870 | 25 | Fernández y Baldenes (fĕrnän'dĕth ĕ bäl- dä'nĕs) | | 17 |
| Eckström, Per | - | 25 | Fernández Vasco (i.e. the Great) (fĕrnän'- dĕth väs'ko) | 1552-? | 17 |
| Eddelien, Matthias (äd'dĕlĕn) | 1803-1852 | 26 | Ferragutti, Arnaldo (fĕrrägüt'tĕ) | 1862- | 6 |
| Edelfelt, Albert (ä'dĕlfĕlt) | 1854-1905 | 25 | Ferrari, Defendente (fĕrrä'rĕ) | fl. 1525 | 4 |
| Edridge, Henry | 1769-1821 | 21 | Ferrari, Gaudenzio (fĕrrä'rĕ) | 1481-1547 | 4 |
| Eeckhout, Gerbrand van den (äk'hä'oot) | 1621-1674 | 14 | Ferri, Ciro (fĕr'rĕ) | 1634-1689 | 5 |
| Eeckhout, Jacob Joseph (äk'hä'oot) | 1793-1861 | 16 | Feselen, Melchior (fĕzä'lĕn) | ?-1538 | 7 |
| Egenes (ä'ĕĕnĕs), see Ekenaes | | | Feuerbach (foi'ĕrbäĕ) | 1829-1880 | 6 |
| Eguiquipa (ägikĕ'pä) | - | 17 | Fiant, Émile (fĕän) | 1863- | 20 |
| Ekenaes, Jahn (ĕ'kĕnäs) | 1847- | 25 | Fictours, Jan, see Victors, Jan | | |
| Eliasz, Nicolas (älĕ'äs) | 1590-1646 | 14 | Fielding, Vandyke Copley | 1787-1855 | 21 |
| Elliot, Charles L. | 1812-1868 | 22 | Filippini, Francesco, of Brescia (filĭp- pĕ'nĕ) | 1853-1895 | 6 |
| Elzheimer (Elsheimer), Adam (ĕlts'hĭmer) | 1574-1620 | 8 | Fiore, Jacobello del (fĕŏ'rä) | fl. 1400-1439 | 3 |
| Emmet, Miss Ellen G. | - | 23 | Fiorenzo di Lorenzo (fĕŏrĕnt'sŏ dĕ lö- rĕnt'sŏ) | 1444-1521 | 3 |
| Ender, Axel | 1853- | 25 | Firle, Walter (fir'lä) | 1859- | 9 |
| Ender, Johann | 1793-1854 | 9 | Fischer, Vincenz (fĭ'shĕr) | 1729-1810 | 8 |
| Ender, Thomas | 1793-1875 | 9 | Fisher, Mark W. | 1841- | 23 |
| Engelbrechtsen, Cornelis | 1468-1533 | 13 | Fitzgerald, Harrington | 1847- | 23 |
| Engelsted, Malthe | 1852- | 26 | Fixter | - | 21 |
| Enhuber, Karl von (ĕn'hoobĕr) | 1811-1867 | 9 | Flandrin, Hippolyte (fländrĕn) | 1809-1864 | 19 |
| Enneking, John J. | 1841- | 23 | Flinck,*Govaert | 1615-1660 | 14 |
| Eskilson, Per | 1820-1872 | 25 | Floris, Frans | 1518-1570 | 10 |
| Essen, Jan van | 1854- | 16 | Fogolino, Marcello (fŏgŏlĕ'no) fl. early xvith century | | 4 |
| Etty, William | 1787-1849 | 21 | Fontana, Lavinia (fontä'nä) | 1552-1614 | 4 |
| Eugen, Prince of Sweden (oigän') | 1865- | 25 | Foppa, Vincenzo, the Elder (fop'pä) | 1455-1492 | 3 |
| Evenepoel, Henri (ä'vĕnĕpool) | - | 12 | Foppa, Vincenzo, the Younger (fop'pä) | fl. xvith century | 4 |
| Everdingen, Allart van | 1621-1675 | 15 | | | |
| Everdingen, Cesar van (of Alkmar) | 1606-1679 | 15 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|--|-----------|-------|
| Forain, J. L. (forēū) | — | 20 | Gabriel, Paul Joseph Constantin (gā'brēēl) | 1828— | 16 |
| Forbes, A. Stanhope | 1837— | 21 | Gaddi, Agnolo (gād'dē) | 1333-1396 | 2 |
| Fortuny y Carbó, Mariano (fortoo'nyī ē kārbō') | 1838-1874 | 17 | Gaddi, Gaddo (gād'dē) | 1239-1312 | 2 |
| Fosberg, Nils | 1842— | 25 | Gaddi, Taddeo (gād'dē) | 1300-1366 | 2 |
| Foster, Ben | 1825-1899 | 23 | Gainsborough, Thomas | 1727-1788 | 21 |
| Fouquet, Jehan (fookā) | 1415-1485 | 18 | Galassi, Galasso (gäläs'sē) | ?-1473 | 3 |
| Fourmois, Théodore (foormwä) | 1814-1871 | 12 | Gallait, Louis (gällā) | 1810-1887 | 12 |
| Fracassini, Cesare (fräkässē'nē) | 1838-1868 | 6 | Gallegos, Fernando (gäl'yā'gōs) | 1475-1550 | 17 |
| Fragiacomo, Pietro (frājākō'mō) | 1856— | 6 | Gallén, Axel (gällän') | — | 25 |
| Fragonard, Jean Honoré (frāgonār) | 1732-1806 | 18 | Gallison, Henry H. | 1850— | 23 |
| Français, François Louis (frānsā) | 1814-1897 | 20 | Gamba, Enrico (gām'bā) | 1831-1883 | 6 |
| Francesca, Piero della (frānchēs'kā) | 1420-1492 | 3 | Gandara, Antonio (gändärā) | 1862— | 20 |
| Francesco da Cottignola, see Zaganelli | | | Gan-ki, see Ngan Hwui | | |
| Francesco da Santacroce (frānchēs'ko dā säntāk'rō'chā) fl. | 1504-1541 | 4 | Gan-ku (Kishi Dō-kō) | 1749-1838 | 28 |
| Franchi, Alessandro (frān'kē) | 1838— | 6 | Gan-tai | 1793-1863 | 28 |
| Francia, Francesco (frān'chā) | 1450-1517 | 3 | Garbo, Raffaellino del | 1466-1524 | 3 |
| Francia, Giacomo di Francesco (frān'chā) | 1486-1557 | 4 | Gardner, Miss E. J. (Mme. Bouguereau) | 1851— | 23 |
| Francia, Giovambattista (frān'chā) | 1533-1575 | 4 | Garofalo, Il (Benvenuto di Piero Tisi) | | |
| Francia, Giulio di Francesco (frān'chā) | 1487-? | 4 | (gārō'fālo) | 1481-1559 | 4 |
| Franciabigio (Bigio) (frān'chābē'jō) | 1482-1525 | 4 | Gassel, Lucas | 1500-1550 | 10 |
| Francken, Ambrosius | 1544-1618 | 10 | Gastaldi, Andrea (gästäl'dē) | 1819-1889 | 6 |
| Francken, Constantyn | 1661-1717 | 11 | Gatti, Bernardo (Bernardino) (Il Sojaro <i>or</i> Sogliaro, i.e. the Copper) (gāt'tē) | 1490-1575 | 4 |
| Francken, Frans, the Elder | 1540-1616 | 10 | Gauermann, Friedrich (gou'ërmän) | 1807-1862 | 9 |
| Francken, Frans, the Younger | 1581-1642 | 11 | Gaugengigl, Ignaz Marcel (gou'gëngëggl) | 1853— | 23 |
| Francken, Frans, the Third (de Rubensche Francken) | 1607-1667 | 11 | Gauld, David | 1866— | 21 |
| Francken, Hans or Jan | 1581-1624 | 10 | Gauley, Robert D. | 1875— | 23 |
| Francken, Hieronymus, the Elder | 1542-1610 | 10 | Gay, Walter | 1856— | 23 |
| Francken, Hieronymus, the Younger | 1578-1623 | 10 | Gebauer, Christian David | 1777-1831 | 26 |
| Francken, Johannes | 1500-? | 10 | Gebhardt, Eduard von | 1838— | 9 |
| Francken, P. H. (H. P.?) fl. | 1650 | 11 | Geeraerts, Martin Joseph (thā'rärts) | 1707-1791 | 11 |
| Francken, Sebastian, see Vrancx | | | Geerarts, Marcus, the Elder (thā'rärts) | ?-1604 | 10 |
| Franz-Dreber, Heinrich (frānts'drā'bēr) | 1822-1875 | 9 | Geerarts, Marcus, the Younger (thā'- rärts) | 1561-1635 | 11 |
| Frass, Leo (L. F.) (frās) fl. | 1502 | 7 | Geertgen van Sint-Jans (thārt'thën) fl. | 1475 | 13 |
| Frédéric, Léon (frādārēk) | 1856— | 12 | Gegerfelt, Vilhelm van (gā'gërfëlt) | 1844— | 25 |
| Fréminet, Martin (frāmīnā) | 1567-1619 | 18 | Gekkei (Matsu-mura), named Go-shun | 1742-1811 | 28 |
| Frère, Édouard (frār) | 1819— | 19 | Gelder, Avert <i>or</i> Aart de (thēl'dēr) | 1645-1727 | 14 |
| Frère, Théodore (frār) | 1815-1888 | 19 | Geldorp, Gortzius (thēl'dorp) | 1533-1618 | 10 |
| Frich, Joachim C. G. (frīk) | 1810-1858 | 25 | Gellée, see Lorrain | | |
| Friedrich, Kaspar David (frēd'rīdī) | 1774-1840 | 9 | Gelli, Edoardo (jē'lē) | 1852— | 6 |
| Fries, Hans (frēs) | 1465-1520 | 7 | Gendron, Auguste (žëndrōn) | 1817-1881 | 19 |
| Frith, William Powell | 1819— | 21 | Genelli, Bonaventura (gëñē'lē) | 1798-1868 | 9 |
| Frithjof-Smith, Carl (frī'chōf) | 1859— | 25 | Genga, Girolamo (jën'gā) | 1476-1551 | 3 |
| Fröhlich, Lorenz (frö'lik) | 1820— | 26 | Gen-ki (Ko-mai Ki <i>or</i> Shi-on) | 1751-1798 | 28 |
| Fromentin, Eugène (fromäntēn) | 1820-1876 | 19 | Gensler, Jacob (gëns'lēr) | 1808-1845 | 9 |
| Fromouth, Charles H. | 1861— | 23 | Gensler, Martin (gëns'lēr) | 1811-1881 | 9 |
| Frothingham, James | 1786-1864 | 22 | Gentileschi, Orazio (jëntilēs'kē) | 1562-1647 | 5 |
| Führich, Josef, Ritter von (fū'rīdī) | 1800-1876 | 9 | Gentz, Wilhelm (gënts) | 1822-1890 | 9 |
| Fujiwara no Nobu-zané (Nabu-zané) | 1177-1265 | 27 | George, Vesper Lincoln | 1865— | 23 |
| Fujiwara no Yoshi-tsuné, see Go-kio-goku | | | Gérard, François Pascal (žārār) | 1770-1837 | 19 |
| Fuller, George | 1822-1884 | 22 | — Géricault, Jean Louis André Théodore (žārīkō) | 1791-1824 | 19 |
| Fuller, Henry B. | 1867— | 23 | Gerini, see Niccolò di Pietro | | |
| Fungai, Bernardino (fūngā'ē) | 1460-1516 | 3 | Gérôme, Jean Léon (žërōm) | 1824-1904 | 19 |
| Furini, Francesco (fūrē'nē) | 1600-1649 | 5 | Gertner, Johan Vilhelm (gërt'nēr) | 1818-1871 | 26 |
| Furse, Charles W. | 1868-1904 | 21 | Gervez, Henri (žërvā) | 1852— | 20 |
| Fuseli, Henry | 1741-1825 | 21 | Gessner, Salomon (gë's'nēr) | 1730-1787 | 8 |
| Fyoll, Konrad (fē'öl) fl. | 1466-1498 | 7 | Ghirlandajo, Benedetto Bigordi (gīr- lāndā'yo) | 1458-1497 | 3 |
| Fyt, Jan (fit) | 1609-1661 | 11 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-------------------|-------|---|---------------|-------|
| Ghirlandajo, Davide Bigordi (ġirländá'yo) | 1452-1525 | 3 | Gossaert, see Mabuse | | |
| Ghirlandajo, Domenico (ġirländá'yo) | 1449-1494 | 3 | Goya y Lucientes, Francisco José de | | |
| Ghirlandajo, Ridolfo Bigordi (ġirländá'yo) | 1483-1561 | 4 | (gō'yā ē lūthyān'tēs) | 1746-1828 | 17 |
| Giampetrino, see Pedrini | | | Goyen, Jan van (ġō'jēn) | 1596-1656 | 15 |
| Gifford, Robert Swain | 1840-1905 | 22 | Gozzoli, Benozzo (gō'tsōlē) | 1424-1498 | 3 |
| Gifford, R. Sandford | 1823-1880 | 22 | Graff, Anton | 1736-1813 | 8 |
| Gigoux, Jean François (ġēgōo) | 1806- | 19 | Graham, Peter | 1836- | 21 |
| Gillot, Claude (ġilyō) | 1673-1722 | 18 | Graham, Thomas | - | 21 |
| Gilsoul, Victor (ġil'sā-ool) | - | 12 | Gran, Daniel (grān) | 1694-1757 | 8 |
| Giltlinger, Gumpolt (ġilt'lingēr) | 1460-1522 | 7 | Granacci, Francesco (grānā'chē) | 1477-1543 | 4 |
| Gimignano, Vincenzo da San (ġiminyā'no), see Vincenzo | | | Grandi, Ercole di Giulio (grāndē) | 1462-1531 | 3 |
| Gioku-raku | fl. xvith century | 27 | Grandi, Ercole di Roberti (grāndē) | fl. 1475-1496 | 3 |
| Giordano, Luca (Fa-Presto) [of Naples] (jōrdā'no) | 1632-1705 | 5 | Granet, François-Marius (grānā) | 1775-1849 | 19 |
| Giorgio di Martini, Francesco di (jōr'jō dē Mārtēnē) | 1439-1502 | 3 | Gray, Henry Peters | 1819-1877 | 22 |
| Giorgione, Il (Giorgio Barbarelli) (jōr- jō'nā) | 1477-1511 | 4 | Grebber, Frans Pietersz de (ġrēb'bēr) | 1579-1649 | 15 |
| Giottino (Tommaso di Stefano) (jōttē'no) | 1324-1369 | 2 | Grebber, Pieter de (ġrēb'bēr) | 1600-1665 | 15 |
| Giotto di Bondone (jōt'tō) | 1266-1337 | 2 | Greco, El (grā'ko), see Theotocópuli | | |
| Giovanni da Fiesoli, see Angelico, Fra | | | Greenwood, John | 1726- | 22 |
| Giovanni da Milano (jōvān'nē dā Mi- lā'no) | fl. 1370 | 2 | Greiner, Otto (grī'nēr) | 1871- | 9 |
| Giovanni da San Giovanni, see Mannozi | | | Greuze, Jean Baptiste (grūz) | 1725-1805 | 18 |
| Giovanni da Udine (jōvān'nē dā oodē'nā) | 1487-1564 | 4 | Grien, see Baldung, Hans | | |
| Giovanni di Martini da Udine (jōvān'nē dē Mārtēnē dā oodē'nā) | ?-1535 | 3 | Grimelund, Johannes Martin (grēmē- lūnt) | 1842- | 25 |
| Giovenone, Girolamo (jōvēnō'nā) | fl. 1500 | 3 | Grönvold, Marcus (grōn'vōl) | 1845- | 25 |
| Girodet de Roussy, Anne Louis (ġērodā) | 1766-1824 | 19 | Gros, Antoine Jean, Baron (grō) | 1771-1835 | 19 |
| Girolamo da Capri (ġērō'lāmo dā ká- prē) | 1501-1561 | 4 | Groux, Charles de (groo) | 1825-1870 | 12 |
| Girolamo da Santa Croce (ġērō'lāmo dā sān'tā krō'chā) | fl. 1520-1549 | 4 | Grünewald, Matthias (grū'nēvālt) | died ca. 1529 | 7 |
| Girolamo dai Libri (ġērō'lāmo dā'ē lēbrē) | 1474-1555 | 4 | Grützner, Eduard | 1846- | 9 |
| Girolamo di Benvenuto (ġērō'lāmo dē bēnvēnoo'to) | 1470-1524 | 4 | Guardi, Francesco (gwar'dē) | 1712-1793 | 5 |
| Girtin, Thomas | 1775-1802 | 21 | Gude, Hans Fredrik (goo'dē) | 1825- | 25 |
| Gi-tō (Shiba-ta) | 1780-1819 | 28 | Guercino, Il (Giovanni Francesco Bar- bieri) (ġwērčē'no) | 1591-1666 | 5 |
| Giulio Romano (jōo'lio romā'no) | 1492-1546 | 4 | Guérin, Pierre Narcisse, Baron (gārēn) | 1774-1833 | 19 |
| Glauber, Jan Godlieb | 1656-1703 | 15 | Guffens, Godfroid (ġōf'fens) | 1823- | 12 |
| Gleyre, Charles Gabriel (glār) | 1806-1874 | 19 | Guido da Siena (ġwē'do dā sē-ē'nā) | fl. 1275 | 2 |
| Glöersen, Jacob | 1852- | 25 | Guido Reni (ġwē'do rā'nē) | 1575-1642 | 5 |
| Go Dōshi, see Wu Tao-tsz' | | | Guillaumet, Gustave (ġyūōmā) | 1840- | 19 |
| Goeneutte, Robert (ġēnūt) | - | 20 | Gussow, Karl (goos'sō) | 1843- | 9 |
| Goes, Hugo van der (ġōos) | 1430-1482 | 10 | Guthrie, James | 1859- | 21 |
| Gō-kan, Shi-ba | 1747-1818 | 28 | Guy, Seymour Joseph | 1824- | 22 |
| Go-kio-goku (Fujiwara no Yoshi-tsuné) fl. xiith century | | | Gysis, Nicolaus (ġy'zīs) | 1842-1902 | 9 |
| Gola, Emilio, Count (go'lā) | 1852- | 6 | Haas, Johannus Hubertus Leonardus de | 1832-1880 | 16 |
| Goltzius, Hendrik (ġōl'tsiūs) | 1558-1616 | 13 | Haas, William Frederick de | 1830-1880 | 16 |
| Gómez, Sebastian (el Mulato de Murillo) (gō'mēth) | 1646-1690 | 17 | Haas, M. F. H. de, see De Haas | | |
| González, Bartholomé (gonthā'lēth) | 1564-1627 | 17 | Habermann, Hugo Freiherr von (hā'bēr- mān) | 1849- | 9 |
| González, Juan Antonio (gonthā'lēth) | - | 17 | Hackaert (Hakkert), Jan (hāk'kärt) | 1636-1699 | 14 |
| Good, Thomas Sword | 1789-1872 | 21 | Hackert, Jacob Philipp (hāk'kért) | 1737-1807 | 8 |
| Goodale, Frederick | 1822- | 21 | Haes, Carlos de (ā'ēs) | - | 17 |
| Görbitz, Johan | 1782-1853 | 25 | Hagborg, August | 1852-1875 | 25 |
| Gordigiani, Michele (gordējā'nē) | 1828- | 6 | Hagen, Joris van der (Verhagen) (hā'ġhēn) | ?-1669 | 14 |
| Go-shun, see Gekkei | | | Haider, Karl (hī'dēr) | - | 9 |
| | | | Hakkert, see Hackaert | | |
| | | | Hallowell, George Hawley | 1872- | 23 |
| | | | Hals, Dirk | 1600-1656 | 15 |
| | | | Hals, Frans, the Elder | 1584-1666 | 15 |
| | | | Hals, Frans, the Younger | 1617-1669 | 15 |
| | | | Hamilton, Charles William de | 1670-1754 | 8 |
| | | | Hamilton, Hamilton | 1847- | 23 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|----------------------|-------|--|----------------------|-------|
| Hamilton, James | 1819-1878 | 22 | Henneberg, Rudolf | 1825-1876 | 9 |
| Hamilton, Jean George de | 1666-1740 | 8 | Henner, Jean Jacques (ënnâr) | 1829-1905 | 19 |
| Hamilton, John McLure | 1853- | 23 | Henningsen, Erik | 1855- | 26 |
| Hamilton, Philip Ferdinand de | 1664-1750 | 8 | Henri, Robert | 1865- | 23 |
| Hammershøy, Vilhelm (häm'mershöü) | 1864- | 26 | Henry, Edward L. | 1841- | 22 |
| Hamon, Jean Louis (ämon) | 1821-1874 | 19 | Henry, George | - | 21 |
| Han Kan (Kan-kan) | fl. viiith century | 28 | Herbert, John Rogers | 1810- | 21 |
| Hana-busa Itchō, see Chō-kō | | | Herbst, Hans | fl. 1500 | 7 |
| Han-bei, Shō-kō-sai | fl. 1800 | 28 | Herbsthoffer, Karl (ërbstoffâr) | 1821-1876 | 19 |
| Hannemann, Adriaen | 1601-1669 | 14 | Herkomer, Hubert von | 1849- | 21 |
| Hanoteau, Hector (änötō) | 1823- | 20 | Hérlin, Friedrich | ?-1499 | 7 |
| Hansen, Carl Frederik (Sundt-Hansen) | 1841- | 25 | Hermans, Charles | 1839- | 12 |
| Hansen, Constantin | 1804-1880 | 26 | Herrera, Francisco de, the Elder (ërrä'rá) | 1576-1656 | 17 |
| Hansen, Hans Nicolai | 1853- | 26 | Herrera, Francisco de, the Younger (ërrä'rá) | 1622-1685 | 17 |
| Hansen, Henrik | 1821- | 26 | Herring, John Frederick | 1795-1865 | 21 |
| Hansteen, Aasta (hän'stän) | 1824- | 25 | Herter, Albert | 1871- | 23 |
| Hansteen, Nils (hän'stän) | 1855- | 25 | Hess, Heinrich Maria von | 1798-1863 | 9 |
| Harding, Chester | 1792-1866 | 22 | Hess, Peter von | 1792-1871 | 9 |
| Harpignies, Henri (ärpinyē) | 1819- | 20 | Heusch, Jacob de (hös) | 1657-1701 | 15 |
| Harrison, L. Birge | 1854- | 23 | Heusch, Willem (Guilliam) de (hös) | 1638-1669 | 15 |
| Harrison, Thomas Alexander | 1853- | 23 | Heyden, Jan van der (hī'dën) | 1637-1712 | 14 |
| Hart, James M. | 1828-1901 | 22 | Heyerdahl, Hans (hä'yërdäl) | 1857- | 25 |
| Haru-nobu, Suzu-ki | fl. xviiiith century | 28 | Heymans, Adrien Joseph (hīmāns) | 1839- | 12 |
| Harvey, Sir George | 1806-1876 | 21 | Hia Kwei (Kakei) | fl. xiith century | 28 |
| Ha-sé-gawa, see Tō-haku | | | Hicks, Thomas | 1823-1890 | 22 |
| Haseltine, William Stanley | 1835-1900 | 22 | Hildebrandt, Eduard | 1817-1868 | 9 |
| Hasenclever, Johann Peter (hä'zënkla'-vër) | 1810-1853 | 9 | Hildebrandt, Theodor | 1804-1874 | 9 |
| Haslund, Otto (häs'lünt) | 1842- | 62 | Hill, Thomas | 1829- | 22 |
| Hassam, Childe | 1859- | 23 | Hilleström, M. Per | - | 25 |
| Haug, Robert (houg) | 1857- | 9 | Hills, Laura Coombs | 1859- | 23 |
| Haverman, Hendrik Johann (hä'vërmän) | 1857- | 16 | Hills, Robert | 1769-1844 | 21 |
| Hayden, Charles II. | 1856-1901 | 23 | Hire (Hyre), Laurent de la (ër) | 1606-1656 | 18 |
| Haydon, Benjamin Robert | 1786-1846 | 21 | Hiro-shigé (Ichi-riü-sai or Kon-dō Jiu-bei) | 1797-1858 | 28 |
| Hayez, Francesco (ä'yës) | 1791-1882 | 6 | Hiro-taka | fl. xth century | 27 |
| Hazard, Arthur Merton | 1872- | 23 | Hiro-tsura, Sumi-yoshi (Hiro-sada) | 1794-1864 | 27 |
| Healy, George P. A. | 1808-1894 | 22 | Hitchcock, George | 1850- | 23 |
| Heaphy, Thomas | 1775-1835 | 21 | Hobberna, Meyndert (höbbä'mä) | 1638-1709 | 14 |
| Hébert, Ernest (äbär) | 1817- | 19 | Höcker, Paul | 1854- | 9 |
| Heda, Willem Claasz (hä'dä) | 1594-1678 | 15 | Hoecgeest, C. (Cornelis?) (hook'djäst) | fl. 1610-1615 | 14 |
| Heem, Cornelis de (häm) | 1631-1695 | 15 | Hoeckert, Johann Frederik (hök'kërt) | 1826-1866 | 25 |
| Heem, David de, the Elder (häm) | 1570-1632 | 15 | Hoffmann, Heinrich | 1824- | 9 |
| Heem, Jan Davidsz de (häm) | 1606-1683 | 15 | Hoffmann, Ludwig von | 1861- | 9 |
| Heemskerck, B. (häm'skërk) | fl. 1730 | 11 | Hoffmann, Samuel | 1592-1648 | 8 |
| Heemskerk, Egbert van, the Elder (häm's-kërk) | 1610-1680 | 15 | Hofmann, see Hoffmann | | |
| Heemskerk, Egbert van, the Younger (häm'skërk) | 1645-1704 | 15 | Hogarth, William | 1697-1764 | 21 |
| Heemskerk, Marten (van Veen) (häm's-kërk) | 1498-1574 | 13 | Högen, see Oka-moto | | |
| Heere, Lucas de (häre) | 1534-1584 | 10 | Hoguet, Charles (högä) | 1821-1870 | 9 |
| Heilbuth, Ferdinand (älboot) | 1829-1889 | 20 | Höin, see Chōga | | |
| Heinz, Joseph, the Elder (hīnts) | 1565-1609 | 8 | Hō-itsu | fl. xviiiith century | 28 |
| Heinz, Joseph, the Younger (hīnts) | 1590-1655 | 8 | Höken, see Oka-moto | | |
| Hellquist, Karl Gustaf | 1851-1890 | 25 | Hoku-sai | 1760-1849 | 28 |
| Helst, Bartholomeus van der | 1613-1670 | 14 | Holbein, Hans, the Elder (hö'l'bīn) | 1460-1524 | 7 |
| Helsted, Axel Theofilus | 1847- | 26 | Holbein, Hans, the Younger (hö'l'bīn) | 1497-1543 | 7 |
| Hemissen, Jan van (hä'mīssen) | 1500-1556 | 10 | Holbein, Siegmund (hö'l'bīn) | 1465-1540 | 7 |
| Hemsen, see Hemissen | | | Holiday, Henry | 1839- | 21 |
| Henkes, Gerke (hën'kes) | 1844- | 16 | Holl | 1845-1888 | 21 |
| | | | Homer, Winslow | 1836- | 23 |
| | | | Hondecoeter, Gillis d' (hon'dëkootër) | ?-1637 | 14 |
| | | | Hondecoeter, Gysbert d' (hon'dëkootër) | 1604-1653 | 14 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-------------------------|-------|---|------------------------|-------|
| Hondecoeter, Melchior d' (hon'dēkootēr) | 1636-1695 | 14 | Israels, Isaac (iz'rāēls) | 1865- | 16 |
| Hō-ni | fl. early xixth century | 28 | Israels, Joseph (iz'rāēls) | 1824- | 16 |
| Honthorst, Gerard van | 1590-1656 | 15 | Itchō, see Chō-kō | | |
| Hooghe (Hooch), Pieter de (hō'fhā) | 1632-1681 | 14 | Ivanov, Aleksandr (ē'vānof) | 1806-1858 | 24 |
| Hoogstraaten, Samuel van (hō'fhāstrā'tēn) | 1627-1678 | 14 | Ivanov, Andrey (ē'vānof) | 1775-1848 | 24 |
| Hook, James Clarke | 1819- | 21 | Ivanov, Mikhail (ē'vānof) | 1748-1823 | 24 |
| Hoppner, John | 1758-1810 | 21 | Jackson, John | 1778-1831 | 21 |
| Homell, Edward | - | 21 | Jacobsz, Dirk (yā'kōbs) | ?-1567 | 13 |
| Horschelt, Theodor (hor'shēlt) | 1829-1871 | 9 | Jacobsz, Juriāen (yā'kōbs) | 1610-1664 | 11 |
| Horsley, John Callcott | 1817- | 21 | Jacopo da Casentino (yā'kōpō) | fl. 1350 | 2 |
| Hovenden, Thomas | 1840-1895 | 23 | Jacque, Charles Émile (zāk) | 1813-1894 | 20 |
| Howe, Hubertus (hō'wā) | 1814-1867 | 16 | Jadin, Louis Godefroy (zādēñ) | 1805- | 20 |
| Howe, W. II. | 1846- | 23 | Jalabert, Charles François (zālābār) | 1819- | 19 |
| Howitt, Samuel | 1765-1822 | 21 | Janssens, H. (Hieronymus) (yāns'sēns) | 1624-1693 | 11 |
| Ho-yen | fl. xviiiith century | 28 | Janssens, Victor Honoré (yāns'sēns) | 1664-1739 | 11 |
| Hubbard, Richard W. | 1817-1888 | 22 | Janssens van Nuyssen, Abraham (yāns'sēns) | 1575-1632 | 11 |
| Hübner, Karl | 1814-1879 | 9 | Jardin, du, see Dujardin | | |
| Huet, Jean Baptiste (ūā) | 1745-1811 | 19 | Jarvis, John Wesley | 1780-1834 | 22 |
| Hughes, Arthur | 1832- | 21 | Ja-soku, Soga | fl. xvth century | 27 |
| Hughtenburg (Huchtenburg), Jacobus van (hō'fh'tenbōrd) | 1639-1670 | 15 | Jeanron, Philippe Auguste (zānrōñ) | 1810-1877 | 19 |
| Hughtenburgh (Huchtenburg), Jan van (hō'fh'tenbōrd) | 1646-1733 | 15 | Jeaurat, Étienne (zōrā) | 1699-1789 | 18 |
| Hugo, Victor (ügō) | 1802-1885 | 19 | Jensen, Carl (yēn'sen) | 1851- | 26 |
| Hunt, William Henry | 1790-1864 | 21 | Jerichau-Baumann, Mrs. Elizabeth (yā'rī- fhou-bou'mān) | 1819-1881 | 26 |
| Hunt, William Holman | 1827- | 21 | Jernberg, August (yēm'bērg) | 1826-1896 | 25 |
| Hunt, William Morris | 1824-1879 | 22 | Jernberg, Olaf (yēm'bērg) | 1855- | 25 |
| Hunter, Colin | 1842- | 21 | Jerndorff, August Andreas (yērn'dōrf) | 1846- | 26 |
| Huntington, Daniel | 1816- | 22 | Jewett, W. S. | 1795-1873 | 22 |
| Hutin, Charles (ütēñ) | 1715-1776 | 18 | Ji-kaku Daishi | 784-854 | 27 |
| Huys, Peeter (hois) | fl. 1675 | 11 | Jiménez y Aranda, José (hīmē'nēth ē ārān'dā) | 1832- | 17 |
| Huysmans, Cornelis (hois'māns) | 1648-1727 | 11 | Jiménez y Aranda, Luis (hīmē'nēth ē ārān'dā) | 1845- | 17 |
| Huysmans, Jacob (hois'māns) | 1656-1696 | 11 | Jocavacci, Francesco (yōkāvāt'chē) | 1838- | 6 |
| Huysmans, Jan Baptist (hois'māns) | 1654-1716 | 11 | Joest of Calcar, Jan (yoost) | 1460-1519 | 13 |
| Huysum, Jan van (hoi'sūm) | 1682-1749 | 16 | Johansen, Viggo (yohān'sēn) | 1851- | 26 |
| Huysum, Justus van (hoi'sūm) | 1659-1716 | 14 | Johansson, Karl (yohān'sōn) | - | 25 |
| Ibbetson, Julius Cæsar | 1759-1817 | 21 | Johnson, David | 1827- | 22 |
| Ichi-riū-sai, see Hiro-shigé | | | Johnson, Eastman | 1824-1906 | 22 |
| I-fu-kiū | fl. xviiiith century | 27 | Johnston, John B. | 1847-1886 | 23 |
| Iké-no, see Tai-ga-dō | | | Johnston, John Humphreys | 1857- | 23 |
| Imola, Innocenza da (i'mōlā) | 1494-1550 | 4 | Jones, Francis Coates | 1857- | 23 |
| Inchbold, John W. | 1830-1888 | 21 | Jones, Hugh Bolton | 1848- | 23 |
| Induno, Domenico (īndoo'nō) | 1815-1878 | 6 | Jonghe, Gustave de (yon'djē) | 1828-1893 | 12 |
| Induno, Girolamo (īndoo'nō) | 1827-1890 | 6 | Jonghe, Jean Baptiste de (yon'djē) | 1785-1844 | 12 |
| Ingegno, L' (Andrea Luigi, Alovigi or Lovigi) (īnjēn'yo) | fl. 1480 | 3 | Jongkind, Johan Barthold (yūng'kīnt) | 1819-1891 | 16 |
| Ingham, Charles C. | 1796-1863 | 22 | Jo-not-ō | - | 27 |
| Ingres, Jean Auguste Dominique (ēngr) | 1780-1867 | 19 | Jordaens, Hans (yor'dāns) | 1595-1643 | 11 |
| Inman, Henry | 1801-1846 | 22 | Jordaens, Jacob (yor'dāns) | 1593-1678 | 11 |
| Inness, George | 1825-1894 | 22 | Jordan, Rudolf (yor'dān) | 1810-1887 | 9 |
| Inness, George, Jr. | 1854- | 23 | Jörgensen, Swend (yōr'gēsēn) | 1861- | 25 |
| Ippo (Mori) | fl. sixth century | 28 | Joris, Pio (yō'rīs) | 1843- | 6 |
| Iriarte, Ignacio (irīā'rtē) | 1620-1685 | 17 | Josephson, Ernst (yō'sēfsōn) | 1851- | 25 |
| Irminger, Valdemar (ir'mīngēr) | 1850- | 26 | Jō-setsu | fl. early xvth century | 27 |
| Irving, John Beauvain | 1826-1877 | 22 | Josselin de Jong (or Yong), Pieter de (yos'sēlin dā yūng) | 1861- | 16 |
| Isabey, Eugène (ēzābā) | 1804-1886 | 19 | Jō-sui, see Sōyen | | |
| I-sai, Katsu-shika | fl. 1860-1870 | 28 | Jouett, M. H. | 1788-1827 | 22 |
| Isenmann, Kaspar (ē'zēnmān) | ?-1466 | 7 | Jouvenet, Jean (soovēnā) | 1644-1717 | 18 |
| Isham, Samuel | 1855- | 23 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------------------|-------|---|-------------------|-------|
| Juanes, Juan de (Vicente) (hooä'nēs) | 1523-1579 | 17 | Kindborg, Johan | 1861- | 25 |
| Juel, Jens (yoo'ēl) | 1745-1802 | 26 | Kindermans, Jean Baptiste | 1805-1876 | 12 |
| Juncker, Justus (yūn'kēr) | 1703-1767 | 8 | Kin-mochi | fl. xth century | 27 |
| Justus de Allamagna (yūs'tūs dā allä-män'yä) | fl. 1451 | 7 | Kin-tada | fl. xth century | 27 |
| Justus (Jodocus) van (of) Ghent (yūs'tūs) | fl. end xvth century | 10 | Kiō-sai, Shō-fu | 1831- | 28 |
| Kadzu-nobu | fl. sixteenth century | 27 | Kiprenski, Orest (kīprēn'skī) | 1783-1836 | 24 |
| Kaemmerer, Frederic Henry (käm'mērēr) | 1850- | 16 | Kiyo-naga, Tokiü | fl. 1765-1780 | 28 |
| Kager, Matthias (käg'gēr) | 1566-1634 | 8 | Kiyo-nobu, Tokiü (Shō-bei) | fl. xviii century | 28 |
| Kai-hoku (Vū-shō) | 1534-1617 | 27 | Klünt, Ernst | 1864-1892 | 9 |
| Kakei, see Iiia Kwei | | | Klinger, Max (klīn'gēr) | 1857- | 9 |
| Kalckreuth, Leopold, Graf von (kälk'roit) | 1855- | 9 | Klinkenberg, Johannes Christian Karel | 1852- | 16 |
| Kalckreuth, Stanislaus, Graf von (kälk'-roit) | 1821-1894 | 9 | Klodt von Jürgensburg, Baron Michael | 1832- | 24 |
| Kalf, Willem (käl'lef) | 1630-1693 | 14 | Klumpke, Miss Anna E. | 1856- | 23 |
| Kalkar, Giovanni di (Hans von) (käl'kär) | 1510-1546 | 4 | Knaus, Ludwig (knous) | 1829- | 9 |
| Kamecke, Otto von (käm'kē) | 1829-1899 | 9 | Kneller (Kniller), Sir Godfrey (knē'l'er) | 1646-1723 | 14 |
| Kampf, Arthur | 1864- | 9 | Knight, Daniel Ridgway | 1845- | 23 |
| Kan Densu | fl. xvth century | 27 | Knight, John Prescott | 1803-1881 | 21 |
| Kana-oka, Kosé na | fl. 850 | 27 | Knille, Otto (knī'lē) | 1832-1898 | 9 |
| Kan-kan, see Han Kan | | | Knoller, Martin (knöll'tēr) | 1725-1804 | 8 |
| Ka-no, see Masa-nobu and Moto-nobu | | | Knüpfer (knüp'fēr) | 1603-1660 | 15 |
| Kappes, Alfred | 1850-1894 | 23 | Kobell, Ferdinand | 1740-1799 | 8 |
| Karpen | - | 16 | Köbke, Christen Schjellerup | 1810-1848 | 26 |
| Kate, Herman Frederik Karel ten (kä'tē) | 1822-1891 | 16 | Kō-bo Daishi (Kū-kai) | 774-834 | 27 |
| Katsu-gawa Shun-chō (Shun-ken) | fl. 1810 | 28 | Koch, Joseph Anton (kōč) | 1768-1839 | 8 |
| Katsu-gawa Shun-shō (Katsu-kama) | fl. 1765-1785 | 28 | Koekkoek, Barend Cornelis (kook'kook) | 1803-1862 | 16 |
| Katsu-kama, see Katsu-gawa | | | Köhler, Robert | 1850- | 23 |
| Kauffmann, Angelica | 1741-1807 | 8 | Ko-Hōgen, see Moto-nobu | | |
| Kauffmann, Hermann | 1808-1889 | 9 | Kolstoe, Fredrik (kol'stō) | 1860- | 25 |
| Kauffmann, Hugo | 1844- | 9 | Ko-mai Ki, see Gen-ki | | |
| Kaula, William Jurian | 1871- | 23 | Kon-dō Jiu-bei, see Hiro-shigé | | |
| Kaulbach, Friedrich August von (koul'-bäč) | 1850- | 9 | König, Johann | fl. 1610 | 8 |
| Kaulbach, Wilhelm von (koul'bäč) | 1805-1847 | 9 | Koninck, Jacob de | 1616-1708 | 14 |
| Ka-wō, Nen | fl. xivth century | 27 | Koninck, Philip de | 1619-1688 | 14 |
| Keibun (Matsu-mura) | 1780-1844 | 28 | Koninck, Salomon | 1609-1663 | 14 |
| Kei-sai, Ō-nishi | fl. sixteenth century | 27 | Koopman, Augustus | 1869- | 23 |
| Kei-sai Yei-sen | fl. sixteenth century | 28 | Körbecke, Johann | fl. xvth century | 7 |
| Kei-shō, see Kei-shōki | | | Korff, Alexander Hugo Bakker | 1824-1882 | 16 |
| Kei-shōki (kei-shō) | fl. late xvth century | 27 | Kō-rin, O-gata | 1660-1716 | 28 |
| Keller, Albert von | 1844- | 9 | Körner, Johann | - | 9 |
| Kendall, William Sergeant | 1869- | 23 | Koskull, Anders Gustav, Baron | 1831- | 25 |
| Kennedy, William | 1860- | 21 | Kost, Frederick W. | 1861- | 23 |
| Kensett, John F. | 1818-1872 | 22 | Ko-un-sho, see Nam-mei | | |
| Kessel, Ferdinand van | 1648-1696 | 11 | Krafft, E. Peter (Per) | 1780-1856 | 9 |
| Kessel, Jan van | 1641-1690 | 14 | Krafft, Johan August | 1798-1829 | 26 |
| Kessel, Jan van, the Elder | 1626-1679 | 11 | Kramskoy, Ivan (kräm'skōē) | 1837-1887 | 24 |
| Kessel, Jan van, the Younger | 1654-1708 | 11 | Kretzschmer, Hermann (krētsh'mēr) | 1811-1890 | 9 |
| Ketel, Cornelis (kät'ēl) | 1548-1616 | 13 | Krohg, Christian (krō'g) | 1852- | 25 |
| Key, Adriaan Thomasz (kī) | 1544-1590 | 10 | Kronberg, Julius | 1850- | 25 |
| Key, Willem (kī) | 1520-1568 | 10 | Kronberg, Louis | 1872- | 23 |
| Keyser, Nicaise de (kī'zēr) | 1813-1887 | 12 | Krouthén, Johan | 1858- | 25 |
| Keyser, Thomas de (kī'zēr) | 1596-1679 | 14 | Kröyer, Per Severin (krō'yēr) | 1851- | 26 |
| Khnopff, Fernand | 1858- | 12 | Krüger, Franz (krü'gēr) | 1797-1857 | 9 |
| Kielland, Kitty (čjē'l'länd) | 1844- | 25 | Krüger, Nils (krü'gēr) | - | 25 |
| Ki-itsu | ?-1858 | 28 | Küchler, Albert | 1803- | 26 |
| Kiku-chi, see Yō-sai | | | Kühl, Gotthard | 1851- | 9 |
| | | | Kū-kai, see Kō-bo Daishi | | |
| | | | Kulle, Axel | 1846- | 25 |
| | | | Kulmbach, Hans von | ?-1522 | 7 |
| | | | Kupetzki (Kopecky), Johann (koopēt's'kē) | 1667-1740 | 8 |
| | | | Kurzbaauer, Eduard (kürts'bauēr) | 1840-1879 | 9 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------------|-------|--|------------------|-------|
| Kwakki, see Kwoh Hi | | | Leibl, Wilhelm (lībl) | 1846-1900 | 9 |
| Kwoh Hi (Kwakki) | fl. xth century | 28 | Leighton, Frederick, Lord | 1830-1896 | 21 |
| Kyhn, Vilhelm (kiin) | 1819- | 26 | Leistikow, Walter (lis'tikō) | 1865- | 9 |
| La Cour (lä koor) | - | 26 | Leleux, Armand (lēlä) | 1818-1885 | 19 |
| Lacroix, Gaspard Jean (läkrwä) | 1810-1878 | 20 | Leloir, Alexandre Louis (lēlwär) | 1843-1884 | 19 |
| Ladbrooke, Robert | 1758-1840 | 21 | Lely, Sir Peter (van der Faes) (lē'li) | 1617-1680 | 11 |
| Laer, Pieter van (Bamboccio) (lä) | 1590-1658 | 15 | Lembke, Johann Philipp | 1631-1713 | 8 |
| Laermans, Eugène (lä'r'mans) | - | 12 | Lemoyné, François (lēmwan) | 1688-1737 | 18 |
| La Farge, John | 1835- | 23 | Le Nain, Antoine (lē nēñ) | 1588-1648 | 18 |
| La Fosse, Charles de (lä föss) | 1636-1716 | 18 | Le Nain, Louis (lē nēñ) | 1593-1648 | 18 |
| Lafrensen, Nicolas (lä'frēnsēn) | 1737-1808 | 25 | Le Nain, Matthieu (lē nēñ) | 1607-1677 | 18 |
| Lagorio, Lev (lägō'riō) | 1826- | 24 | Lenbach, Franz (län'badj) | 1836- | 9 |
| Lairesse, Gerard de, the Elder | 1640-1711 | 14 | Lens, Andries Cornelis | 1739-1822 | 11 |
| Lambert, Louis Eugène (länbär) | 1825- | 20 | Leonardo, José (lēōnär'do) | 1616-1656 | 17 |
| Lamen, Christoffel Jacob van der (lä'mēn) | 1615-1651 | 11 | Leonardo da Vinci, see Vinci, Leonardo da | | |
| Lami, Louis Eugène (lämē) | 1800- | 19 | Le Prince, Jean Baptiste (lēprēns) | 1733-1781 | 18 |
| Lance, George | 1802-1864 | 21 | Lerolle, Henri (lēröl) | 1851- | 20 |
| Lancerotto, Egisto (länchärot'to) | 1848- | 6 | Leroux, Hector (léroo) | 1829-1900 | 19 |
| Lancret, Nicolas (länkrä) | 1690-1743 | 18 | Leslie, Charles Robert | 1794-1859 | 21 |
| Landseer, Charles | 1799-1879 | 21 | Leslie, George Dunlop | 1835- | 21 |
| Landseer, Sir Edwin | 1802-1873 | 21 | Lessing, Karl Friedrich | 1808-1880 | 9 |
| Lanfranco, Giovanni (länfrän'ko) | 1580-1647 | 5 | Le Sueur, Eustache (lē süör) | 1616-1655 | 18 |
| Lang, Heinrich | 1838-1891 | 9 | Lethière, Guillaume Guillon (lētīär) | 1760-1832 | 19 |
| Lanini, Bernardino (lä'nē'nē) | 1510-1578 | 4 | Leutze, Emmanuel | 1816-1868 | 22 |
| Lansyer, Emmanuel (länsiä) | 1835- | 20 | Levitski, Dmitri | 1735-1822 | 24 |
| Lantara, Simon Mathurin (läntärä) | 1729-1778 | 18 | Lévy, Émile (lävē) | 1826- | 19 |
| Lanzani, Polidoro (ländzä'nē) | 1515-1565 | 5 | Lévy, Léopold (lävē) | 1840- | 19 |
| Largillière, Nicolas (lä'rjilyär) | 1656-1746 | 18 | Lewis, John Frederick | 1805-1876 | 21 |
| Larsen, Carl Frederik Emanuel | 1823-1859 | 26 | Leyden, Lucas van (lī'dēn) | 1494-1533 | 13 |
| Larsson, Carl | 1855- | 25 | Leys, Hendrik (lis) | 1815-1869 | 12 |
| Larsson, Marcus | 1825-1864 | 25 | L'hermitte, Léon Augustin (lēmīt) | 1844- | 20 |
| Lastman, Pieter | 1583-1649 | 14 | Liberale di Jacopo da Verona (libērälä dē jākō'pō) | 1451-1536 | 3 |
| La Thangue | 1860- | 21 | Liberi, Pietro (Libertino) (libär'rē) | 1605-1687 | 5 |
| Lathrop, Francis | 1849- | 23 | Libertino, see Liberi | | |
| Lathrop, W. L. | 1859- | 23 | Lie, Jonas | 1880- | 23 |
| La Tour, Maurice Quentin de (lätoor) | 1704-1788 | 18 | Lieb, Michael, see Munkácsy | | |
| Lauder, Robert Scott | 1803-1869 | 21 | Liebermann, Max (lē'bērmän) | 1849- | 9 |
| Laurens, Jean Paul (lörēn) | 1838- | 20 | Lier, Adolf (lēr) | 1827-1882 | 9 |
| Laurenti, Cesare (lourēn'tē) | 1854- | 6 | Lievens, Jan (lē'vēns) | 1607-1674 | 15 |
| Lavery, John | 1858- | 21 | Liezen-Mayer (lē'sen-mī'ēr) | 1839-1898 | 9 |
| Lawrence, Sir Thomas | 1769-1830 | 21 | Liljefors, Bruno Andreas (lil'yēfors) | 1860- | 25 |
| Lawson, Cecil Gordon | 1851-1882 | 21 | Li Lung-yen (Ri-riu-min or Ri-ko-riu) | fl. xith century | 28 |
| Lawson, Thomas B. | 1807-1888 | 22 | Lindgreen, Amalia (līn'dēgrän) | 1814-1891 | 25 |
| Lazarus, Jacob A. | 1823-1891 | 22 | Lindenschmit, Wilhelm, the Elder | 1806-1848 | 9 |
| Lazzarini, Gregorio (lätsärē'nē) | 1657-1735 | 5 | Lindenschmit, Wilhelm, the Younger | 1829-1895 | 9 |
| Leader, Benjamin Williams | 1831- | 21 | Lindholm, Lorenz August | 1819- | 25 |
| Lebedev, Mikhail (lä'bēdef) | 1812-1837 | 24 | Lindmann, Axel | 1848- | 25 |
| Le Brun, Charles (lēbrön) | 1619-1690 | 18 | Linen, George | 1802-1888 | 22 |
| Lebrun, Mme Élisabeth Louise Vigée- (lēbrön) | 1755-1842 | 20 | Ling Liang (Rin-riō) | fl. xvth century | 28 |
| Leczano, Angel (lēkthä'no) | - | 17 | Lingelbach, Johannes (līn'gēlbädj) | 1622-1674 | 14 |
| Lee, Homer | 1856- | 23 | Linnell, John | 1792-1882 | 21 |
| Leemans, Égide François (lä'mäns) | 1839-1876 | 12 | Liotard, Jean Étienne (liotär) | 1702-1789 | 18 |
| Leempoels, Jeff (lä'm'pools) | 1867- | 12 | Lippi, Filippino (līp'pē) | 1457-1504 | 3 |
| Leemputten, Frans van (lämpöt'tēn) | 1850- | 12 | Lippi, Fra Filippo (līp'pē) | 1406-1469 | 3 |
| Lefebvre, Jules Joseph (lēfävr) | 1834- | 19 | Lissandrino, Il (Alessandro Magnasco) (līsändrē'no) | 1661-1747 | 5 |
| Lefèvre, Claude (lēfävr) | 1632-1675 | 18 | Llanos y Valdes, Sebastian de (lyä'nos) | 1602-1668 | 17 |
| Lefèvre, Robert (lēfävr) | 1756-1830 | 18 | Llorrente, Don Bernardo German de (lyorēn'tē) | 1685-1757 | 17 |
| Legros, Alphonse (lēgrō) | 1837- | 20 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------------------------|-------|--|---------------|-------|
| Locher, Carl (lō'kēr) | 1851- | 26 | — Madrazo, Don Raimundo de (mädrá'tho) | 1841- | 17 |
| Lockwood, Wilton | 1861- | 23 | Madrazo y Agudo, José de (mädrá'tho ē ägoo'do) | 1781-1859 | 17 |
| Loeb, Louis | 1866- | 23 | Madrazo y Kunt, Federico de (mädrá'tho ē koont) | 1815-1894 | 17 |
| Löfftz, Ludwig von | 1845- | 9 | Maes, Godfried (mäs) | 1649-1700 | 11 |
| Lombard, Lambert (Susterman) | 1505-1566 | 10 | — Maes, Nicolaas (mäs) | 1632-1693 | 14 |
| Lon, Gert von | fl. 1505-1521 | 7 | Magnasco, Alessandro, see Lissandrino, Il | | |
| Long, Edwin | 1829- | 21 | Mainardi, Sebastiano (minär'dē) | ?-1513 | 3 |
| Lonza, Antonio (lon'tsä) | 1846- | 6 | Mainella, Raffaele (minē'l'lä) | 1858- | 6 |
| Loo, Charles Amédée Philippe van (lō) | 1719-1790 | 18 | Makart, Hans | 1840-1884 | 9 |
| Loo, Charles André van (Carle Vanloo) (lō) | 1705-1765 | 18 | Makovski, Konstantin | 1839- | 24 |
| Loo, Jacob van (lō) | 1614-1670 | 14 | Makovski, Vladimir | 1846- | 24 |
| Loo, Jan van (lō) | 1585-1661 | 14 | Malbone, Edward G. | 1787-1807 | 22 |
| Loo, Jean Baptiste van (lō) | 1684-1745 | 18 | Malmström, Johan August (mälm'ström) | 1829- | 25 |
| Loo, Louis van (lō) | 1641-1713 | 14 | Mancinelli, Giuseppe (mänchēnē'l'le) | 1813-1875 | 6 |
| Loon, Theodorus van, the Younger (lōn) | 1595-1678 | 11 | Mander, Karel van, the Elder | 1548-1606 | 10 |
| Lorentzen, Christian August (lō'rentsēn) | 1749-1828 | 26 | Mander, Karel van, the Younger | 1579-1665 | 14 |
| — Lorenzetti, Ambroggio (lō'renzēt'tē) | fl. 1342 | 2 | Mander, Karel van, the Third | 1610-1672 | 14 |
| Lorenzetti, Pietro (lō'renzēt'tē) | ?-1350 | 2 | Manet, Édouard (mänā) | 1833-1883 | 20 |
| — Lorenzo da San Severino (lō'rend'zo) | 1374-? | 2 | Manglard, Adrien (mänlär) | 1695-1760 | 18 |
| Lorenzo di Pietro di Giovanni di Lando, see Vecchieta, Il | | | Mannozi, Giovanni (Giovanni da San Giovanni) (mänō't'sē) | 1590-1636 | 5 |
| Lorenzo Monacco, Don (lō'rend'zo) | 1370-1422 | 2 | Mansueti, Giovanni (mänsōō'ä'ti) | fl. 1500 | 3 |
| Lorrain, Claude Gellée, called (klōd lorrēn) | 1600-1682 | 18 | Mantegna, Andrea (mäntēn'yä) | 1431-1506 | 3 |
| Losenko, Anton | 1737-1773 | 24 | Manvoisin, Raymond Auguste (mänv wäsēn) | 1794-1870 | 19 |
| Loth, Johann Karl (Carlotto) (lōt) | 1632-1698 | 8 | Maratta, see Maratti | | |
| Lotto, Lorenzo | 1480-1554 | 4 | Maratti (Maratta), Carlo, Cavaliere (mä-rät'ti) | 1625-1713 | 5 |
| Lovigi, see Ingegno, L' | | | Marchal, Charles François (märs'häl) | 1825-1877 | 20 |
| Low, Will H. | 1853- | 23 | Marche, Émile van, see Van Marcke | | |
| Luigi, Andrea, see Ingegno, L' | | | Marco d'Oggione (märk'ō dödjō'nä) | 1470-1530 | 4 |
| Luiñi, Bernardino (lüē'nē) | 1475-1533 | 4 | Marconi, Rocco (märk'ō'nē) | fl. 1505-1520 | 4 |
| Luminais, Évariste Vital (loominä) | 1822- | 20 | Marées, Georg de (Desmarées) (mä'rä'ēs) | 1697-1776 | 25 |
| Lund, Fredrik Christian | 1826- | 26 | Marées, Hans von (mä'räs') | 1837-1887 | 9 |
| Lundberg, Gustaf | 1695-1786 | 25 | Marescalco, Il, see Buonconsiglio | | |
| Lundbye, Johan Thomas (loon'büē) | 1818-1848 | 16 | Margaritone (märgärītō'nä) | 1216-1290 | 2 |
| Lundens, Gerrit (lün'dēns) | fl. 1652-1673 | 24 | Mariani, Cesare (märiä'nē) | 1826-1901 | 6 |
| Lundgren, Egront Sellif (lünd'grän) | 1815-1875 | 25 | Mariani, Pompeo (märiä'nē) | 1857- | 6 |
| Lundström, Ernst | 1853- | 25 | Marilhat, Prosper (märi'lä) | 1811-1847 | 19 |
| Luti, Benedetto, Cavaliere (loo'tē) | 1666-1724 | 5 | Marinelli, Vincenzo (mä'rēnē'l'le) | 1820-1892 | 6 |
| Luyten, Henri (loi'tēn) | 1859- | 12 | Marinus, see Roymerswale, Marinus van | | |
| Lyon, Jacob (li'on) | 1586-1651 | 14 | Maris, Jacob (mä'rīs) | 1837-1899 | 16 |
| Lys (Pan), Jan van der (līs) | 1600-1657 | 15 | Maris, Matthys (mä'rīs) | 1835- | 16 |
| Ma Yüen (Ba-yen) | fl. xiith century | 28 | Maris, Willem (mä'rīs) | 1815- | 16 |
| Mabuse, Jan (Gossaert) van (mäboo'zē) | 1470-1541 | 10 | Markov, Aleksyey | 1802-1878 | 24 |
| Macallum, Hamilton | 1841-1896 | 21 | Marne, Jean Louis de (märn) | 1754-1829 | 18 |
| Macbeth, Robert Walker | 1848- | 21 | Marr, Carl | 1858- | 23 |
| McChesney, Clara T. | 1861- | 23 | Marsh, Fred Dana | 1872- | 23 |
| McEwen, Walter | 1860- | 23 | Marstrand, Vilhelm Nikolaj | 1810-1873 | 26 |
| Macgregor, Robert | - | 21 | Martens, Willem Johannes | 1838-1895 | 16 |
| McKnight, Dodge | 1860- | 23 | Martin, Elias (märtēn') | 1740-1804 | 25 |
| Mach, Hildegard von (mäç) | 1873- | 9 | Martin, Henri (märtin') | - | 20 |
| Macip, Juanes Vicente, see Juanes, Juan de | | | Martin, Homer D. | 1836-1897 | 23 |
| Maclise, Daniel | 1806 (sometimes said 1811)-1870 | 21 | Martinetti, Giacomo (märtēnēt'tē) | - | 6 |
| MacMonnies, Mrs. Mary F. | - | 23 | Martínez, Jusepe (märtē'nēth) | 1612-1682 | 17 |
| MacNee, Sir Daniel | 1806-1882 | 21 | Martini, see Simone di Martino | | |
| Macomber, Mary L. | 1861- | 23 | Martino da Udine, see Pellegrino da San Daniele | | |
| Macrino d'Alba (mäkrē'no dä'l'bä) | ?-1528 | 3 | Marziale, Marco (märt'siä'l'le) | fl. 1492-1507 | 3 |
| MacWhirter, John | 1839- | 21 | | | |
| Madou, Jean Baptiste (mädo) | 1796-1877 | 12 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|----------------------|-------|---|----------------------|-------|
| Mas y Fondevilla, Arcadio (mäs ē fon-dēvēl'yä) | - | 17 | Melozzo da Forli (mēlōt'so dä för'lē) | 1438-1494 | 3 |
| Masaccio, Tommaso (mäsät'chō) | 1401-1428 | 3 | Melville, Arthur | - | 21 |
| Masa-nobu, Ka-no | 1424-1520 | 27 | Memling, Hans | 1425-1495 | 10 |
| Masa-taka, Sugi-mura Ji-hei | fl. xviiith century | 28 | Memmi, Lippo (mēm'mē) | ?-1356 | 2 |
| Masolino da Panicale (mäsolē'no) | 1383-1440 | 3 | Meneses, Luis de Miranda-Perreira (mē-nā'sēs) | 1820- | 17 |
| Mason, George Heming | 1818-1872 | 21 | Mengs, Anton Raphael | 1728-1779 | 8 |
| Masiera, J. (mäsrē'rä) | - | 17 | Mentessi, Giuseppe (mēntēs'sē) | - | 6 |
| Massys, Cornelis (mä's'sis) | 1511-1580 | 10 | Menzel, Adolf (mēn'tsēl) | 1815-1904 | 9 |
| Massys, Jan (mä's'sis) | 1509-1575 | 10 | Merian, Maria Sibylla (mä'rēän) | 1647-1717 | 8 |
| Massys, Quentin (Quinten) (mä's'sis) | -1530 | 10 | Merian, Matthäus (mä'rēän) | 1621-1687 | 8 |
| Master of the Altar of St. George (Georg-altar) | fl. xivth century | 7 | Merritt, Mrs. Anna Lea | 1844- | 23 |
| Master of the Amsterdam Cabinet | fl. xivth century | 7 | Mertens, Charles | - | 12 |
| Master of the Bartholomew and Thomas Altar | fl. ca. 1500 | 7 | Mesdag, Hendrik Willem (mēs'däđ) | 1831- | 16 |
| Master of the Death of Mary | fl. 1530-1550 | 7 | Mesdag-van Houten, Mrs. S. (mēs'däđ-vän hä'ooten) | - | 16 |
| Master of Flemalle | fl. 1450 | 10 | Meshcherski, Arseni | 1834- | 24 |
| Master of the Glorification of Mary | fl. xvth century | 7 | Metcalf, Willard Leroy | 1858- | 23 |
| Master of the Half-figures of Women | fl. 1520 | 10 | Metsu, Gabriel (mēt'sii) | 1630-1667 | 14 |
| Master of the Holy Kith-and-Kin | fl. end xvth century | 7 | Mettling, Louis (mētlēn) | 1847-1904 | 20 |
| Master of Liesborn | fl. 1465 | 7 | Meulen, Adam Frans van der (mü'lēn) | 1632-1690 | 11 |
| Master of the Life of Mary | fl. 1463-1492 | 7 | Meulen, F. P. ter (mü'len) | 1834- | 16 |
| Master of the Lyversberg Passion | fl. 1463-1480 | 7 | Meulener (Molenaer), Peeter (mü'lēnēr) | 1602-1654 | 11 |
| Master of St. Severin | fl. xvth century | 7 | Meunier, Constantin (münyä) | 1831- | 12 |
| Master, see also Meister | | 7 | Meyer, Ernst (mī'ēr) | 1797-1861 | 26 |
| Mata-hei, Iwa-sa | fl. 1600 | 28 | Meyer, Johann Georg (Meyer von Bremen) (mī'ēr) | 1813- | 9 |
| Matejko, Johann (mätēy'ko) | 1838-1893 | 9 | Meyer, Klaus (mī'ēr) | 1856- | 9 |
| Matsu-moto, see Bum-pei | | | Meyer von Bremen, see Meyer, Johann Georg | | |
| Matsu-mura, see Gekkei and Kei-bun | | | Meyerheim, Eduard (mī'ērhim) | 1808-1879 | 9 |
| Matsys, see Massys | | | Meyerheim, Paul (mī'ērhim) | 1842- | 9 |
| Matteo di Giovanni (da Siena) (mättä'o) | 1435-1495 | 3 | Meytens (Mytens), Martin van (mī'tēns) | 1696-1770 | 8 |
| Maurer, Christof (mou'rēr) | fl. 1570 | 7 | Michallon, Achille Etna (mishälön) | 1796-1822 | 19 |
| Mauve, Anton (mōv) | 1838-1888 | 16 | Michel, Georges (mishēl) | 1763-1843 | 19 |
| Max, Gabriel | 1840- | 9 | Michelangelo di Lodovico Buonarrotti Simone (mikēlän'jēlō dē lödōvē'ko boo-ōnärōt'tē sēm'ōnā) | 1475-1564 | 4 |
| May, Edward Harrison | 1824-1887 | 22 | Michetti, Francesco Paolo (mikēt'tē) | 1852- | 6 |
| Mayer, Constance (māy'ēr) | 1778-1821 | 19 | Micheli, Andrea (mikēäl'ē) | 1539-1614 | 5 |
| Maynard, George Willoughby | 1843- | 23 | Michi-Nobu | fl. xviiiith century | 27 |
| Mazo, Juan Bautista Martínez (mä'tho) | 1610-1667 | 17 | Miel, Jan (mēl) | 1599-1664 | 11 |
| Mazzola, Francesco, see Parmigianino, Il | | | Mielich, Hans (mē'lidj) | 1516-1573 | 7 |
| Mazzola, Girolamo (mätsō'lä) | 1520-1580 | 4 | Mierevelt, Michiel Janszen van (mē'rēvēlt) | 1567-1641 | 14 |
| Mazzolino, Lodovico (mätsolē'no) | 1478-1528 | 4 | Mierevelt, Pieter van (mē'rēvēlt) | 1595-1623 | 14 |
| Mazzuola, Filippo (mätsōo-ō'lä) | ?-1505 | 3 | Mieris, Frans van, the Elder (mē'rīs) | 1635-1681 | 15 |
| Mazzuoli, Giuseppe (mätsōo-ō'lē) | ?-1589 | 4 | Mieris, Frans van, the Younger (mē'rīs) | 1689-1763 | 16 |
| Medola, Andrea, see Schiavone | | | Mieris, Jan van (mē'rīs) | 1660-1690 | 15 |
| Medula, Andrea, see Schiavone | | | Mieris, Willem van (mē'rīs) | 1662-1747 | 16 |
| Meer, Barend van der (mār) | 1659-? | 15 | Migliara, Giovanni (milyärä) | 1785-1837 | 6 |
| Meer, Jan van der, the Elder (mār) | 1628-1691 | 15 | Mignard, Nicolas (mīnyär) | 1606-1668 | 18 |
| Meer, Jan van der, the Younger (mār) | 1656-1705 | 15 | Mignard, Pierre (Le Romain) (mīnyär) | 1610-1695 | 18 |
| Meer, Jan van der, see also Vermeer | | | Mignon, Abraham (mīnyōn) | 1640-1679 | 8 |
| Meire, Gerard van der (mī'rē) | 1427-1474 | 10 | Millais, Sir John Everett (mil'lā) | 1829-1896 | 21 |
| Meissonier, Ernest (mässōnyä) | 1815-1891 | 19 | Millet, Francis D. (mil'lēt) | 1846- | 23 |
| Meister Berthold | fl. 1425 | 7 | Millet, François (Frans Mille) (mil'lēt) | 1642-1679 | 11 |
| Meister Stephan Lochner | fl. 1450 | 7 | Millet, Jean François (mīyā or millä) | 1814-1875 | 20 |
| Meister Wilhelm | fl. 1370 | 7 | Minardi, Tommaso (mīnär'dē) | 1787-1871 | 6 |
| Melbye, Anton (mēl'biē) | 1818-1875 | 26 | Minor, Robert Crannell | 1840-1904 | 23 |
| Melbye, Vilhelm (mēl'biē) | 1824- | 23 | Miola, Camillo (mīō'lä) | 1840- | 6 |
| Melchers, J. Gari | 1860- | 26 | | | |
| Melone, Altobello (mēlō'nä) | fl. 1490 | 3 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-------------------------|-------|---|------------------------|-------|
| Mion, Luigi (mē'on) | — | 6 | Morris, Philip Richard | 1838— | 21 |
| Miranda, see Rodriguez de Miranda | | | Morris, William | 1834— | 21 |
| Mitsu-nobu | 1445-1543 | 27 | Morse, Samuel Finley Breese | 1791-1872 | 22 |
| Mitsu-ōki | ?-1691 | 27 | Mosé, Albert (mōzā') | 1835— | 6 |
| Mitsu-yoshi | 1701-1772 | 27 | Moser, Lucas (mō'zēr) | fl. 1431 | 7 |
| Moeijaert, Moeyaert, see Moyaert | | | Moshkov | —1839 | 24 |
| Mol, Peeter van | 1599-1650 | 11 | Mosler, Henry | 1841— | 23 |
| Molenaer, Cornelis (mō'lēnār) | 1540-1591 | 10 | Mosso, Francesco | 1849-1877 | 6 |
| Molenaer, Jan Miense (mō'lēnār) | ?-1668 | 15 | Mostaert (Mostert), Frans (mos'tärt) | 1534-1560 | 10 |
| Molenaer, Nicolaas (Klaas) (mō'lēnār) | ?-1676 | 15 | Mostaert, Gillis (mos'tärt) | 1534-1598 | 10 |
| Moll, Karl | 1861— | 9 | Mostaert, Jan (mos'tärt) | 1474-1556 | 13 |
| Molmenti, Pompeo (molmēn'tē) | 1819— | 6 | Moto-mitsu | fl. xith century | 27 |
| Molyn, Pieter de, the Elder (mō'līn) | 1600-1661 | 15 | Moto-nobu, Ka-no (Ko-Hōgen) | 1477-1559 | 27 |
| Molyn, Pieter de, the Younger (Pieter de Mulieribus or Il Cavaliere Tempesta) (mō'līn) | 1637-1701 | 15 | Motte, Émile (mot'tē or mōt) | — | 12 |
| Momper, Frans de | ?-1661 | 11 | Moucheron, Frederik de (mooshērōn) | 1633-1686 | 14 |
| Momper, Jodocus (Joost) de | 1564-1635 | 11 | Moucheron, Isaak de (mooshērōn) | 1670-1744 | 14 |
| Monchablon, Jean (mōnshāblōn) | 1854— | 20 | Mount, William S. | 1807-1868 | 22 |
| Monet, Claude (mōnā) | 1840— | 20 | Mowbray, Henry Siddon | 1858— | 23 |
| Monks, J. A. S. | 1850— | 23 | Moya, Pedro de (mō'yā) | 1610-1666 | 17 |
| Monnoyer, Jean Baptiste (mōn-nwāyā) | 1634-1699 | 11 | Moyaert (Moeijaert, Moeyaert), Nicolaas (mō'yärt) | 1600-1659 | 14 |
| Montagna, Bartolommeo (montān'yā) | 1450-1523 | 3 | Mudo, El, see Navarrete | | |
| Montagna, Benedetto (montān'yā) | fl. early xvith century | 4 | Muhrman, Henry H. | 1854— | 23 |
| Montagnana, Jacopo (montānyā'nā) | 1450-1499 | 3 | Müller, Adam August | 1811-1844 | 26 |
| Montenard, Frédéric (mōntēnār) | 1849— | 20 | Müller, Morten | 1828— | 25 |
| Monticelli, Adolphe (mōntēsēlli) | 1824-1886 | 20 | Müller, Victor | 1829-1871 | 9 |
| Mooney, Edward | 1813— | 22 | Müller, William | 1786-1863 | 21 |
| Moor, Karel de (mōr) | 1656-1738 | 15 | Mulready, William | 1786-1863 | 21 |
| Moore, Albert | 1841-1892 | 21 | Multscher, Hans (mül'chēr) | fl. xvith century | 7 |
| Moore, Henry | 1831-1895 | 21 | Munari, see Pellegrino da Modena | | |
| Mor, or Moro van Dashorst, Antonis (Antonio Moro) | 1512-1576 | 10 | Munch, Edvard (mūnk) | 1863— | 25 |
| Morales, Luis de [of Badajoz] (mōrālēs) | 1510-1586 | 17 | Munkácsy (Michael Lieb) (mūn'kächē) | 1846-1900 | 9 |
| Moran, Edward | 1829-1901 | 22 | Muñoz, Sebastian (mūnyōth') | 1654-1690 | 17 |
| Moran, Peter | 1841— | 23 | Munthe, Gerhard (mūn'tē) | 1849— | 25 |
| Moran, Thomas | 1837— | 22 | Munthe, Ludvig (mūn'tē) | 1841-1896 | 25 |
| Morando, Paolo (Cavazzola) | 1486-1522 | 3 | Murano, Giovanni da, see Alemannus, Giovanni | | |
| Moreau, Gustave (mōrō) | 1826-1898 | 20 | Murillo, Bartolomé Esteban (mūrē'yo) | 1618-1682 | 17 |
| Morelli, Domenico (Domenico Soliero) (morēllē) | 1826— | 6 | Murphy, Herman Dudley | 1867— | 23 |
| Morelse, Paulus | 1571-1638 | 15 | Murphy, J. Francis | 1853— | 23 |
| Morero y Galicia (morā'ro ē galē'thīā) | — | 17 | Mussini, Cesare (moossē'nē) | 1808— | 6 |
| Moretto, Il | 1498-1555 | 4 | Mussini, Luigi (moossē'nē) | 1813-1888 | 6 |
| Morgenstern, Christian Ernst Bernhard | 1805-1867 | 9 | Muziano, Girolamo (mootsiā'no) | 1530-1592 | 5 |
| Morgenstern, Johann Ludwig Ernst | 1738-1819 | 8 | Muzzioli, Giovanni (mootsiō'lē) | 1854-1894 | 6 |
| Mori, see So-sen | | | Mytens, Daniel, the Elder (mī'tēns) | 1590-after 1658 | 14 |
| Mori-kagé | fl. xviiith century | 27 | Mytens, Johannes (mī'tēns) | ?-1671 | 14 |
| Mori-kuni, Tachi-bana | 1670-1748 | 28 | Nabu-zané, see Fujiwara no Nobu-zané | | |
| Morland, George | 1736-1804 | 21 | Naga-mitsu | fl. late xvith century | 27 |
| Moro, Antonio, see Mor, Antonis | | | Naga-sawa, see Ro-setsu | | |
| Moro, Il, see Torbido, Francesco | | | Nakken, Willem Karel | 1835— | 16 |
| Moro van Dashorst, see Mor, Antonis | | | Nam-mei, Haru-ki (Shiu-ki, Ri-sho, Ko-un-sho) | fl. sixth century | 27 |
| Moro-fusa | fl. xviiith century | 28 | Nao-nobu | 1603-1650 | 27 |
| Morone, Domenico (morō'nā) | 1442-1508 | 3 | Nasmyth, Alexander | 1758-1814 | 21 |
| Morone, Francesco (morō'nā) | 1474-1529 | 3 | Nasmyth, Patrick | 1787-1831 | 21 |
| Moroni, Giovanni Battista (morō'nē) | 1520-1578 | 4 | Natoire, Charles Joseph (nātwär) | 1700-1777 | 18 |
| Moro-nobu, Hishi-gawa | ?-1711 | 28 | Nattier, Jean Marc (nättyā) | 1685-1766 | 18 |
| Morot, Aimé Nicolas (mōrō) | 1850— | 19 | Navarrete, Juan Fernández (El Mudo) (nāvārā'tē) | 1526-1579 | 17 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-----------|-------|--|-----------|-------|
| Navez, François Joseph (nävä) | 1787-1869 | 12 | Orley, Bernaert (Barend van Brussel) (or'li) | 1491-1542 | 10 |
| Neagle, John | 1799-1865 | 22 | Orley, Jan van (or'li) | 1665-1735 | 11 |
| Needham, Charles Austin | 1844- | 23 | Orley, Richard van (or'li) | 1663-1732 | 11 |
| Neeffs, Peeter, the Elder (näfs) | 1578-1656 | 11 | Orlovski, Aleksander | 1777-1832 | 24 |
| Neeffs, Peeter, the Younger (näfs) | 1620-1675 | 11 | Orrente, Pedro (Bassano) (orrën'tē) | 1570-1644 | 17 |
| Neer, Aart van der (nār) | 1603-1677 | 14 | Ortolano, L' (The Gardener) (Giovanni Battista Benvenuti) (ortölä'nō) | 1467-1525 | 4 |
| Neer, Eglon Hendrik van der (nār) | 1643-1703 | 14 | Os, Georgius Jacobus Johannes | 1782-1861 | 16 |
| Neff, Timoleon Karl von | 1805-1876 | 24 | Os, Jan van | 1744-1808 | 16 |
| Nelli, Ottaviano (něl'lē) | ?-1444 | 3 | Ö-shin | 1791-1840 | 28 |
| Netscher, Caspar (něts'čđer) | 1639-1684 | 14 | Ossenbeeck (os'senbäk) | 1627-1678 | 15 |
| Netscher, Constantin (něts'čđer) | 1668-1722 | 16 | Ostade, Adriaan van (ostä'dē) | 1610-1685 | 15 |
| Netti, Cavaliere Francesco (nět'tē) | 1832-1894 | 6 | Ostade, Isaac van (ostä'dē) | 1621-1649 | 15 |
| Neuchatel (Nutschiedel), Nicolaus (nüşhätēl) | 1527-1595 | 10 | Otis, Bass | 1784-1861 | 22 |
| Neuhuys, Albert (nüş'hois) | 1844- | 16 | Ou. For names not listed under Ou, see U. | | |
| Neuville, Alphonse de (növēl) | 1836-1885 | 19 | Oudry, Jean Baptiste (oodrē) | 1686-1755 | 18 |
| Newton, Gilbert Stuart | 1795-1835 | 22 | Oules, Walter William | 1848- | 21 |
| Ngan Hwui (Gan-ki) fl. early xiii th century | | 28 | Ouwater, Albert van fl. xv th century | | 13 |
| Niccolò da Foligno (Alunno) (nikkölö' dā folin'yo) | 1430-1502 | 3 | Ouwater, (Oudewater) Gerard David, see David, Gheeraert | 1450-1523 | 10 |
| Niccolò di Pietro (Gerini) (nikkölö' dē piä'tro) fl. 1380 | | 2 | Overbeck, Johann Friedrich | 1789-1869 | 9 |
| Nichols, Mrs. Rhoda Holmes | - | 23 | Owen, Samuel | - | 21 |
| Nicol, Erskine | 1825- | 21 | Owen, William | 1769-1825 | 21 |
| Nielsen, Amaldus | 1838- | 25 | Owens, Jürgen | 1623-1679 | 8 |
| Nigris, Giuseppe (nē'gris) | 1812- | 6 | Pacchia, Girolamo del (pāk'kiä) | 1477-1535 | 4 |
| Nittis, Giuseppe de (nittä) | 1846-1884 | 20 | Pacchiarotti, Jacopo (pākkjāröt'tē) | 1474-1550 | 4 |
| Nono, Luigi | 1850- | 6 | Pacheco, Francisco (pāchā'ko) | 1571-1654 | 17 |
| Noort, Adam van (nört) | 1562-1641 | 11 | Pacher, Michel (pā'čđer) | 1430-1498 | 7 |
| Nordenberg, Bengt | 1822- | 25 | Padovanino, Il (The feminine Titian, Alessandro Varotari) (pädovänē'no) | 1590-1650 | 5 |
| Nordling, Adolf | 1840-1888 | 25 | Page, William | 1811-1885 | 22 |
| Nordström, Carl | 1855- | 25 | Pagliano, Elenterio (pälyä'no) | 1826- | 6 |
| Normann, Eilert Adelsteen | 1848- | 25 | Palamedesz (Stevaerts, Antonis) (pälämä'dēs) | 1601-1674 | 15 |
| Northcote, James | 1746-1831 | 21 | Palamedesz, Palamedes (Stevaerts) (pälämä'dēs) | 1607-1638 | 14 |
| Norton, William E. | 1843- | 22 | Palizzi, Giuseppe (pälit'sē) | 1818-1888 | 6 |
| Nourse, Elizabeth | - | 23 | Palm, Gustaf Vilhelm (also called Palma Vecchio) (pälma) | 1810-1890 | 25 |
| Nutschiedel, see Neuchatel | | | Palma Il Giovane (Palma, Giacomo, the Younger) (päl'mä il jō'vänē) | 1544-1628 | 4 |
| Nyberg, Ivar (nüşberg) | 1855- | 25 | Palma Il Vecchio (Palma, Giacomo, the Elder) (päl'mä il vėk'kiō) | 1480-1528 | 4 |
| Nys, Carl (nīs) | 1858- | 12 | Palma Vecchio, see Palm, Gustaf Vilhelm, and Palma il Vecchio | | |
| Ochtervelt (Uchtervelt) (očđer'velt) | ?-1710 | 15 | Palmer, Walter Launt | 1854- | 23 |
| Ochtman, Leonard (očđer'män) | 1854- | 23 | Palmezzano, Marco (pälmezsä'no) | 1456-1527 | 3 |
| Oesterlind, Allan (ös'terlind) | 1853- | 25 | Palomino de Castro y Velasco, Don Acislo Antonio (pälömē'no dā käs'tro ē vėlās'ko) | 1653-1725 | 17 |
| Offermans, Antonij Jacob | 1796- | 16 | Panetti, Domenico di Gasparo (pänēt'tē) | 1460-1512 | 3 |
| Ö-i, see Wang Wei | | | Pannini, Giovanni Paolo (pännē'nē) | 1695-1768 | 5 |
| Oka-moto Höken (Högen) (called Toyohiko) | 1768-1845 | 28 | Pantoja de la Cruz, Juan (pāntō'hä dā lä krooth) | 1551-1609 | 17 |
| Ö-kio, Maru-yama | 1733-1795 | 28 | Paolino da Pistoja, Fra (päolē'no dā pīs-tō'hä) | 1490-1547 | 4 |
| Olis, Jan | 1610-1655 | 14 | Pape, Eric | 1870- | 23 |
| Oliver, Isaac | 1556-1617 | 21 | Pareja, Juan de (pärä'hä) | 1606-1670 | 17 |
| Oliver, Peter | 1601-1660 | 21 | Paret de Alcázar, Luis (pärät'dä älkä'thär) | 1747-1799 | 17 |
| Ommeganck, Balthazar Pauwel (om'mē-čänk) | 1755-1826 | 11 | | | |
| Oost, Jacob van, the Elder (öst) | 1600-1671 | 11 | | | |
| Oost, Jacob van, the Younger (öst) | 1639-1713 | 11 | | | |
| Oostsaanen, see Corneliszen, Jacob | | | | | |
| Opie, John | 1761-1807 | 21 | | | |
| Orbetto, L', see Turchi, Alessandro | | | | | |
| Orcagna (Andrea di Cione) (orkän'yä) | 1308-1368 | 2 | | | |
| Orchardson, William Quiller | 1835- | 21 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------|-------|---|----------------------|-------|
| Parmigianino, Il (Francesco Mazzola) (pärmējānē'no) | 1504-1540 | 4 | Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista (pēātsēt'tā) . | 1682-1754 | 5 |
| Parrish, Maxfield | 1870- | 23 | Picard, Louis (pēkār) | 1850- | 20 |
| Parsons, Alfred | 1847- | 21 | Picknell, William L. | 1852-1897 | 23 |
| Parton, Ernest | 1845- | 21 | Picot, François Édouard (pēkō) | 1786-1868 | 19 |
| Pasini, Alberto (pāsē'nē) | 1826-1899 | 6 | Picou, Henri Pierre (pēkoo) | 1822- | 19 |
| Passerotti, Bartolommeo (pässērōt'tē) . | 1520-1592 | 4 | Pidoll, Karl von | 1847-1901 | 9 |
| Passignano, Domenico da (pässinyā'no) . | 1550-1638 | 5 | Pieneman, Jan Willem (pē'nēmān) | 1779-1853 | 16 |
| Patel, Pierre, the father (pätēl) | fl. 1625 | 18 | Pieneman, Nicolaas (pē'nēmān) | 1810-1860 | 16 |
| Patel, Pierre, the son (pätēl) | 1605-1676 | 18 | Piero, Guido di, see Angelico | | |
| Patenier, see Patinir | | | Pieter de Mulieribus, see Molyn, Pieter de | | |
| Pater, Jean Baptiste (pätār) | 1695-1736 | 18 | Pietro da Cortona (pēā'tro) | 1596-1669 | 5 |
| Paterson, James | 1854- | 21 | Pigheim, Bruno (pīg'hīm) | 1848-1894 | 9 |
| Patinir (Patenier), Joachim de (pätinēr) . | 1490-1524 | 10 | Piloty, Karl von (pēlō'tē) | 1826-1886 | 9 |
| Paton, Sir Joseph Noel | 1821- | 21 | Pils, Isidore (pīs) | 1815-1875 | 19 |
| Paudiss (Pauditz), Christoffer (pou'dīss) . | 1618-1666 | 8 | Pine, R. E. | 1742-1790 | 22 |
| Pauli, Georg (pou'lē) | 1855- | 25 | Pinturicchio (pīntürrik'kīō) | 1454-1513 | 3 |
| Paulsen, Julius (pou'lsēn) | 1860- | 26 | Piola, Domenico (pīō'lā) | 1628-1703 | 5 |
| Paulssen, Erik (pou'lsēn) | 1749-1790 | 26 | Piombo, Fra Sebastiano del (pīom'bo) . | 1485-1547 | 4 |
| Pauwels, Ferdinand (pou'wēls) | 1830- | 12 | Pisanello, see Pisano, Vittore | | |
| Paxton, William M. | 1869- | 23 | Pisano, Vittore (Pisanello) (pēsā'no) . . | 1380-1456 | 3 |
| Peale, Charles Wilson | 1741-1827 | 22 | Pissarro, Camille (pēssārō) | 1831- | 20 |
| Peale, Rembrandt | 1787-1860 | 22 | Pissarro, Lucien (pēssārō) | - | 20 |
| Pearce, Charles Sprague | 1851- | 23 | Pizzolo, Niccolò (pētsō'lo) | fl. 1470 | 3 |
| Pedrini, Giovanni (Giampetrino) (pēd- rē'nē) | fl. 1520-1550 | 4 | Plagemann, Carl Gustaf (plā'gēmān) . . . | 1805- | 25 |
| Peirce, H. Winthrop | 1850- | 23 | Platt, Charles Adams | 1861- | 23 |
| Pelenov | - | 24 | Pleydenwurff, Hans (plī'denvürf) | ?-1472 | 7 |
| Pellegrino da Modena (Munari) (pēllē- grē'no) | 1468-1524 | 3 | Pleydenwurff, Wilhelm (plī'denvürf) . . . | 1450-1494 | 7 |
| Pellegrino da San Daniele (Martino da Udine) (pēllēgrē'no) | 1460-1547 | 4 | Plockhorst, Bernhard | 1825- | 9 |
| Pelouse, Léon Germain (pēlooz) | 1845?-1891 | 20 | Podesti, Francesco (pödēs'tē) | 1800-1895 | 6 |
| Pencz, Georg (pēnts) | 1500-1550 | 7 | Poel, Egbert van der (pool) | 1621-1664 | 14 |
| Penni, Francesco (Il Fattore) (pēn'nē) . | 1488-1528 | 4 | Poelenborch, see Poelenburg | | |
| Pepino, Josef D. (pēpē'no) | 1863- | 9 | Poelenborch (Poelenborch), Cornelis van (poo'lenbörč) | 1586-1667 | 15 |
| Pepper, Charles Hovey | 1864- | 23 | Poggenbeek, Georg (pög'genbāk) | 1853- | 16 |
| Pepyn, Marten (pē'pīn) | 1575-1643 | 11 | Pointelin, Auguste Emmanuel (pwōntēlēn) 1839- | 20 | |
| Pereda, Antonio de (pērā'dā) | 1599-1669 | 17 | Pollajuolo, Antonio (pollāyoo'ōlo) | 1433-1498 | 3 |
| Perov, Vasili | 1833-1882 | 24 | Pollajuolo, Pietro (pollāyoo'ōlo) | 1443-1496 | 3 |
| Perréal, Jean (Jehan de Paris) (pērrāäl) . | 1455-1528 | 18 | Pollastrini, Enrico (pollāstrē'nē) | 1817-1876 | 6 |
| Perry, E. Wood | 1831- | 22 | Pomarance (Pomerance), Cristoforo delle (Roncalli) (pömērān'chā) | 1552-1626 | 5 |
| Perry, Mrs. Lilla Cabot | - | 23 | Pomarance (Pomerance), Niccolò delle (Roncalli) (pömērān'chā) | fl. end xvth century | 5 |
| Perugini, Pietro (Pietro di Cristoforo Vannucci) (pērūjē'no) | 1446-1523 | 3 | Ponte, da, see Bassano | | |
| Peruzzi, Baldassare (pēroot'sē) | 1481-1537 | 4 | Pontormo, Jacopo | 1494-1557 | 4 |
| Pescador, Eduardo Fernández (pēskādōr') | 1836-1872 | 17 | Poore, Henry R. | 1859- | 23 |
| Pesellino, Francesco (pēsēllē'no) | 1422-1457 | 3 | Poorter, Willem de (pōr'tēr) | fl. 1635-1645 | 15 |
| Pesne, Antoine (pān) | 1683-1757 | 18 | Porcellis, Jan (porsē'līs) | 1597-1632 | 14 |
| Peters, Clinton | 1865- | 23 | Pordenone, Bernardino Licinio da (pordē- nō'nē) | ?-1541 | 4 |
| Peters, Vilhelm Otto (pā'ters) | 1851- | 25 | Pordenone, Giovanni Antonio Licinio da (pordēnō'nē) | 1483-1539 | 4 |
| Peterssen, Eilif (pā'tērsēn) | 1852- | 25 | Portaels, Jean François (por'tāls) | 1818- | 12 |
| Pettenkofen, August von | 1821-1889 | 9 | Porter, Benjamin C. | 1845- | 23 |
| Pettie, John | 1839-1893 | 21 | Post, Frans | 1612-1680 | 15 |
| Petzholdt, Ernst Christian (pēts'hōlt) . . | 1805-1838 | 26 | Potter, Paulus | 1625-1654 | 14 |
| Philippoteaux, Henri Emmanuel Félix (fēlīppōtō) | 1815-1884 | 19 | Potter, Pieter | 1587-1650 | 14 |
| Philipsen, Theodor (fīlīp'sēn) | 1840- | 26 | Pourbus, Frans, the Elder (pūr'būs) | 1545-1581 | 10 |
| Phillip, John | 1817-1867 | 21 | Pourbus, Frans, the Younger (pūr'būs) . . | 1570-1622 | 10 |
| Piazza, Callisto (pēā'tsä) | ?-1561 | 5 | Pourbus, Peeter (pūr'būs) | 1510-1584 | 10 |
| | | | Poussin, Gaspard (Dughet) (püssēn) . . . | 1613-1675 | 18 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------------|-------|--|----------------------|-------|
| Poussin, Nicolas (püssēñ) | 1593-1665 | 18 | Regnault, Henri (rēnyō) | 1843-1871 | 20 |
| Powell, William H. | 1824-1879 | 22 | Regnault, Jean Baptiste, Baron (rēnyō) | 1754-1829 | 19 |
| Poynter, Sir Edward John | 1836- | 21 | Rehn, Frank K. M. | 1848- | 23 |
| Pradilla, Francisco (prädēl'yā) | 1847- | 17 | Reid, Sir George | 1842- | 21 |
| Pratt, Mathew | 1734-1805 | 29 | Reid, John Robertson | 1851- | 21 |
| Preller, Friedrich, the Elder | 1804-1878 | 9 | Reid, Robert | 1863- | 23 |
| Preller, Friedrich, the Younger | 1838- | 9 | Reinhart, Benjamin Franklin | 1829-1885 | 23 |
| Prendergast, Maurice B. | - | 23 | Reiniger, Otto (rī'nigēr) | 1863- | 9 |
| Preu, see Breu | | | —Rembrandt van Ryn (rēm'brānt vān rīn) | 1607-1669 | 14 |
| Previali, Gaetano (prāvīā'tē) | - | 6 | Remeens, David (rāmāns) | 1555-1625 | 11 |
| Previtali, Andrea (prāvītā'lē) | 1480-1528 | 3 | Renan, Ary (rēnān) | 1855-1900 | 20 |
| Prichetnikov, Vasili | 1767-1809 | 24 | René of Anjou (rēnā) | 1408-1480 | 18 |
| Prikker, Thorn | - | 16 | Reni, see Guido Reni | | |
| Primaticcio (prēmātīt'chō) | 1504-1570 | 4 | Renoir, Firmin Auguste (rēnwār) | 1841- | 20 |
| Prinsep, Valentine Cameron | 1836- | 21 | Renouard, Paul (rēnooar) | 1845- | 20 |
| Procaccini, Camillo (prokkātchē'nē) | 1546-1626 | 4 | Ren-zan | ?-1859 | 28 |
| Procaccini, Ercole, the Elder (prokkātchē'nē) | 1520-1591 | 4 | Répin, Elias, see Rye-pin, Ilya | | |
| Procaccini, Ercole, the Younger (prokkātchē'nē) | 1596-1676 | 5 | Restout, Jean (rēstoo) | 1692-1768 | 18 |
| Procaccini, Giulio Cesare (prokkātchē'nē) | 1548-1626 | 4 | Rethel, Alfred (rātēl) | 1816-1859 | 9 |
| Protais, Paul Alexandre (protā) | 1826-1890 | 19 | Reynolds, Sir Joshua | 1723-1792 | 21 |
| Prout, Samuel | 1783-1852 | 21 | Ribalta, Francisco de (rībāl'tā) | 1550-1628 | 17 |
| Prud'hon, Pierre Paul (prūdōñ) | 1758-1823 | 20 | Ribalta, Juan de (rībāl'tā) | 1597-1628 | 17 |
| Puligo, Domenico (pülē'go) | 1492-1527 | 4 | Ribera, Giuseppe, see Spagnoletto, Lo (rībār'rā) | | |
| Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre (püvē dē shävän) | 1824-1898 | 20 | Ribot, Théodule (rībō) | 1823-1891 | 20 |
| Pyle, Howard | 1853- | 23 | Ricard, Gustave (rīkār) | 1823-1872 | 20 |
| Pynacker, Adam (pī'nākkēr) | 1621-1673 | 14 | Ricci, Marco (rīt'chē) | 1679-1729 | 5 |
| Pynas, Jan (pī'nās) | 1580-1621 | 15 | Ricci, Sebastiano (rīt'chē) | 1659-1734 | 5 |
| Quadrone, Giovanni Battista (quādrō'nā) | 1844-1898 | 6 | Riccio, see Brusasorci | | |
| Quartley, Arthur | 1839-1886 | 22 | Richards, William T. | 1833-1905 | 22 |
| Quast, Pieter | 1602-1646 | 14 | Richmond, William Blake | 1843- | 21 |
| Quellinus (Quellin), Erasmus (quēllē'nus) | 1607-1678 | 11 | Richter, Gustav (Karl Ludwig) (rīch'tēr) | 1823-1884 | 9 |
| Querfurt, August (quār'foort) | 1697-1761 | 8 | Richter, Ludwig (rīch'tēr) | 1803-1884 | 9 |
| Quidor, John | ca. 1875 | 22 | Rico, Martín (rē'ko) | 1850- | 17 |
| Rabus, Karl | 1800-1857 | 24 | Ridinger, see Riedinger | | |
| Raeburn, Sir Henry | 1756-1823 | 21 | Riedel, August (rē'dēl) | 1802-1883 | 9 |
| Raffaelli, Jean François (rāffāälē) | 1850- | 20 | Riedinger (Ridinger), Johann Elias (rē'dīnger) | 1698-1767 | 8 |
| Raffaello, see Raphael | | | Rigaud, Hyacinthe (rēgō) | 1659-1743 | 18 |
| Raffet, Auguste Marie (rāffā) | 1804-1860 | 19 | Ri-ko-riu, see Li Lung-yen | | |
| Rahl, Karl (rāl) | 1812-1865 | 9 | Rincon, Antonio del (rīnkōn) | 1446-1500 | 17 |
| Ramírez, Manuel (rāmē'rēth) | - | 17 | Ring, Hermann tom | 1521-1597 | 7 |
| Ramsay, Allan | 1713-1784 | 21 | Ring, Lauritz | 1854- | 26 |
| Ranc, Jean (rān) | 1674-1735 | 18 | Ring, Ludger tom, the Elder | 1496-1547 | 7 |
| Ranger, Henry W. | 1858- | 23 | Ring, Ludger tom, the Younger | 1521-1584 | 7 |
| Raoux, Jean (rāoo) | 1677-1734 | 18 | Rin-riō, see Lin Liang | | |
| Raphael or Raffaello Sante (Santi, Sanzio) (rāffāäl'lō) | 1483-1520 | 4 | Riō-kai | fl. xvith century | 27 |
| Ravestyn, Anthony van (rāv'vēstīn) | fl. xviiith century | 14 | Ri-riu-min, see Li Lung-yen | | |
| Ravestyn, Arent van (rāv'vēstīn) | 1645-1687 | 14 | Ri-sho, see Nam-mei | | |
| Ravestyn, Jan van (rāv'vēstīn) | 1575-1657 | 14 | Ritsu-wō | fl. xviiiith century | 27 |
| Read, Thomas Buchanan | 1822-1872 | 22 | Ritter, Heinrich | 1816-1853 | 9 |
| Redfield, Edward Willis | 1868- | 23 | Rivaltz, Antoine (rēvāltz) | 1667-1735 | 18 |
| Redon, Odilon (rēdōn) | 1862- | 20 | Rivière, Briton (rīvīār) | 1840- | 21 |
| Regamey, Guillaume (rēgāmā) | 1837-1876 | 19 | Rix, Julian Walbridge | 1851-1903 | 23 |
| Regemorter, Ignatius Josephus van (rā'tjē-mortēr) | 1785-1873 | 12 | Rizi, Francisco (rē'thī) | 1668-1685 | 17 |
| | | | Rizi, Fray Juan (rē'thī) | 1595-1675 | 17 |
| | | | Robert, Hubert (rōbār) | 1733-1808 | 18 |
| | | | Robert, Leopold (rō'bērt) | 1794-1835 | 9 |
| | | | Robert-Fleury, Nicolas (rōbār-flōrē) | 1797-1890 | 19 |
| | | | Robinson, Theodore | 1852-1896 | 23 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------|-------|--|---------------|-------|
| Robinson, Thomas | 1835-1888 | 23 | Rousseau, Philippe (roossō) | 1816-1887 | 20 |
| Roche, Alexander | 1863- | 21 | Rousseau, Théodore (roossō) | 1812-1867 | 20 |
| Roche-grosse, Georges (roshgross) | 1859- | 20 | Roybet, Ferdinand (rwābā) | 1840- | 20 |
| Rochussen, Karel (rōđy'oossēn) | 1814-1894 | 16 | Roymerwale, Marinus van (roimērswālē) | 1497-1567 | 10 |
| Röd, Jörgen (röd) | 1808- | 26 | Rubens, Peter Paul (rō'bens) | 1577-1640 | 11 |
| Rodríguez de Miranda, Pedro de (rōdrē'- ğēth dā mirān'dā) | 1696-1766 | 17 | Rugendas, Georg Philipp (roogēn'dās) | 1666-1742 | 8 |
| Roed, see Röd | | | Ruisdael, Salomon van, see Ruysdael | | |
| Roelas, Juan de las (rōālās) | 1558-1625 | 17 | Rump, Christian Godfred | 1816-1880 | 26 |
| Roelofs, Willem (roo'lofs) | 1822-1897 | 16 | Runciman, Alexander | 1736-1785 | 21 |
| Rogers, Frank W. | 1854- | 23 | Runciman, John | 1744-1766 | 21 |
| Rohde, Johan (rō'dē) | 1856- | 26 | Runge, Philipp Otto (rūn'gē) | 1777-1810 | 9 |
| Rokotov, Fedor | 173?-1810 | 24 | Ruskin, John | 1819-1900 | 21 |
| Roll, Alfred Philippe | 1847- | 20 | Russel, John | 1744-1806 | 21 |
| Rolshoven, Julius | 1858- | 23 | Ruthart, Karl (root'härt) | fl. 1660-1680 | 8 |
| Romanelli, Giovanni Francesco (rōmā- nē'lē) | 1610-1662 | 5- | Ruysch, Rachael (rois) | 1664-1750 | 16 |
| Romanino, Girolamo (rōmānē'no) | 1485-1566 | 4 | Ruysdael, Jacob van (rois'dal) | 1625-1682 | 15 |
| Rombouts, J. | fl. 1660 | 15 | Ruysdael (Ruisdael), Salomon van (rois'- dal) | 1600-1670 | 15 |
| Rombouts, Salomon | fl. 1650 | 15 | Ryckaert, David, the Third (rī'kärt) | 1612-1661 | 11 |
| Rombouts, Theodor | 1597-1637 | 11 | Ryckaert, Marten (rī'kärt) | 1587-1631 | 11 |
| Romeyn, Willem (rō'mīn) | 1624-1693 | 15 | Rydberg, Gustaf Fredrik (rūd'bērg) | 1835- | 25 |
| Romney, George | 1734-1802 | 21 | Ryder, Albert Pinkham | 1847- | 23 |
| Roncalli, see Pomarance | | | Ryepin, Ilya (Elias Répin) | 1844- | 24 |
| Rondani, Francesco Maria (rondā'nē) | ?-1548 | 4 | Sabbatini, see Andrea da Salerno | | |
| Rondinello, Niccolò (rondēnē'lō) | fl. 1475-1500 | 3 | Sacchi, Andrea (sāk'kē) | 1600-1661 | 5 |
| Ronner, Mme Henriette | 1821- | 16 | Sacchi di Pavia, Pier-Francesco (sāk'kē) fl. | 1512-1526 | 3 |
| Roos, Johann Heinrich (rōs) | 1631-1685 | 8 | Sadé, Philip Lodewijk Jacob Frederik (sādā') | 1837- | 16 |
| Roos, Johann Melchior (rōs) | 1659-1731 | 8 | Saenredam, Pieter (sän'rēdām) | 1597-1665 | 15 |
| Roos (Rosa), Joseph (rōs) | 1726-1805 | 8 | Saftleven, Cornelis (säft'lāven) | 1612-1682 | 15 |
| Roos, Philipp Peter (Rosa di Tivoli) (rōs) | 1655-1705 | 8 | Saftleven, Herman (säft'lāven) | 1609-1685 | 15 |
| Rops, Félicien (rō or röps) | 1845-1898 | 12 | Sala y Francés, Emilio (sä'lä ē franthās') | 1850- | 17 |
| Roqueplan, Camille (rokplān) | 1800-1855 | 19 | Salai, see Salaino | | |
| Rörbye, Martinus Christian Wesseltoft (rör'büē) | 1803-1848 | 26 | Salaino (Salai), Andrea (sälī'no) | 1483-1520 | 4 |
| Rosa, Joseph, see Roos | | | Saliba, see Antonello da Saliba | | |
| Rosa, Salvator (rō'sä) | 1615-1673 | 5 | Salimbeni, Ventura (sälīmbā'nē) | 1557-1613 | 5 |
| Rosales, Eduardo (rōsālēs) | 1837-1873 | 17 | Salmson, Hugo Fredrik | 1843-1894 | 25 |
| Rosen, Georg, Count von | 1843- | 25 | Salvi, Giovanni Battista, see Sassofer- rato, II | | |
| Rosenstand, Vilhelm Jakob (ro'senstän) | 1838- | 26 | Salviati, Cecchino del (sälviātē) | 1510-1563 | 5 |
| Ro-setsu (Naga-sawa) | 1755-1799 | 28 | Sánchez, Mariano Ramon (sän'chēth) | 1740-1822 | 17 |
| Roslin, Alexander | 1718-1793 | 25 | Sánchez Coello, Alonso (sän'chēth koē'l'yo) | 1515-1590 | 17 |
| Ross, Christian Meyer | 1843- | 25 | Sánchez Cotán, Fray Juan (sän'chēth kotān') | 1561-1627 | 17 |
| Ross, Denman | 1853- | 23 | Sánchez de Castro, Juan (sän'chēth dā käs'tro) | ?-1516 | 17 |
| Rosseels, Jacques (rōs'säls) | 1828- | 12 | Sanctis, Guglielmo de (sänk'tis) | 1830- | 6 |
| Rosselli, Cosimo (rōssē'l'lē) | 1439-1507 | 3 | Sandberg, Johan Gustav | 1782-1854 | 25 |
| Rosselli, Matteo (rōssē'l'lē) | 1578-1650 | 5 | Sande-Bakhuysen, Hendrik van (sän'dē- bāk'hoisen) | 1795-1860 | 16 |
| Rosset-Granget, Édouard (rossā-gränžā) | 1853- | 20 | Sandrart, Joachim von | 1606-1688 | 8 |
| Rossetti, Gabriel Charles Dante (better known as Dante Gabriel Rossetti) | 1828-1882 | 21 | Sandreuter, Hans (sänd'roitēr) | 1850-1901 | 9 |
| Rossi, Rosso de' (Il Rosso) (ros'sō dā ros'sē) | 1494-1541 | 4 | Sano (see Ansano) di Pietro (sä'no dē piā'tro) | 1405-1481 | 3 |
| Rossi Scotti, Count Lemmo (ros'sē skot'tē) | 1848- | 6 | San-Raku (Kimura), Kano | 1559-1635 | 27 |
| Rotermund, Julius Wilhelm Louis (rō'tēr- münd) | 1826-1859 | 9 | San-setsu (Da-soku-ken) | 1592-1654 | 27 |
| Rothermel, Peter F. | 1817-1895 | 22 | Sant, James | 1820- | 21 |
| Rotta, Antonio (rot'tā) | 1828- | 6 | Santa Leocadia, Pablo de (sän'tā lēō- kād'iā) | - | 17 |
| Rottenhammer, Johann | 1564-1623 | 7 | | | |
| Rottmann, Karl | 1797-1850 | 9 | | | |
| Rouget, Georges (roožā) | 1784-1869 | 19 | | | |

| | | DATES | TABLE | | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------|-------|-------|---|------------------------|-------|-------|
| Santacroce, Francesco da, see Francesco da Santacroce | | | | Schuster-Woldan (shoos'ter-vol'dän) | | - | 9 |
| Santacroce, Girolamo da, see Girolamo Santacroce | | | | Schuster-Woldan, Raffael (shoos'ter-vol'dän) | | - | 9 |
| Sante (Santi), see Raphael | | | | Schut, Cornelis (schüt) | 1597-1655 | | 11 |
| Santerre, Jean Baptiste (säntär) | 1658-1717 | 18 | | Schwabe, Carlos (swäb) | | - | 20 |
| Santi, Giovanni (sän'tē) | 1435-1494 | 3 | | Schwartz, Johan Georg (schvār'tsē) | 1814-1874 | | 16 |
| Santi di Tito (sän'tē dē tē'to) | 1536-1603 | 5 | | Schwartz, Thérèse (schvār'tsē) | 1851- | | 16 |
| Sanzio, see Raphael | | | | Schwarz, Christoph (shvār'ts) | 1550-1597 | | 7 |
| Saporetti, Pietro (säpörēt'tē) | 1832- | 6 | | Schwind, Moritz von (shvīnd) | 1804-1871 | | 9 |
| Sargent, John Singer | 1856- | 23 | | Sch. For names not listed under Sch, see Sh | | | |
| Sartain, William | 1843- | 23 | | Sciuti, Giuseppe (shoo'tē) | 1835- | | 6 |
| Sarto, Andrea del | 1486-1531 | 4 | | Scorel, Jan van (sko'rēl) | 1495-1562 | | 13 |
| Sartori, Giuseppe (särtō'rē) | 1863- | 6 | | Scott, David | 1806-1849 | | 21 |
| Sartorio, Aristide (särtō'rīō) | 1861- | 6 | | Sears, Mrs. Sarah C. | 1858- | | 23 |
| Sassatta, see Stefano di Giovanni | | | | Seekatz, Johann Konrad (zä'kät's) | 1719-1768 | | 8 |
| Sassi (sä's'sē) | - | 6 | | Segantini, Giovanni (sägäntē'nē) | 1858-1899 | | 6 |
| Sassoferrato, Il (Giovanni Battista Salvi) (säsoferrä'tō) | 1605-1685 | 5 | | Segers, see Seghers | | | |
| Savage, Edward | 1761-1817 | 22 | | Seghers (Segers, Zeghers), Daniel (zä'chjērs) | 1590-1661 | | 11 |
| Savery, Roelant | 1576-1639 | 11 | | Seghers, Hercules (zä'chjērs) | 1589-1650 | | 14 |
| Savoldo, Gian' Girolamo (sävol'do) | 1480-1548 | 4 | | Sei-mo | fl. xvth century | | 27 |
| Scarsella, Ippolito, see Scarsellino, Lo | | | | Seligman, Georg (sä'ligmān) | 1866- | | 26 |
| Scarsellino, Lo (Ippolito Scarsella) (skar-säll'ē'no) | 1551-1621 | 4 | | Semiradski, Genrikh (Hendrik) | 1843- | | 24 |
| Schadow, Friedrich Wilhelm von (shä'dō) | 1789-1862 | 9 | | Semitecolo, Niccolò (sēmītā'kolo) | 1351-1400 | | 2 |
| Schaffner, Martin (shäf'nēr) | fl. 1500-1535 | 7 | | Sequeira, Domingo Antonio de (sēkā'irā) | 1768-1837 | | 17 |
| Schalcken, Godfried (schäl'kēn) | 1643-1706 | 14 | | Serov, Valentin, see Syerov | | | |
| Schampheler, Edmond de (schäm'fēlār) | 1824-1899 | 12 | | Sesshiū | 1420-1507 | | 27 |
| Schäufelin, Hans Leonhard (shoi'fēlēn) | 1490-1540 | 7 | | Sesson (Shiu-ki) | fl. xvth century | | 27 |
| Scheffer, Ary (shēffār) | 1797-1858 | 19 | | Settei | fl. xvth century | | 27 |
| Scheits, Mathias (shīts) | 1640-1700 | 8 | | Seurat, George (sōrā) | 1859-1891 | | 20 |
| Schelfhout, Andreas (schēlf'hä-oot) | 1787-1870 | 16 | | Shannon, James Jebusa | 1863- | | 23 |
| Schendel, Pietrus van (schēn'dēl) | 1806-1870 | 16 | | Sharpless, James | 1751-1811 | | 22 |
| Schiavone, Andrea (Andrea Medola or Medola) (skiävō'nē) | 1522-1582 | 4 | | Sha-san-rō, see Bun-chō | | | |
| Schiavone, Felice (skiävō'nē) | 1803-1868 | 6 | | Shaw, Byam | | - | 21 |
| Schiavone, Natale (skiävō'nē) | 1777-1858 | 6 | | Shchedrin, Semen | 1745-1804 | | 24 |
| Schick, Gottlieb (shīk) | 1779-1812 | 8 | | Shchedrin, Silvestr | 1791-1830 | | 24 |
| Schidone, Bartolommeo (skidō'nē) | 1570-1615 | 5 | | Shee, Sir Martin Archer | 1769-1850 | | 21 |
| Schirmer, Johann Wilhelm (shir'mēr) | 1807-1863 | 9 | | Shiba, see Son-kai | | | |
| Schleich, Eduard (shlīch) | 1812-1874 | 9 | | Shiba-ta, see Gi-tō | | | |
| Schlottmüller, see Slott-Möller | | | | Shin-sō or Sō-a-mi | fl. late xvth century | | 27 |
| Schmid, Mathias (shmit) | 1835- | 9 | | Shi-on, see Gen-ki | | | |
| Schmitt, Albert Felix | 1873- | 23 | | Shirlaw, Walter | 1838- | | 23 |
| Schnetz, Jean Victor (snäts) | 1788-1870 | 19 | | Shishkin, Aleksandr | 1831-1898 | | 24 |
| Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Julius (shnorr fön kār'olsfeld) | 1794-1872 | 9 | | Shiū-bun | fl. xvth century | | 27 |
| Schofield, W. Elmer | 1867- | 23 | | Shiū-bun Soga | fl. xvth century | | 27 |
| Schöngauer, Martin (shōn'gouēr) | 1446-1488 | 7 | | Shiū-getsu | fl. late xvth century | | 27 |
| Schönleber, Gustav (shün'läbēr) | 1851- | 9 | | Shiū-hō | fl. sixth century | | 28 |
| Schooten, Joris van (Verschooten) (schō-tēn) | 1587-1650 | 15 | | Shiu-ki, see Nam-mei and Sesson | | | |
| Schotel, Pieter Jan (schō'tēl) | 1808-1865 | 16 | | Shiu-kō | fl. early xvth century | | 27 |
| Schrader, Julius (shrād'ēr) | 1815- | 9 | | Shō-bei, see Kiyo-nobu | | | |
| Schreyer, Adolf (shri'ēr) | 1828-1899 | 9 | | Shō-Gaku | fl. sixth century | | 28 |
| Schrödter, Adolf (shrō'tēr) | 1805-1875 | 9 | | Shō-haku, see Shō-Gaku | | | |
| Schtschedrin, see Shchedrin | | | | Shō-kwa-dō | 1582-1639 | | 27 |
| Schüchlin, Hans (shüch'fēn) | ?-1505 | 7 | | Shurtleff, Roswell M. | 1838- | | 23 |
| Schuessle, Peter F. | 1824-1879 | 22 | | Sh. For names not listed under Sh, see Sch | | | |
| | | | | Siberechts, Jan (zē'bērēch'ts) | 1627-1703 | | 11 |
| | | | | Sigalon, Xavier (sīgälōn) | 1788-1837 | | 19 |
| | | | | Signac, Paul (sīnyäk) | 1863- | | 20 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|-------------------|-------|--|-----------------------|-------|
| Signorelli, Luca d' Egidio di Ventura de' (sinyōrē'lē) | 1441-1523 | 3 | Sōyen (Jō-sui) | fl. late xvth century | 27 |
| Signorini, Telemaco (sinyōrē'nē) | 1835- | 6 | Spada, Lionello (spä'dä) | 1576-1622 | 5 |
| Silva y Velásquez, see Velásquez | | | Spaendonck, Cornelis van (spän'dōnk) | 1756-1840 | 16 |
| Silvestre, Louis de (silvātr) | 1675-1760 | 18 | Spaendonck, Gerardus van (spän'dōnk) | 1746-1822 | 16 |
| Simmons, Edward | 1852- | 23 | Spagna, Lo (spän'yä) | ?-1530 | 3 |
| Simone di Martino (Martini) (simō'nä dē märtē'nō) | 1284-1344 | 2 | Spagnoletto, Lo (Giuseppe Ribera) (spän-yōlēt'tō) | 1588-1656 | 5 |
| Simonetti, Alfonso (simonēt'tē) | 1840-1892 | 6 | Spangenberg, Friedrich (spän'gēnbērg) | 1843-1874 | 9 |
| Simoni, Gustavo (símō'nē) | 1846- | 6 | Spartali-Stillman, Mrs. (Marie Spartali) | 1844- | 21 |
| Sinding, Elizabeth | 1846- | 25 | Speckter, Erwin | 1806-1835 | 9 |
| Sinding, Otto Ludwig | 1842- | 25 | Speekhaert, Léopold (späk'härt) | - | 12 |
| Sisley, Alfred (sislä) | 1840-1899 | 20 | Speranza, Giovanni (spērän'dzä) | fl. 1500 | 3 |
| Skånberg, Karl | 1850-1883 | 25 | Sperl, Ludwig | - | 9 |
| Skarbina, Franz (skärbē'nä) | 1849- | 9 | Spinelli, see Spinello | | |
| Skovgård, Joachim (skōv'gâr) | 1856- | 26 | Spinello Aretino (Spinello, Spinelli) (spē-nē'lō ärētē'no) | 1333-1410 | 2 |
| Skovgård, Niels (skōv'gâr) | 1858- | 26 | Spitzweg, Karl (spits'väg) | 1808-1885 | 9 |
| Skovgård, Peter Kristian (skōv'gâr) | 1817-1875 | 26 | Spranger, Bartholomeus (sprän'djēr) | 1546-1627 | 10 |
| Skramstadt, Ludvig | 1855- | 25 | Springinklee (sprin'ginklä) | ?-1540 | 7 |
| Skredsvig, Christian | 1854- | 25 | Squarçione, Francesco (skwärchō'nä) | 1394-1474 | 3 |
| Slevogt, Max (slä'fōgt) | - | 9 | Staigg, Richard M. | 1820-1881 | 22 |
| Slingeland (Slingelandt), Pieter Cornelisz van (sli'n'djēlant) | 1640-1691 | 15 | Stanfield, William Clarkson | 1793-1867 | 21 |
| Slingeneyer, Ernest (sli'n'djēniēr) | 1823- | 12 | Stanhope, R. Spencer | - | 21 |
| Slott-Möller, Mrs. Agnes | 1862- | 26 | Stanzioni, Massimo (stäntsio'nē) | 1585-1656 | 5 |
| Slott-Möller, Harold | 1864- | 26 | Stark, James | 1794-1859 | 21 |
| Smedley, William Thomas | 1858- | 23 | Starna, see Stamina | | |
| Smibert, John | 1684-1751 | 22 | Stamina, Gherardo (Gherardo d' Jacopo Starna) (stämē'nä) | 1354-1413 | 2 |
| Smith, Joseph Lindon | 1863- | 23 | Stauffer-Bern, Karl (stou'fēr-bēr'n) | 1857-1891 | 9 |
| Smits, Eugène | - | 12 | Steen, Jan (stän) | 1626-1679 | 15 |
| Snayers, Peeter (snī'ērs) | 1592-1667 | 11 | Steenwyck, Hendrik van, the Elder (stän'wik) | 1550-1604 | 10 |
| Snell, Henry B. | 1858- | 23 | Steenwyck, Hendrik van, the Younger (stän'wik) | 1580-1649 | 11 |
| Snellinck, Jan, the Elder | 1549-1638 | 11 | Stefano da Zevio (stēfā'no dä dzä'vīo) | 1393-1450 | 3 |
| Snyders, Frans (snī'dērs) | 1579-1657 | 11 | Stefano di Giovanni (Sassatta) (stēfā'no dē jōvān'nē) | fl. 1436 | 3 |
| Snyers, Pieter (snī'ērs) | 1681-1752 | 11 | Steffeck, Karl | 1818-1890 | 9 |
| Sō-a-mi, see Shin-sō | | | Steinle, Eduard (stīn'lē) | 1810-1886 | 9 |
| Södermark, Johan Per | 1822-1889 | 25 | Stella, Jacques (stēllä) | 1595-1657 | 18 |
| Södermark, Olaf Johan | 1790-1848 | 25 | Sternberg, Vasili | 1818-1845 | 24 |
| Sodoma, Il Cavaliere (sō'dōmä) | 1477-1549 | 4 | Stetson, Charles Walter | 1858- | 23 |
| Soest (Zoest), Gerard (sōst) | ?-1681 | 8 | Stevaerts, see Palamedesz | | |
| Soest, Konrad von (sōst) | fl. 1400 | 7 | Stevens, Alfred (stā'vēns) | 1828- | 12 |
| Sofonisba, see Anguisciola Sofonisba | | | Stevens, Gustave-Max (stā'vens) | - | 12 |
| Sō-futsu-kō, see Tsao Fuh-hing | | | Stevens, Joseph (stā'vens) | 1822-1892 | 12 |
| Sogliani, Giovanni Antonio (sōlyā'nē) | 1492-1544 | 4 | Stevenson, Macaulay R. | 1864- | 21 |
| Sogliaro, Il, see Gatti | | | Stewart, Julius L. | 1855- | 23 |
| Sojaro, Il, see Gatti | | | Stimmer, Tobias | 1534-1582 | 7 |
| Sō-ken | fl. xth century | 27 | Stobbaert, Jean Baptiste (stob'bärt) | 1838- | 12 |
| Solario, Andrea (Milanese) da (sōlā'riō) | 1458-1530 | 4 | Stoltenberg-Lerche, Vincent (stōl'tēnbērg-lēr'djē) | 1837-1892 | 25 |
| Solimena (Solomene), Francesco, Cavaliere (sōlimā'nä) | 1657-1747 | 5 | Stone, Marcus | 1840- | 21 |
| Son-kai, Shiba | fl. xvth century | 27 | Stone, William O. | 1830-1875 | 22 |
| Sonne, Jörgen Valentin (sōn'nē) | 1801-1890 | 26 | Stortenbeker, Pieter (stōr'tēnbēkēr) | 1828- | 16 |
| Sörensen, Carl Frederik | 1818-1879 | 26 | Story, George H. | 1835- | 23 |
| Sorgh (Zorg), Hendrik Maertensz | 1611-1670 | 15 | Story, Julian | 1857- | 23 |
| Sō-rin | fl. sixth century | 27 | Stothard, Thomas | 1755-1834 | 21 |
| So-sen (Mori) | 1747-1821 | 28 | Strigel, Bernhard (strē'gēl) | 1461-1528 | 7 |
| Sostermans (Sustermans), Joost | 1597-1681 | 11 | Ström, Halfdan | 1863- | 25 |
| Sō-tan, O-guri | fl. xvth century | 27 | | | |
| Sō-tatsu, named also Tawaraya Kosé-toshi | 1623-1685 | 27 | | | |
| Soutman, Pieter (sä'oot'män) | 1580-1657 | 15 | | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|-------------------|-------|--|------------------------|-------|
| Strozzi, Bernardo (Il Capuccino) (stró'tsē) | 1581-1644 | 5 | Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista (tiā'polo) | 1696-1770 | 5 |
| Strudwick, John Melhuish | 1849- | 21 | Tiepolo, Giovanni Domenico (tiā'polo) | 1727-1804 | 5 |
| Struys, Alexandre (strois) | 1852- | 12 | Tiffany, Louis C. | 1848- | 23 |
| Stry, Jacobus van (stri) | 1756-1815 | 16 | Tintoretto, Domenico (tintōrēt'tō) | 1562-1637 | 4 |
| Stuart, Gilbert | 1755-1828 | 22 | Tintoretto, Jacopo (tintōrēt'tō) | 1518-1594 | 4 |
| Stubbs, George | 1724-1806 | 21 | Tiratelli, Aurelio (tērātēll'ē) | 1842- | 6 |
| Stuck, Franz (stük) | 1863- | 9 | Tirén, Johan (tirān') | 1853- | 25 |
| Suardi, Bartolommeo, see Bramantino | | | Tischbein, J. H. Wilhem (tish'bīn) | 1751-1829 | 8 |
| Subleyras, Pierre (süblārā) | 1699-1749 | 18 | Tisi, Benvenuto, see Garofalo, Il | | |
| Sully, Thomas | 1783-1872 | 22 | Tissot, James (baptized Joseph Jacques) (tissō) | 1836-1902 | 20 |
| Sundt-Hansen, see Hansen, Carl Sundt- | | | Titian (Tiziano Vecellio) (tī'shan) | 1477-1576 | 4 |
| Susterman (Sustermans), see Lombard, Lambert, and Sostermans | | | Tito, Ettore (tē'to) | 1859- | 6 |
| Swanenburgh, Jacob Isaaksz. | 1580-1639 | 15 | Tō-gan | fl. xvith century | 27 |
| Swanevelt, Herman (swā'nēvelt) | 1610-1655 | 15 | Tō-haku (Ha-sé-gawa) | fl. late xvith century | 27 |
| Swerts, Jan | 1825-1879 | 12 | Toledo, Juan de (tolā'do) | 1611-1665 | 17 |
| Syberg, Fritz (sü'bērg) | 1862- | 26 | Tolstoy, Count Fedor (Theodore) | 1783-1828 | 24 |
| Syerov, Valentin | 1865- | 24 | Tommaso di Stefano, see Giottino | | |
| Sylvestre, Joseph Noel (silvātr) | 1847- | 20 | Tompkins, Frank Hector (Henry) | 1847- | 23 |
| Taber, Edward M. | 1863- | 23 | Toorenvliet, Jacob (tōr'ēnflēt) | 1641-1719 | 15 |
| Taber, J. W. | - | 23 | Toorop, Jan (tō'rop) | 1860- | 16 |
| Tada-hira | fl. xth century | 27 | Torbido, Francesco (Il Moro) (torbē'do) | 1486-1546 | 4 |
| Tai-ga-dō (Iké-no) | 1722-1775 | 27 | Tō-rei | fl. xviiiith century | 28 |
| Talcott, Allen B. | 1867- | 23 | Tosa Tsuné-taka | fl. 1240 | 27 |
| Tamm, Franz Werner | 1658-1724 | 8 | Tō-shiu-ki, Ishi-kawa Izai-yémon | fl. xviiith century | 28 |
| Tanner, Henry O. | - | 23 | Toulmouche, Auguste (toolmoosh) | 1829-1890 | 19 |
| Tan-yu (Tan-yu-sai) | 1602-1674 | 27 | Toyo-hiko, see Oka-moto Höken | | |
| Tarbell, Edmund C. | 1862- | 23 | Traini, Francesco (trā-ē'nē) | fl. 1350 | 2 |
| Tassaert, Octave (tässäär) | 1800-1874 | 19 | Trigt, Hendrik Albert van | 1829- | 16 |
| Tawaraya, see Sō-tatsu | | | Tristán, Luis (tristān') | 1586-1640 | 17 |
| Tejedor, Alcázar (tēh'dōr') | 1852- | 17 | Troger, Paul (trō'gēr) | 1698-1777 | 8 |
| Tempesta, Il Cavaliere, see Moly, Pieter de | | | Troost, Cornelis (trōst) | 1697-1750 | 16 |
| Teniers, David, the Elder (tē'nērz or tēn'yērs) | 1582-1649 | 11 | Tropinin, Vasilii | 1780-1857 | 24 |
| Teniers, David, the Younger (tēn'ērz or tēn'yērs) | 1610-1690 | 11 | Troy, François de (trwä) | 1645-1730 | 18 |
| Tenniel, John | 1820- | 21 | Troy, Jean François de (trwä) | 1679-1752 | 18 |
| Ter Boch, see Terburg | | | Troyon, Constant (trwäyōñ) | 1810-1865 | 20 |
| Terbrugghen, Hendrik (ter'brūgjen) | 1588-1629 | 15 | Trübner, Wilhelm | 1851- | 9 |
| Terburg (Ter Boch), Gerard (tēr'būrdj) | 1614-1681 | 15 | Trumbull, John | 1756-1843 | 22 |
| Termeulen, see Meulen, F. P. ter | | | Tryon, Dwight William | 1849- | 23 |
| Tessan (Mori) | fl. ninth century | 28 | Tsao Fuh-hing (Sō-futsu-kō) | fl. iiiid century A.D. | 28 |
| Thaulow, Fritz (tou'lō) | 1847- | 25 | Tschistyakov, Paul, see Chistyakov | | |
| Thayer, Abbott Handerson | 1849- | 23 | Tsuné-nobu | 1636-1713 | 27 |
| Thegerström, Robert (tā'gērstrōm) | 1854- | 25 | Tsuné-nori | fl. xth century | 27 |
| Theoderich of Prague (tēō'dērīčf) | fl. 1348-1378 | 7 | Tsuné-taka, see Tosa | | |
| Theotocópuli, Domenico (see Greco, El) (tāotokō'pülē) | 1548-1625 | 17 | Tuckerman, S. Salisbury | 1830-1904 | 23 |
| Tholen, Willem Bastiaan (tō'lēn) | 1850- | 16 | Tuke, Henry Scott | 1858- | 21 |
| Thoma, Hans (tō'mā) | 1839- | 9 | Tura, Cosimo (Cosmé) (too'rā) | 1430-1495 | 3 |
| Thomas, S. Seymour | 1868- | 23 | Turchi, Alessandro (L'Orbetto) (tūr'kē) | 1582-1650 | 5 |
| Thompson, Cephas G. | 1809-1888 | 22 | Turner, Charles Yardley | 1850- | 23 |
| Thomsen, Carl (tom'sēn) | 1847- | 26 | Turner, Joseph Mallord William | 1775-1851 | 21 |
| Thōme, Alfred (tōr'nē) | 1850- | 25 | Tuxén, Laurits Regner (tooksān') | 1853- | 26 |
| Thornhill, Sir James | 1676-1734 | 21 | Twachtman, John H. | 1853-1902 | 23 |
| Thulden, Theodorus van (tōl'dēn) | 1606-1676 | 16 | Ubertini, Francesco (oobērtē'nē) | 1494-1557 | 4 |
| Thys, Peeter (tis) | 1624-1678 | 11 | Uccello, Paolo (oochēll'ō) | 1397-1475 | 3 |
| Tiarini, Alessandro (tēārē'nē) | 1577-1668 | 5 | Uchtervelt, see Ochtervelt | | |
| Tibaldi, Pellegrino (tibāl'dē) | 1532-1592 | 4 | Uckermann, Karl | 1855- | 25 |
| Tidemand, Adolf (tē'dēmān) | 1814-1876 | 25 | Uden, Lucas van (oo'dēn) | 1595-1672 | 11 |
| | | | Udine, Giovanni da, see Giovanni da Udine | | |
| | | | Udine, Martino da, see Pellegrino da San Daniele | | |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|---|---------------|-------|---|---------------|-------|
| Uffenbach, Philipp (úf'fēnbāĉ) | 1570-1640 | 7 | Veit, Philipp (vīt) | 1793-1877 | 9 |
| Ugryumov, Grigori | 1764-1823 | 24 | Velásquez (Velázquez), Diego Rodríguez | | |
| Uhde, Fritz von (oo'dē) | 1848- | 9 | de Silva y (vēlās'kéth) | 1599-1660 | 17 |
| Uitenbroeck, Moses van (oi'tēnbrook) | 1590-1648 | 14 | Velde, Adriaan van de | 1635-1672 | 14 |
| Uitenwaal (Uytenwael), Joachim (oi'tēnwāl) | 1566-1638 | 15 | Velde, Esaias van de | 1590-1630 | 15 |
| Ukiyo (Ukio) Mata-hei, see Mata-hei | | | Velde, Jan van de | 1598-? | 15 |
| Ulrich, Charles F. | 1858- | 23 | Velde, Willem van de, the Elder | 1610-1693 | 14 |
| Uncker, Karl d' | 1828-1866 | 25 | Velde, Willem van de, the Younger | 1633-1707 | 14 |
| Unterberger, Michelangelo | 1695-1758 | 8 | Veneto, see Bartolommeo Veneto | | |
| Urgel, Modesto (oorhēl') | - | 17 | Venetianov, Aleksyey | 1779-1845 | 24 |
| Ussi, Stefano (ūs'sē) | 1822- | 6 | Venne, Adriaan van der | 1589-1662 | 14 |
| Uta-marō, Kita-gawa | fl. 1800 | 28 | Venusti, Marcello (vānoos'tē) | 1515-1585 | 4 |
| Uta-no-suké, see Yuki-nobu | | | Vera, Don Alejo (vā'rā) | 1834- | 17 |
| Utrecht, Adriaan van (oo'trēĉt) | 1599-1652 | 11 | Verboeckhoven, Eugène Joseph (vērbook- | | |
| Utrecht, Jacob van (oo'trēĉt) | fl. 1523 | 13 | hō'vēn) | 1799-1881 | 12 |
| Uytenwael, see Uitenwaal | | | Verdi, Francesco Ubertini dei, see Bac- | | |
| | | | chiacca, Il | | |
| Vaccaro, Andrea (vākkārō) | 1598-1670 | 5 | Verdier, François (vērdyā) | 1651-1730 | 18 |
| Vaenius, Otho (Ottavio van Veen) (vā'nīūs) | 1558-1629 | 11 | Verelst, Pieter | fl. 1643-1668 | 14 |
| Vaga, Perino del (vā'gā) | 1500-1547 | 4 | Vereshchagin, Vasili | 1842-1904 | 24 |
| Vail, Eugene | 1856- | 23 | Verhagen, Joris van, see Ilagen, Joris | | |
| Valckenborch, Frederik van (vāl'kēnbōĉ) | 1570-1623 | 10 | van der | | |
| Valckenborch, Lucas van (vāl'kēnbōĉ) | 1530-1625 | 10 | Verhagen, Pierre Joseph (vērhā'gēn) | 1728-1811 | 11 |
| Valckenborch, Marten van (vāl'kēnbōĉ) | 1533-? | 10 | Verhas, Frans (vērhās) | 1827- | 12 |
| Valckert, Werner van | fl. 1622-1627 | 14 | Verhas, Jan (vērhās) | 1834- | 12 |
| Valdivia, de (vāldē'viā) | - | 17 | Verkolje, Jan (vērkōl'yē) | 1650-1693 | 14 |
| Valenciennes, Pierre Henri (vālānsyēn) | 1750-1819 | 19 | Verkolje, Nicolaas (vērkōl'yē) | 1673-1746 | 16 |
| Valentin, Le (Jean de Boullongne) (vālān- | | | Verlat, Charles | 1824-1890 | 12 |
| tēn) | 1591-1634 | 18 | Vermay, Vermayen, see Vermeyen | | |
| Valkenburg, Hendrik (vāl'kēnbōĉ) | 1826-1896 | 16 | Vermeer, Jan (van der Meer) (vēr'mār) | 1632-1675 | 14 |
| Van Boskerck, Robert | 1855- | 23 | Vermehren, Johan Frederik | 1823- | 26 |
| Van der Lyn, see Vanderlyn | | | Vermeyen (Vermay, Vermayen), Jan Cor- | | |
| Vanderlyn, John (vān'derlin) | 1775-1852 | 22 | nelis (Il Barbalonga) (vērmi'ēn) | 1500-1559 | 10 |
| Van der Weyden, Harry (vān dēr vī'dēn) | 1868- | 23 | Vernet, Claude Joseph (vērnā) | 1712-1789 | 18 |
| Van Dyck, see Dyck, van | | | Vernet, Horace (vērnā) | 1789-1863 | 19 |
| Van Hove, Édmond (vān hō'vā) | - | 12 | Veronese, Paolo (vāronā'sā) | 1528-1588 | 4 |
| Van Laer, Alexander T. (vān lār) | 1857- | 23 | Veronese, see also Cagliari | | |
| Van Loo, see Loo | | | Verrochio, Andrea del (vērrōk'ĉio) | 1435-1488 | 3 |
| Van Marcke, Émile (vān mārĉ) | 1827-1890 | 20 | Verschooten, see Schooten, Joris van | | |
| Vanni, Francesco, Cavaliere (vān'nē) | 1563-1609 | 5 | Verschuringh, Hendrik (vērs'ĉoo'rīng) | 1627-1690 | 15 |
| Vannucci, Pietro di Cristoforo, see Perugi- | | | Vershuier, Lieve (vērs'hoiēr) | 1630-1686 | 15 |
| gino | | | Verspronck (Versprong), Jan | 1597-1662 | 15 |
| Vanutelli, Scipione (vānootēl'lē) | 1834- | 6 | Versprong, see Verspronck | | |
| Vanvitelli (van Wittel), Gasparo (vānvē- | | | Verstraate, Théodore (vēstrā'tē) | 1852- | 12 |
| tēl'lē) | 1647-1736 | 5 | Veitunni, Achille, Baron (vērtoon'nē) | 1826-1897 | 6 |
| Vargas, Luis de (vār'gās) | 1502-1568 | 17 | Verwee, Alfred Jacques (vērwā) | 1838-1895 | 12 |
| Varnek, Aleksandr | 1782-1843 | 24 | Veth, Jan (vāt) | 1864- | 16 |
| Varotari, Alessandro, see Padovanino, Il | | | Veyrassat, Jules Jacques (vārāssā) | 1828-1893 | 20 |
| Vasari, Giorgio (vāsār'rē) | 1511-1574 | 5 | Vibert, Jean Georges (vēbār) | 1840- | 19 |
| Vasilev, Fedor | 1850-1873 | 24 | Victoors, Jan, see Victors, Jan | | |
| Vautier, Benjamin (vōtyā') | 1829-1898 | 9 | Victors, Jan | 1620-1672 | 14 |
| Vecchieta, Il (Lorenzo di Pietro di Gio- | | | Vien, Joseph Marie (vēĉēn) | 1716-1809 | 19 |
| vanni di Lando) (vēkkēĉ'tā) | 1412-1480 | 3 | Vigée-Lebrun, see Lebrun, Mme. | | |
| Vecelli, see Vecellio | | | Villavicencio, Don Pedro Nuñez de (vil- | | |
| Vecellio (Vecelli), Francesco (vēĉēl'lĉio) | 1475-1560 | 4 | yāvīthēn'thĉio) | 1635-1700 | 17 |
| Vecellio (Vecelli), Marco (di Tiziano) | | | Villegas y Cordero, José (vilyā'gās ē | | |
| (vēĉēl'lĉio) | 1545-1611 | 4 | kordā'ro) | 1848- | 17 |
| Vecellio (Vecelli), Orazio (vēĉēl'lĉio) | 1515-1576 | 4 | Villevalde, Bogdan (Godfrey) | 1818- | 24 |
| Vedder, Elihu | 1838- | 23 | Villodas, Ricardo (vilyō'dās) | 1846- | 17 |
| Veen, Ottavio van, see Vaenius, Otho | | | Villumsen, J. F. | 1856- | 26 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|---------------------|-------|--|---------------|-------|
| Vincent, François André (vĩnsãn) | 1746-1816 | 19 | Ward, Edgar M. | 1849- | 23 |
| Vincent, George | 1796-1851 | 21 | Ward, James | 1769-1859 | 21 |
| Vincentino, see Andrea Michieli | | | Watelet, Louis Étienne (wätälä) | 1780-1866 | 19 |
| Vincenzo da San Gimignano (vinchen'dzo dã sãn jĩminyã'no) | 1492-1529 | 4 | Waterhouse, John William | 1849- | 21 |
| Vinci, Leonardo da (vĩn'chẽ) | 1452-1519 | 4 | Waterman, Marcus | 1834- | 23 |
| Vinea, Francesco (vĩnã'ã) | 1846- | 6 | Watrous, Harry Willson | 1857- | 23 |
| Viniegra y Lasso, Salvador (vĩniã'grã ě lãs'so) | 1862- | 17 | Watson, John | 1685-1768 | 22 |
| Vinton, Frederic Porter | 1846- | 23 | Watteau, Antoine (wättõ) | 1684-1721 | 18 |
| Viotti, Giulio (vĩõt'tẽ) | 1845-1877 | 6 | Watts, George Frederick | 1817-1904 | 21 |
| Vite, Timoteo (vĩt'ã) | 1469-1523 | 4 | Wauters, Émile (wouters) | 1846- | 12 |
| Vivarini, Antonio da Murano (vĩvãrẽ'nẽ) ? -1470 | | 3 | Weber, August (vã'běr) | 1817-1873 | 9 |
| Vivarini, Bartolommeo da Murano (vĩvã- rẽ'nẽ) | fl. 1450-1499 | 3 | Webster, Thomas | 1800-1886 | 21 |
| Vivarini, Luigi (Alvise), the Elder (vĩvã- rẽ'nẽ) | fl. 1414 | 3 | Weeks, Edwin Lord | 1849-1903 | 23 |
| Vivarini, Luigi, the Younger (vĩvãrẽ'nẽ) ? -1503 | | 3 | Weenix, Jan (wã'nix) | 1640-1719 | 14 |
| Vivien, Joseph (vĩvyẽñ) | 1657-1735 | 18 | Weenix, Jan Baptista (wã'nix) | 1621-1664 | 14 |
| Vlieger, Simon de (vlẽ'đer) | 1600-1660 | 14 | Weir, John Ferguson | 1841- | 23 |
| Vliet, Hendrik Cornelisz van (vlẽt) | 1611-1675 | 14 | Weir, Julian Alden | 1852- | 23 |
| Voerman, J. (voor'mãn) | - | 16 | Weir, Robert Walter | 1803-1889 | 22 |
| Vogel, Hugo (fõ'đẽl) | 1855- | 9 | Weissenbruch, Jan (wis'senbrõđ) | 1822-1880 | 16 |
| Volk, Douglas | 1856- | 23 | Weissaupt, Victor (vis'haupt) | 1848- | 9 |
| Vollon, Antoine (vollõn) | 1833-1900 | 20 | Wendel, Theodore | 1857- | 23 |
| Volterra, Daniele da (voltěr'rã) | 1509-1566 | 4 | Wenneberg | - | 25 |
| Volterra, Francesco da (voltěr'rã) | fl. 1350 | 2 | Wentworth, Mrs. Cecilia de | - | 23 |
| Vonnoh, Robert W. | 1858- | 23 | Wentzel, Gustav | 1859- | 25 |
| Voort, Cornelis van der (võrt) | 1576-1624 | 14 | Werenskiold, Erik (vã'rẽnskĩõld) | 1855- | 25 |
| Vorobev, Maksim | 1787-1855 | 24 | Werff, Adriaen van der | 1659-1722 | 15 |
| Vos, Cornelis de, the Elder | 1585-1651 | 11 | Wergeland, Oskar Arnold | 1844- | 25 |
| Vos, Marten de | 1532-1603 | 10 | Werner, Anton Alexander von (věr'něr) | 1843- | 9 |
| Vos, Paulus de | 1590-1678 | 11 | West, Benjamin | 1738-1820 | 22 |
| Vos, Simon de | 1603-1676 | 11 | Westall, Richard | 1765-1836 | 21 |
| Vouet, Simon (vooã) | 1590-1649 | 18 | Westin, Fredrik | - | 25 |
| Vrancx (Francken), Sebastian | 1573-1647 | 11 | Wet, Jacob de | fl. 1636-1671 | 15 |
| Vries, Abraham de (vrẽs) | ? -1662 | 14 | Wet, Jan de (Johann Dũwett) | 1617-? | 14 |
| Vries, Adriaan de (vrẽs) | 1601-1643 | 14 | Weyden, Rogier van der (wĩ'den) | 1400-1464 | 10 |
| Vries, Roelof de (vrẽs) | fl. xviiith century | 15 | Weyer, J. Matthias (vi'ěr) | ? -1690 | 8 |
| Vrolijk, Jan Maerten (vrõ'lik) | 1845-1894 | 16 | Whistler, James McNeil | 1834-1903 | 23 |
| Vroom, Cornelis Hendricksz (vrõm) | 1620-1661 | 15 | White, Edwin | 1817-1877 | 22 |
| Vroom, Hendrik Corneliszen (vrõm) | 1566-1640 | 15 | White, John Blake | 1781-1859 | 22 |
| V. For names not listed under V, see W | | | Whitmore, William R. | 1861- | 23 |
| Waay, Nicolaes van der (wãã') | 1855- | 16 | Whittemore, William J. | 1860- | 23 |
| Wächter, Eberhard Georg Friedrich von (vẽđ'těr) | 1762-1852 | 8 | Whittredge, Worthington | 1820- | 22 |
| Wahlberg, Alfred | 1834- | 25 | Wickenberg, Per | 1808-1846 | 25 |
| Wahlborn, Karl | 1810-1858 | 25 | Wiertz, Antoine Joseph (wěrts) | 1806-1865 | 12 |
| Walden, Lionel | 1862- | 23 | Wiggins, Carleton | 1848- | 23 |
| Waldmüller, Ferdinand (vãld'mũller) | 1793-1865 | 9 | Wijsmuller, J. H. (wis'mõller) | - | 16 |
| Waldo, Samuel | 1783-1861 | 22 | Wildens, Jan | 1586-1653 | 11 |
| Walker, Frederick | 1840-1875 | 21 | Wiles, Irving Ramsey | 1861- | 23 |
| Walker, Henry Oliver | 1843- | 23 | Wiles, Lemuel M. | 1826-1905 | 23 |
| Walker, Horatio | 1858- | 23 | Wilkie, Sir David | 1785-1841 | 21 |
| Wallander, Alf | 1862- | 25 | Willaert, Fernand (wil'lãrt) | - | 12 |
| Wallander, Josef Vilhelm | 1821-1888 | 25 | Willems, Florent | 1823- | 12 |
| Walton, James Trout | 1835-1867 | 21 | Williams, Benjamin, see Leader, Benja- min Williams | | |
| Wang Wei (Ō-i) | fl. viiith century | 28 | Wilmarth, Lemuel E. | 1835- | 23 |
| Wappers, Gustave | 1803-1874 | 12 | Wilson, P. MacG. | - | 21 |
| | | | Wilson, Richard | 1713-1782 | 21 |
| | | | Winge, Martin Eskil (vĩn'đẽ) | 1825- | 25 |
| | | | Wint, de, see Dewint | | |
| | | | Wit, Jacob de | 1695-1754 | 16 |
| | | | Witte, Emanuel de (wĩt'tẽ) | 1607-1692 | 14 |

| | DATES | TABLE | | DATES | TABLE |
|--|--------------------|-------|---|---------------|-------|
| Witte, Gaspar de (wit'tē) | 1624-1681 | 11 | Zacho, Christian (tsä'ko) | 1843- | 26 |
| Witte, Peeter de (Candido) (wit'tē) | 1548-1628 | 10 | Zaganelli (Francesco da Cottignola) (dzägänē'lē) | ?-1518 | 3 |
| Wittel, van, see Vanvitelli | | | Zahrtmann, Kristian (tsärt'män) | 1843- | 26 |
| Witz, Konrad (vits) | fl. 1430-1450 | 7 | Zai-chin | ?-1837 | 28 |
| Woensam (Wonsam), Anton (von Worms) (vön'säm) | fl. 1528-1561 | 7 | Zamacois, Eduardo (thämä'kois) | 1842-1871 | 17 |
| Wolgemut, Michel (völ'gēmoot) | 1434-1519 | 7 | Zampieri, Domenico, see Domenichino | | |
| Wonsam, see Woensam | | | Zaryanko, Sergyey | 1818-1870 | 24 |
| Wood, Thomas Waterman | 1823-1903 | 23 | Zeeman, Reimer (Remigius Nooms) (zä-' män) | 1612-1663 | 14 |
| Woodbury, Charles H. | 1864- | 23 | Zegers, Geeraard (zä'tjērs) | 1591-1651 | 11 |
| Woodbury, Marcia (Mrs. Charles H. Woodbury) | 1865- | 23 | Zegers, see Segers | | |
| Wootton, John | ?-1765 | 21 | Zeitbloom, Bartholomäus (tsit'blöm) | fl. 1484-1517 | 7 |
| Worms, Anton von, see Woensam | | | Zeloti, Giambattista (dzälō'tē) | 1532-1592 | 4 |
| Wouverman, Jan (wä'oo'vërmän) | 1629-1666 | 15 | Zenale, Bernardino (dzänä'lä) | 1436-1526 | 3 |
| Wouverman, Philips (wä'oo'vërmän) | 1619-1668 | 15 | Zerezo, see Cerezo | | |
| Wright, Ethel | - | 21 | Zessos, Alessandro (dzēs'sos) | - | 6 |
| Wright, Joseph | 1756-1793 | 22 | Zevio, see Stefano da Zevio | | |
| Wu 'Tao-tsz' (Go Dōshi) | fl. viiith century | 28 | Zick, Januarius (tsík) | 1733-1797 | 8 |
| Wurmser, Nicolaus (vürm'zër) | fl. 1348-1365 | 7 | Ziem, Félix (tsēm) | 1821- | 19 |
| Wyant, Alexander H. | 1836-1892 | 22 | Zimmermann, Ernst (tsīm'mërmän) | 1852- | 9 |
| Wyck, Thomas (wik) | 1616-1677 | 15 | Zoest, see Soest, Gerard | | |
| Wylie, Robert | 1839-1877 | 22 | Zoll, Kilian (tsöll) | 1818-1860 | 25 |
| Wynants, Jan (wī'nänts) | 1615-1679 | 15 | Zona, Antonio (dzō'nä) | 1813- | 6 |
| W. For names not listed under W, see V | | | Zoppo, Marco (dzöp'po) | 1445-1498 | 3 |
| Váñez, Hernando (jän'yěth) | - | 17 | Zorg, see Sorgh | | |
| Vasu-nobu | 1613-1685 | 27 | Zorn, Andreas (tsörn) | 1860- | 25 |
| Vei-toku | 1545-1592 | 27 | Zuccara, see Zuccherro | | |
| Von, Édmond Charles (yön) | 1836-1897 | 20 | Zuccarelli, Francesco (tsükärē'lē) | 1702-1788 | 5 |
| Yō-sai (Kiku-chi) | 1787-1878 | 28 | Zuccherro, Federigo (tsükä'ro) | 1543-1609 | 5 |
| Yoshi-hidé | fl. xivth century | 27 | Zuccherro (Zuccara), Taddeo (tsükä'ro) | 1529-1566 | 5 |
| Yuki-nobu (Uta-no-suké) | 1513-1575 | 27 | Zügel, Heinrich (tsü'gël) | 1850- | 9 |
| Yvon, Adolphe (ëvön) | 1817- | 19 | Zuloaga, Ignacio (thoolöä'gä) | - | 17 |
| | | | Zurbaran, Francisco de (thürbärän') | 1598-1662 | 17 |

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF PAINTING

PART THREE

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE
HISTORY OF PAINTING

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF PAINTING TO THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

To-day we sometimes distinguish between a colored drawing and a painting. No such distinction is possible as regards the early history of art. All pictures, therefore, whether fundamentally drawings, with parts picked out in color, or not, may be claimed as legitimate instances by which to illustrate the development of painting.

Color sense, implying delicacy of perception of color distinctions, is a recent acquisition, at least in so far as it is revealed in pictures. It is rarely found earlier than the Renaissance. Nevertheless, if we trace the forces that have culminated in one of Mr. Whistler's color symphonies as far back as we can, we arrive at one of the early Egyptian colored drawings.¹ If, however, we lacked accurate information and no remains of the past arts existed, so that we were permitted to fill the gaps with seemingly reasonable guesses, we should look not so much for drawings with added bits of color, as for patches of color artistically combined without attempted imitation of actual forms. Such an art, however, far from having belonged to the past, may perhaps be detected in the future by the prophet's eye. Our early ancestors were too much concerned with their own thoughts of the appearances of things to have created pictures seemingly at variance with them.

Both in sculpture and in painting they endeavored to reproduce objects of nature, most frequently animate nature, as intelligently as their skill permitted. They were familiar with them because they had seen them, and most especially because they had formed ideas of

them. At the time of drawing, these ideas were the nearer source of knowledge, so that the pictures conformed more closely to them than to actual shapes. This fact is so notable that if we were to speak of art not according to periods of history, — Egyptian, Greek, early Christian, Renaissance, and so forth, — but according to natural divisions, we should call the first the period when men drew according to their thoughts, and the second the period when they painted according to their vision. This latter period may again be subdivided; for in its earlier stages the drawing alone was according to the vision, that is, in linear perspective, while the color was still applied according to the thoughts of the people. Grass, for instance, was painted green, however different its actual color under the given light might be, because to most people grass is green.

Roughly speaking, the first period comprises antiquity and the Middle Ages. The second period begins with the Renaissance in Italy and enters into its latter stage during the nineteenth century. Since the characteristic achievements of one generation, however, are often foreshadowed by those of an earlier one, we must not expect to find absolute demarcation lines. Perspective, for instance, was not unknown to the Greeks. They made use of it probably as early as the fifth century before Christ in the decoration of their stage settings. It certainly appears in the wall paintings in Rome and in Pompeii, where it is even better than that of Cimabue or Giotto, the fathers of Italian painting. Never, however, before these men, did it enter into the composition as one of the most vital factors; nor did it ever indicate that the

¹ Mr. Whistler was greatly influenced by the Japanese. His art, nevertheless, cannot be called oriental in origin.

artist had ceased to ask what he and his public were thinking of and had begun to inquire what they were seeing.

Egyptian painting extends to hoary antiquity, and surely dates back several millenniums before Christ. It is noticeable for its brightness and purity of unconnected colors, and gives indications in its drawing of the tenacity with which the ancient people clung to established forms. What once had been the most accurate expression of an untrained conception in later ages became a fashionable convention. In early times Egyptian painting doubtless influenced the art of neighboring countries; later it could no longer do this, because it was spiritless. To-day, better preserved than other paintings of antiquity, thanks to the climate of the country, it deserves attention as an interesting thing of the past. The pleasure which it gives is due to its fine drawing and its symbolic mystery. For the development of art it teaches little.

Equally unimportant in this connection are the *paintings of Babylonia, Assyria, Persia*, and other countries of Asia Minor. And since the few remains there prove that their main purpose was the pleasing coloring of decorative bas-reliefs, their study belongs more properly to the field of sculpture.

It is different with *Greek painting*, for painting, if not actually the chief art of the Greeks, was a close second to sculpture. No one who knows Greek statues and reliefs can fail to notice at every turn the influence of the great painters. Unfortunately the ravages of time have so completely destroyed their works that even a guess at their excellence is impossible. The copious references to them in ancient writings teach us little, because they rarely emanated from the pens of critics who knew anything of art or of its problems. The thoughtless opinions of the common people, which they repeat, do not form a sound basis on which to construct an estimate of Greek painting. If one were to judge by the highest praise bestowed on the most famous pictures, an indelicate sense of realism was characteristic of them. A curtain so cleverly painted

that the spectator desired to remove it in order to behold the picture which he thought it concealed, is one of the transmitted stories. It reminds one of a similar one in Japanese writings, where the king endeavored to brush away a painted fly. Since, in Japan, extant pictures show how impossible it is to take the praise literally, one should doubtless hold the same attitude toward the Greek encomiums. The people believed deceptive realism to be the acme of perfection. When they desired to express admiration they could do no better than to repeat stories which, in fact, had no foundation. We also ought to remember that what might have deceived people two thousand years ago probably would fail to do so to-day.

The names of the best known Greek painters are Polygnotos and Apollodoros, in the fifth century before Christ; Zeuxis, Parrhasios, and Timanthes in the fourth century, and especially Apelles and Protogenes, two contemporaries of Alexander the Great. Even if we do not accept the exaggerated and prejudiced accounts of their successes, we cannot doubt that in single instances they anticipated some of the notable achievements of much later times. Perspective they doubtless knew, and also probably some aspects of light and shade. How near they came to solving the problems of harmony of colors and of values — that is, to representing the proper qualities of colors under different lights — we do not know; and with their works destroyed and the accounts of them unreliable, we have no means of ascertaining.

The many extant vase paintings are of little importance in this connection. They were influenced, it is true, by the creations of the masters, but give as little an idea of them as decorated pottery to-day gives of the paintings of our best men. The only thing that they actually prove is that the standard for all, even for the artisans, was high. These decorators of pottery had a touch of such delicacy that it might well be the despair of modern artists; and, what is perhaps more, they had the skill to cope easily with all the problems that their particular undertaking offered

The true relation of *Roman painting* to that of *Greek painting* continues to be a bone of contention. But here again, owing to scanty and unreliable sources of information, we should in justice confess our ignorance. The extant wall paintings from Italy enable us to study one phase of this art during the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era; but we do not know how much Roman and, incidentally, Etruscan art, and how much Greek and Græco-Egyptian art, is to be detected in them.

The wall paintings are of various styles, generally bright in color, as befits the decorative use to which they were put. Linear perspective, which enters into the composition of practically all, is consistently carried out in only a few. Aërial perspective, even in its crudest beginnings, is entirely unknown. In the portrayal of character, realistic poses and gestures are more frequent than truth, and no attempt is made at making the settings of the scenes probable. Abstract and detached beauty in the faces is not unusual, but a penetrating eye does not fail to perceive that the original artist of these wall paintings was concerned with creating pictures which should appeal to the minds of the people rather than be true to the actual appearances of things.

One other group of pictures of about the same age, and in part later, is important, — the tablets with portrait heads from the Fayum¹ in Egypt. They were placed in the outside covers of mummy cases, and preserved the images of the dead. Their execution is often exquisite. They contain portraits of such lifelikeness that they do not lose their high place even when they are judged by modern standards. Frequent faults in drawing, however, especially when a three-quarter profile view made demands on the artist's knowledge of perspective, indicate that this knowledge was incomplete. As to an equal skill of the artist in large compositions, it is erroneous to draw conclusions from the power of portraiture revealed in these

¹ The so-called Cortona Muse, said to be a Greek easel picture, is best compared with these portraits from the Fayum.

heads. The extant Roman wall paintings contain single heads fully as beautiful as those from the Fayum, but they give no indications that the artists, who were in some respects the equals of modern portrait painters, could measure themselves in any other respect with the artists of the Renaissance or of the present day.

With the rise of Christianity, the disappearance of pagan art, and the advent of the lowly converts placing their meager skill in the service of their church, a step backward is to be noted in the history of painting. The fervor of conception of the early Christians was so far beyond their power of expression, and the material things to them so insignificant compared with the eternal ideas to which they pointed, that their pictures were but symbols of those ideas. Symbolism, at first a pious necessity, soon became a stumbling-block of *Christian art* and eventually rang its death knell; for when the thing painted is no longer of necessity a mere shadow and almost unrelated indication of the thing meant, but by the perversity of the artist and the indolence of his character continues to be so long after a new form is demanded, all life departs and a meaningless shell remains. This was the case with art in the Eastern Empire, customarily called *Byzantine art*. Forms, often not without beauty, which once had meant much to the people, continued to be used for generations without the addition of so much as a new idea.

The imperial edict decreeing the destruction of the art remains of the "heathen" Greeks shut off one powerful source from which inspiration might have arisen. The iconoclasts wantonly destroyed the more immediate past, the conquest of Rome and the separation of the empire prevented any influence from the west, and the invasion of the Mussulmans, finally, so completely isolated the Byzantine artists that progress became impossible. If their art is, nevertheless, not entirely void of appealing points, this is due to the strong first impulses of Christianity.

In the Western Empire, also, after the destructive conquest by the northern barbarians,

art found no fertile field. It was, however, less hampered by lack of outside influences. Even Byzantine art, when it became known, excited considerable interest and it was often imitated, so that some of the best known instances of it are found in northern Italy.

Of paintings, in the proper sense of the word, few are extant, since mosaics as church decorations gradually had supplanted them.

Surveying all that remains of paintings or mosaics earlier than the thirteenth century, one is little prepared for the remarkable development of painting from that time on, and feels

inclined to agree with Vasari, the biographer of Italian artists, who believed that heaven itself had taken pity on the fine minds that Tuscany was then daily bringing forth, and had directed their activities into channels leading to success.

If one judges early Christian and Byzantine art by itself, one cannot fail to be disappointed. But if one views it in the light of future achievements, and seeks in it the germ of perfection, which blossomed forth suddenly in the Renaissance, one begins to realize that even this seemingly sterile age must have contained some worthy elements.

CHAPTER II

ITALIAN PAINTING

THE GOTHIC PERIOD AND THE EARLY RENAISSANCE

At the time when the Gothic style in architecture was developed in all other Christian lands to its highest glory, Italy alone seemed to follow different ideals. She could not entirely withdraw herself from the powerful influences known as Gothic, but she failed to espouse their cause with ardor. The Italian master who built the façade of the Cathedral of San Lorenzo in Genoa followed the style of French cathedrals, but destroyed their characteristically vertical lines by building the façade of alternate courses of white and black marble. The horizontal lines which he thus introduced were dear to the Italians but contrary to the principles of Gothic architecture.

The fact was the Italians felt themselves to be not only the descendants but also the heirs of the classic people of their peninsula, whose art remains they had just begun to rediscover after centuries of neglect.

Of even greater influence than the actual remains of the ancients, especially for the painters, was the imaginative reconstruction of early conditions. Classic artists, it seemed, had been leaders of society. Their taste had carried the masses, to the extent that individual ideas of beauty had been the standards everywhere. The same, the new artists claimed, ought again to take place. While in the northern countries gifted men, now nameless, were willing to embody in their works the average conceptions of beauty, in Italy each artist strove to set up his own idea, and by excellent execution to procure for it the approval of the people.

In this endeavor the artists were confirmed everywhere by the powerful princes and communities, so that it is small wonder that many

of them were fairly eaten up with conceit. The one factor which rendered this conceit harmless for the progress of art was that it had to be based on real merit. Never perhaps has the world seen a class of harder-working men than these artists of the Renaissance, and never men who were more fervently impressed with the nobility and importance of their vocation.

Italy at that time was prosperous, and the demand for works of art, most especially for paintings, was enormous. We do not hear miserable tales of worthy men starving for want of employment. Reputations, once made, stood the artists to good advantage, but they were never so secure that they prevented the rise of new men of genius.

Heaven itself, as Vasari says, had taken compassion on the fine minds of Tuscany, directing their endeavors into proper channels, so that the demands of the people for art could be filled. Altogether the history of the world offers no parallel for these favorable conditions. Advances were made by leaps and bounds, problems were solved almost as quickly as they arose, and new difficulties found ever new men ready to cope with them.

Italian painting is often misunderstood. It is believed to be religious, where in fact it is intellectual. The truly religious painter in the long list of these remarkably gifted men is the exception. The subjects are mainly religious, but this should not deceive the student. Given whatever subject, the Italian masters endeavored to treat it adequately. This meant skill. And skill, therefore, was their chief concern. If it had not been so, no such rapid progress as is recorded could have taken place. Many a man who painted a madonna of such beauty that the religious devotee to-day finds new inspiration in her, was as callous to the

precepts of Christianity as the most confirmed unbeliever. Plato and Platonism and a refined love of the bright days of classic paganism ruled the finest minds of the day.

The existence of such conditions far from lowering our estimate of the Italian painters should increase it. He is a truly great man who treats with reverence and justice a subject which is emotionally not his, and which he has only learned to understand by reason of his intellect. And doubly great is he who in treating such a subject does not permit even a shadow of the sneer to appear, which in everyday life is ready on his lips for those who actually believe in miracles and the flaming sword of angels.

Lest insincerity finally be charged against the Italian artists because they painted largely religious subjects when their minds were secular, it must be remembered that no man can wisely withdraw himself from the conditions and requirements of his age; and in their age few subjects other than those connected with sacred stories were deemed worthy of a great artist's brush. Even while people were losing faith in the historic accuracy of these stories they continued to feed their imagination on them. The eternal truths expressed in some Greek legends are not less powerfully felt by us to-day because we know that Zeus and Herakles and all the other gods and heroes were creations of fancy.

Another and perhaps even stronger argument may be based on the fact that the Italian painters did not readily break with the past. They continued, they improved, but they did not despise what had been done before. So imperceptibly, in fact, was the transition made from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance that it is impossible to designate any one man as the father of the new art of painting.

With the Quattrocento¹ the Renaissance has truly begun. In the early century many men

¹ Quattrocento is the Italian designation for the space of time from 1400 to 1499, that is, those years where a 4 (quattro) appears in the space of the hundreds (cento). We call this space of time the fifteenth century.

belonged as clearly to the Middle Ages as others unmistakably heralded the coming of a new era.

These latter men who had something to offer in addition to what had already been done issued largely from two places, Florence and Siena. They attempted to paint more pleasing forms than their predecessors had given, and to express both motion and emotion. Heretofore the latter had to be supplied solely by the spectator; now the figures themselves began to be swayed by it. Formerly they were symbols, blank checks, if one may say so, the values of which depended on the imaginative powers of those who beheld them; now they issued from the painter's brush as definite characters. This, of course, brought action into the picture, so that after a while, instead of viewing lifeless scenes one felt drawn into the events portrayed as an intimate participant. Who can view the "Do not touch me" (*Noli me tangere*) by *Duccio* in Siena without coming into close personal contact with Christ and the kneeling woman?

Side by side with such stirring figures many others, of course, were painted which did not rise much above the level of Byzantine art. The effort to create the few really excellent characters was so great that the artist's strength was very soon spent. Skill, moreover, was in its infancy. Variety of forms and of conceptions, therefore, was impossible. This is most notable in the case of Giotto, whose square jaws and somewhat monotonous draperies falling in heavy smooth folds and large expanses of cloth cannot possibly excite our enthusiasm, however highly we esteem him for the amount of life and action which he succeeded in imparting to his figures.

Giotto was the first dramatist in art. His figures not only illustrated but also acted the incidents which he painted, so that the very demands which the national conditions made were singularly well satisfied by his art. Shortly before his time a religious revival movement had swept over the country, and had led to the establishment of the mendicant orders of

St. Francis and St. Dominic. The sacred stories, which the educated could read in books, were to be told to the illiterate by means of pictures on the walls of the churches. Such pictures, therefore, were no longer to be considered only as decorations, as had been the Byzantine mosaics. The peculiar development of Italian architecture, also, which offered broad wall spaces, while everywhere else the Gothic style suppressed these, was a favorable factor for the growth of Giotto's style.

Barring a few panel paintings and fragments of an altar piece in St. Peter's in Rome, and a much restored mosaic at the same place, the extant works of Giotto are contained in the frescoes of the Upper and the Lower Churches of St. Francis in Assisi, the Arena Chapel in Padua, and two chapels of Santa Croce in Florence. All these frescoes, with the exception of those in the Lower Church of Assisi, are entirely restored, so that it is difficult to realize the exact state of Giotto's art at the various stages of his career.

In the Upper Church of Assisi he had an exceptionally satisfactory subject, the life of St. Francis. This had not before been painted, so that he was unhampered by tradition. The characters, too, were of such recent date that the introduction of real, almost portrait, types was in place. The break with the past was therefore made easy for Giotto, and popular favor was more readily won for him than would have been possible under different conditions. It should be noted, however, that recent critics believe that the frescoes in the Lower Church were painted first. Owing to the difference in subjects and in the state of preservation of the two sets of pictures, this question cannot be definitely settled.

The frescoes of the two chapels of Santa Croce in Florence, which were rediscovered in 1853 under the whitewash with which a barbarous later age preferred to cover the walls of churches, show the greatest technical perfection of which Giotto was capable; but they cannot endear themselves to the spectator so immediately as the deeply felt, simple, and yet

wondrously powerful scenes from the lives of the Virgin Mary and of Christ in the earlier frescoes in the Arena Chapel in Padua.

Giotto had an almost unequaled feeling for form and a clear eye for realities. This must not be understood to mean that his paintings were realistic. He seems to have painted from nature only as he remembered her types, and was truer to the soul life than to the physical life of his characters. Everywhere he selected essentials, and never did he introduce people to fill empty spaces. Every one of his characters has his well-defined part in the drama.

Very little is known of the life of Giotto. Vasari gives 1276 as the year of his birth, but a study of all available sources has led most people to substitute 1266 for the date given by Vasari. In 1298 he was already famous, and was called to Rome. Early in the next century he was in France, possibly for a considerable space of time. It is certain that he visited Dante (who had been exiled from Florence) in Paris, but it is very doubtful whether or not he accompanied him on the extensive travels which Dante undertook through the empires of Europe. Two years before his death Giotto returned from Naples, where he had been highly honored at the court of the king. Florence had called him home as architect of the cathedral. He designed the bell tower (campanile) of this church and probably sculptured several of its decorative panels, while others were finished from his designs by Andrea Pisano.

In 1336 Giotto died. He had gained the highest reputation everywhere, and most especially in his home, Florence. It is as if this city had intended to make amends for her treatment of Dante by showering favors on this other of her two famous sons of the early Quattrocento.

The difference between the early schools of Florence and Siena is slight. The Florentines, it seems, strove after accuracy of drawing, forgetting almost everything else. The Siense, on the other hand, developed early a love of sweetness of expression, and were somewhat less careful in execution.

With *Masaccio* in the early Quattrocento the emancipation from the transmitted style of symbolism is completed. He is said to be the first painter of the new style, which is characterized by honesty of conception and sincerity of execution. His "Adam and Eve driven from Paradise," in the church of the Carmelite monks in Florence, are the first figures painted which are images of reality both in outlines of forms and in modeling by means of light and shade. They are true externally and internally. The greatest achievement of Masaccio, however, because the way for it was not prepared by even the slightest hint of any of his predecessors, was his peculiar use of light and shade not only for the sake of the modeling of his figures but also for the sake of agreeing with his clearly defined artistic intentions. This was the great step which with Masaccio art made into a new world,—the combination of the intentions of the artist with the imitation of nature. On the proper relation of these two factors and the worth of the first and the skill of the second depends the excellence of his achievement. Let his intentions predominate and the work is artificial; suppress them and the result is grossly realistic. Avoid the imitation of nature and the picture is fantastic and in danger of losing solid worth; make it your guiding star and you soon deteriorate to a level where art cannot survive. The key to the proper mixture of these two elements is held only by the artist, who possesses it not as an achievement of intellect or of skill but as the result of experience, or more probably as a natural gift.

Strangely enough, uninfluenced by Masaccio, *Fra Angelico* continued the earlier style in his famous pictures. His real name was Guido di Piero, but when he entered the monastery of Fiesole he was re-baptized Giovanni. His contemporaries knew him, even after he had removed to Florence, as Fra Giovanni da Fiesole. After his death, however, he was called "Fra Angelico, the monk of the angelic disposition."

All his paintings reveal a soul as pure as that of angels. His piety rings true. His art

was the last and noblest product of the mystic and adoring spirit of the Middle Ages. By nature raised above the common horde of men, he was lifted still higher by the subjects which he selected for his brush. Angels he preferred to paint, and by his angels he will always be known. "O mother dear, Jerusalem, when shall I come to thee?" had sung the yearning soul of a French monk¹; and imagining he had reached his goal, he had added, "Then shall my sorrows be at end; thy joy then shall I see." It was this joy of heaven that Fra Angelico painted,—the heavenly choir, the blessed, the saints, the whole company to join which was the fondest hope of all true Christians.

Compared with earlier artists, Fra Angelico commanded great skill. Some of his groups are almost unsurpassed, others, however, especially where there is a transition from one plane to another, are awkward, for his knowledge of perspective was insufficient. The halos which he still painted as round disks troubled him much whenever he painted his figures with averted faces. He used much gold in his pictures, and also blue, the color of constancy and truth.

No greater contrast is imaginable than exists between Fra Angelico, the great mystic, and the other famous painter monk of the Quattrocento, *Fra Filippo Lippi*. Lippi was a man of the world, a child of his own time, as Fra Angelico was, one might say, the posthumous product of the best of bygone ages. Sensitive to the extreme, without the strong support of faith, Lippi was a man of God and a sinner in rapid succession. He eloped with a nun, and was the father of Filippino Lippi. Deeply religious he appears in some of his works, while in others he is truly secular. In skill he is superior to any of his predecessors. He is the first who knew how to paint the depth of an interior, such as that of a large church in the funeral scene of St. Stephen in Prato. His figures often are studies from nature rather than

¹ St. Bernard of Cluny about 1140 wrote *De Contemptu Mundi*. This poem, freely translated by Rev. John Mason Neal, has suggested most modern hymns treating of the heavenly Jerusalem.

creations of a vivid imagination. He is versatile, and equally at home with the inhabitants of heaven and those of earth. The former, to him, however, are rarely more than exceptionally beautiful editions of the latter. In his madonna pictures he sets the example for the endless list of madonnas painted from life wherever a beautiful face meets the artist. The reprehensible habit of looking only at the lines of the face, however, and of paying no attention to the character expressed in them is distinctly a modern product. No such perversity of taste can be charged to any of the early Italians.

In the pictures of religious subjects by Fra Filippo Lippi there is a certain affinity with those by his son *Filippino Lippi*, and by the teacher of the latter, *Botticelli*. Externally it shows itself in madonna pictures by the introduction of a third¹ little figure of prominence, sometimes an angel, or the little St. John, or another playmate. It is not the presence of this third figure that is characteristic, but its treatment as a figure intended to catch the immediate attention of the spectator. Often a look of worldly mischief makes of it an exquisite foil to the thoughtful look of the Virgin. Another resemblance is found in the peculiar physical proportions of Mary, as if copied from a beautiful woman suffering with the dreadful malady, consumption. Some critics have actually endeavored to prove that the model which Botticelli constantly followed was thus afflicted.

This artist was undoubtedly the greatest of the three here under discussion. In his lifetime he was not appreciated, and even to-day, when the tide of his reputation is at its highest, he is not a universal favorite. This is due to his mannerisms, to the peculiar flights of his fancy, which do not always impress one as wholesome, and to his coloring, which, like his fancy, is based more on individual preference than on truth.

His delineation of character, however, is exquisite, and his lines are always graceful. His power of suggestion is limitless, and in an age when accuracy of execution was the chief aim, and intellect the guiding star, he

¹ Sometimes there are more than three figures.

dared to dream and to strike strange notes of unknown music.

Like Fra Filippo Lippi, but with even greater boldness, Botticelli often turned his back on the traditional religious subjects. With him the division between pictures for the church and pictures for the home was completed. For the latter he gathered his inspiration from classic legends or the descriptions of long-lost pictures, such as the "Calumny" by Apelles.

Some of his figures have a distinctly modern air, as if the man whose dreams seemed to shatter the bonds that bind ordinary mortals to space was not bound by time either. One of his pictures is genre pure and simple, although genre was not "invented" until later, or, to be more accurate, much time had to pass before the natural development of art demanded expression in genre. The painting here referred to is in the collection Pallavicini in Rome. On the steps of a door which pierces a massive wall a girl sits sobbing, with her head in her hands. She has been expelled from the house. Her clothes, which have been thrown after her, lie at her feet in disorder. They are her entire worldly possession, but she pays no heed to them. Stooping far over she weeps. She is alone in the world!

Such a subject seems entirely outside the realm of Italian art, in fact it is outside of it. It is one of those rare phenomena foreshadowing future events long before they have taken place. It is prophetic. But it is not the only instance in which Botticelli has shown in which direction art was to turn. One of the pitfalls which, after the Renaissance, art failed to avoid was restlessness—restlessness for its own sake, and in order to attract attention, however ill founded it was in the spirit of art. It was this that culminated in the later style called *rococo*. Botticelli made use of it in several pictures. Fluttering draperies suggestive of motion, where rest was the keynote of the composition, are frequent with him. Restlessness, in fact, was perhaps not alien to him in anything. The nervous hands of his figures, their fine transparent draperies, and their scalloped flimsy hair

dresses all point in the same direction. If it were not for his coloring and the setting of his large pictures, with their peculiar perspective of buildings gathered more massively on one side, while on the other side they stretch along a street leading to the distant mountains, or equally distributed to the right and left with an extended view in the center, one would hardly believe that Botticelli had lived in the fifteenth century.

Botticelli, like all the Florentines of this century, was little mindful of the magic power of color. Colors they knew, and how to place them side by side in harmonious order; also how to accentuate this or that figure by brighter or more subdued hues. On the whole, however, their chief attention was bestowed on the composition. They wrestled with the most intricate problems of linear perspective and did not know the charm of a well-blended color scheme. They would not have understood the remark of a recent painter, who defended his selection of a subject which his critic called homely, even ugly, by saying that there were no forms in nature so ugly but that the play of light and shade and the just blending of color would make them beautiful.

The first to discover the truth of this remark, or rather to set out on the road which led to its discovery, were the Venetians. Where they acquired their love of color is matter of speculation. Some say they could not help it, being surrounded by it, — seeing it in the sky above them and the water around them. Others point to oriental influences transmitted by their traders. In truth, it was probably innate. The Venetians were a pleasure-loving people, fonder of splendor than of the glory of learning. They were sensuous in the finest sense of the word. And there is no power on earth better able to satisfy the demands of such a disposition than color. The very forces that made Venice great politically, and sent her sons over the waters to distant lands, and made her populace admire pageants and luxurious displays, made her artists revel in the beauty of color.

A kind providence, moreover, sent them, when they most needed it, a new technique.

In southern Italy *Antonello da Messina* had become familiar with oil paintings of Dutch and French artists, and had traveled to the Netherlands, according to an unauthenticated but very probable story, in order to master the new medium. When he later settled in Venice he taught the artists there the mysteries of the new invention. Before him the Italians had painted in distemper or *al fresco*.

In Venice at this time two masters, Antonio da Murano, assisted by Giovanni Alemannus, and Jacopo Bellini, were laying the foundations for promising schools. The sons of Jacopo were Gentile and Giovanni, the latter of whom so far outstripped all his contemporaries that the future generation built almost exclusively on his achievements.

Giovanni Bellini was forty-five years of age and had gained considerable reputation, when Antonello da Messina came to Venice and changed his life. Not that Giovanni began to have new ideas; he simply had placed at his disposal the means of carrying out those which had been his always. The melodies which filled his soul he translated into poems of color; while the transparency and diffusion of light, which the technique in oil permitted, enabled him to express what formerly could at best be only suggested. Thoughts are not really ours until they have been expressed, and surely they cannot form the starting point of a long train of orderly conceptions until they have been thus added to the storehouse of our assured ideas. It is for this reason that the achievements of Giovanni Bellini count for much. For the first time the color sense of people was satisfied, while this very satisfaction conclusively proved the existence of a need which had long been neglected.

The most important Venetian artist of the Quattrocento, next to Giovanni Bellini, was *Carpaccio*, a pupil of Gentile Bellini. Unlike Giovanni, he was little interested in the possible transparency of oil pigments, but he knew how to render the effect of light, either in interiors or in out-of-door scenes, with an accuracy entirely his own. He filled the large

chambers of his scenes with an exquisite feeling of warmth, and successfully rendered the bright atmosphere of Venice in those pictures which treated of the glory of his native place. He was an amiable artist, so that with few exceptions his creations rank among the most lovable pictures of Italian art.

One powerful influence felt in the work of Giovanni Bellini, but absent in that of Carpaccio, is that of the genius of *Andrea Mantegna* of Padua. This man, brought up on the study of the antique, was big enough to learn its lesson of truth and sincerity without becoming a slave to imitation. His temperament fitted him to be a realist, while his skill and powerful personality preserved him from gross materialism. In the characterization of his figures he was uniformly exquisite, and being essentially a dramatist he painted pictures full of life and action. Drawing and composition were his strong points, so that his figures often impress one as almost plastically real. In this respect he merely followed the example of a well-known predecessor, Squarcione.

Among the many other important artists of the Quattrocento, two, Signorelli and Perugino, stand out prominently. *Signorelli*, according to the opinion of Michelangelo, was the greatest of all the painters of the fifteenth century. He was a man of exceptional force, pointing directly to the titanic power of conception and skill of Michelangelo. Color in the sense of the Venetians he neither knew nor fancied, and drawing as the Florentines practiced it, with the resulting dignity and unity of composition, he deemed an unsatisfactory medium of expression. He thought essentially in three dimensions, they only in two dimensions. The accurate representation of space was his great problem. There is a difference between a figure drawn according to all the laws of perspective, and another which actually seems to detach itself from the background. In the former you forget the existence of parts which you do not see, in the latter you are made fully aware of them. You, too, are made to think in three dimensions. Signorelli was the

first of the Italians to paint actions in space rather than tableaux on a plane. This resulted in so frequent and bold foreshortenings that these may be said to be characteristic of his style. The vigor of his conceptions also distinguished him from his contemporaries, and most especially from Perugino.

Perugino, known as a teacher of Raphael, was a man of easy-going manners and a like temperament. He had skill, but he was lazy, and his conceptions came to him as pleasant reveries rather than as mighty thoughts shaping his artistic aims. He made a reputation early in life and did not add to it in later years. He gathered, as it were, the achievements of his predecessors, but failed to infuse into them anything distinctly new. To-day we should call a man like him an academician. Michelangelo, always impatient of men who rested by the wayside instead of pressing on, called him a blockhead in art.

In judging of Perugino one should distinguish between his earlier and his later works, the latter being the emasculated editions of his earlier endeavors. In his youth he painted pictures which deserve attention for their grace and quiet dignity. His figures are pure and beautiful, their heads tilted sideways and upwards, a pose which was originally expressive of faith in heaven, but which was ultimately repeated with meaningless frequency. Often his figures stand below arches through which one sees distant landscapes spotted with remarkably beautiful trees. No one ever had painted such feathery branches and delicately graceful outlines, or known how to use equally successfully landscapes as foils to the figures in the foreground. Nor had any one before Perugino been so perfect a disciple of abstract and passionless beauty, beauty that neither stirs nor suggests, but simply is.

If one draws the sum total of the achievements of the painters in the Quattrocento, one is amazed at the completeness with which they cover the entire field of art. Drawing in its various forms, precise and refined, bold and vigorous, and following all the laws of perspective, had come to be the common property of

all. Composition was perfected. Hardly a picture could be painted that did not find its prototype in a creation of the fifteenth century. Color, by some artists at least, had been felt to be a factor as powerful as drawing or composition; and a technique finally had been introduced which enabled the artists to express themselves readily and adequately. These were the achievements on which the new generation of painters in the early sixteenth century were to build. Weaker men would have rested on the laurels of their predecessors. These giants, however, pressed on, and added so many new accomplishments that they created an entirely new standard of art.

THE HIGH RENAISSANCE

Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian are the three great names of the Italian High Renaissance; da Vinci, del Sarto, Correggio, Giorgione, Veronese, and Tintoretto are worthy seconds; while the number of other artists is so large that it defies concise enumeration.

Raphael was a man whose genius for the beautiful, that is, for the essential poise of perceivable beauty, was absolute. He was skill personified. He drew not a line which did not support every other line, enhancing it and joining with it in the making of a perfect whole. No thought incapable of adequate expression with the means at his command ever seems to have come to him. The spectator may not always be in sympathy with the thought, but granting its existence, no better expression of it can be suggested than that of Raphael. There is nothing relative or indefinite in his work. Like truth, it is; but unlike truth, it rarely concerns loftier ideas than those which mortals readily perceive. Raphael was a man of the world, and all his faculties were adjusted with unwonted nicety.

Not so *Michelangelo*. His thoughts were snatched immediately from the peaks of heaven. Their adequate expression, therefore, was an impossibility. If ever divine conceptions came to a man, they came to him, and tortured him.

His skill was great, — greater, in fact, than that of any of his predecessors, and in drawing probably superior to that of any artist before or since, but it failed to do justice to his conceptions. Everybody can understand Raphael. Michelangelo is approached only by those whose souls can take flights heavenward.

To-day when we can look back over the course taken by art, and notice the perverse tendencies which the followers of Michelangelo introduced, because they copied his forms and were unable to understand his thoughts, we are tempted to blame him for the decay in art which he is said to have begun. He deviated from the quiet beauty to which the other Italians had aspired; he shattered all tacitly accepted canons and almost despised them. Form as form was nothing to him; it had its right of being only as the vehicle of some grand idea. This was the reason why he hated the pictures of Perugino, which were beautiful but had no further meaning; and why Raphael was not so great in his eyes as in those of most people; for Raphael's thoughts were rarely on higher planes than were accessible to all.

Michelangelo suggests ideas; Raphael expresses them. The works of the former grow with the growth of our own personality; those of the latter are the same always. Michelangelo elevates one and makes one realize the existence of the divine spark within one; Raphael puts in harmony all the qualities of one's human nature. Breadth follows the study of Raphael; elevation that of Michelangelo.

Since the art of Michelangelo is essentially the art of suggestion, one is tempted to speculate as to the possible result if Michelangelo had known the imaginative and suggestive power of color, such as was used, for instance, by Titian, and has since been wielded by the great colorists. The genius of Michelangelo, however, as revealed in his paintings and in his sculpture, was so distinctly that of form that it is not readily associated with the less tangible gift of expression by means of color. Drawing was his strong point, and even if the achievements of Titian had been better known

to him than they were, it is little likely that he could have adopted them successfully.

He admired Signorelli, and did not weary studying the bold foreshortenings and strong, rugged figures of this artist, while Raphael had started with Perugino. In early years Raphael actually copied the subjects of his teacher, but by apparently slight changes showed the beauty of expression of which they were capable. Later he advanced beyond Perugino and painted in various styles. His guiding stars, however, always remained poise and noble charm of exquisite appearance.

Much insight into the works of both Raphael and Michelangelo is gained if one studies them in connection with those of *Leonardo da Vinci*. Leonardo was, in the words of Professor Van Dyke, "a full-rounded, universal man, learned in many departments, and excelling in whatever he undertook." His knowledge, however, "made him skeptical of his own powers. He pondered and thought how to reach up higher, how to penetrate deeper, how to realize more comprehensively, and in the end gave up in despair. He could not fulfill his ideal of the head of Christ, nor the head of Mona Lisa, and after years of labor he left them unfinished." To study the failures of Leonardo makes one realize how dearly many successes of Raphael are bought at the expense of elevated ideas, and how impossible it is to express adequately thoughts of superhuman nobility.

The greatest positive accomplishment of Leonardo is his mastery of light and shade, — *chiaroscuro*, as it is called. The hands of his Mona Lisa, for instance, are for the first time hands full of life. There are no flat plains; light and shade follow each other with the same mysterious charm that characterizes their play in nature.

It was the new technique in oils which enabled Leonardo to perfect his *chiaroscuro*. He was one of the most ardent advocates of this medium, and did much to establish it not only in Florence but also in Lombardy, where he spent many years of his life. Here his personality made itself strongly felt among the

artists of the younger generation, the most amiable of whom was *Luini*. This painter, an almost universal favorite to-day, was distinguished by grace and that coveted poise which by means of contrast strongly appeals to one in the hurry of modern life.

Andrea del Sarto, the fourth in the quartet of famous Florentine painters, as Michelangelo, Raphael, da Vinci, and del Sarto are often called, was warmer and richer in his coloring than any of the other three. His contemporaries called him "the faultless painter." He was fond of the mystery of shadows, and in the pursuit of his ends often resorted to artificial means, such as heavy draperies and their unwonted arrangement. Although most of his subjects were religious, he was not much exalted by them. The treatment and not the subject interested him. But so perfect was his art that it placed him, in spite of his one-sided attitude, by the side of the greatest of his contemporaries.

Like a stranger among the masters of the Cinquecento, *Correggio* of Parma makes his appearance. Born in a town poor in art, it was his fate to work almost exclusively in similar places. And yet he made grand strides into the future, and is rivaled only by Michelangelo in his influence on future generations. Essentially self-taught, he yet gathered together the achievements of all his predecessors. What they had attained by hard labor was his as a birthright. Perspective and the problems of light fascinated him. He also endeavored to bring his figures into closer relationship with the spectator, an attempt which, unfortunately, often resulted in profaning his religious characters.

His art appeals preëminently to the senses. In fact, it is the acme of sensuous art, and judged as such is of unsurpassed perfection. Such worldly beautiful figures as his had not been painted before. They charm and please, they lure one; but if one were to follow them, one would reach not heaven, but Tannhäuser's Mountain of Venus. Even his children, angels, and genii are imbued with latent sensuousity.

Over all, however, hovers like a kind spirit of another world the element of exquisite refinement, the sense of proportion and of faith in the essential nobility of the human race. Sometimes this veil of dignity is thin, a fact which accounts for the disrespect with which some modern critics regard Correggio. One may not like him, but one cannot deny his greatness as a painter. He was undaunted by the most difficult problems, and not only solved those which existed but even created new ones of his own, such as figures raised straight up in the air and seen from below. The result is not always pleasant, a "sprawl of legs" meeting the eyes of the spectators. The fact, however, remains that only the most perfect technician could have conceived such subjects and have executed them consistently.

The problems of light which Correggio set himself to solve, and in which he anticipated some of the successes of the later Dutch and Flemish artists, are of greater worth. He was the first to acknowledge in his paintings the possibility of unusual conditions, — a dark interior, for instance, with only one corner bathed in light and everything else in comparative darkness.

Correggio's color is warm, — even to-day his flesh tints are rarely surpassed, — and it is almost the equal of that of the Venetians, who in the Cinquecento, as in the Quattrocento, were the noted colorists of Italy.

The greatest of the Venetians was *Titian*. He made his reputation early in life, and added to it until he died at ninety-nine years of age, active to the last. At first he showed little self-reliance, leaning heavily on two of his contemporaries, Giorgione and Palma il Vecchio. But suddenly, when Giorgione died and he himself was not far from forty years of age, he asserted himself, and by means of his strong and dramatic temperament assumed the leadership of Venetian art. His fairly impetuous activity was tempered with artistic wisdom, and for once the world saw the example of a man of so fiery a disposition that he readily conquered, but of such sobriety of thought that he was preserved from making mistakes.

These two characteristics are rarely combined in one man, and more rarely still does such a man find himself born at a time when it is easy not only to start on the right road but also to persevere in it.

Titian had an imagination fully as worldly warm as that of Correggio, but he combined with it sound common sense and a vigorous love of the ideal. His creations, therefore, are not only unmistakably real, but, in addition, infinitely noble. He knew well that what was needed to tell his stories were not types of men, but men. And again, that men, if they are fortuitously copied from nature and are unmistakably real, cannot express those ideas which one associates with people who take part in a powerful drama. It makes no difference whether this drama is based on the Bible, on the life of the saints, on an ancient myth, or on an everyday occurrence. The pictures of Titian in consequence are not epics but dramas. All the figures act together, making an appeal the more powerful, since it is single and not addressed to several emotions. A peculiar charm of his art is found in the fact that its invariable subject, under whatever guise, is humanity. It is we ourselves, not as we are but as we should be, and Titian seems to say, as we might be, — noble, majestic human beings.

His use of color is exquisite. He knows how to fill his pictures with poems in colors, just as the great musician pours them forth in sounds. One might almost say he thought in colors. And yet he never used them as a medium of expression distinct from the form to which they were attached. A Monet in a photograph has lost that distinctive quality which gives it its value. A Titian is exquisite even in a photograph because of its composition, its action, and sometimes, although not always, its drawing. Nevertheless, those who have not seen the originals, however familiar they are with reproductions, do not know Titian; for his greatest achievement is his use of color.

In Titian everything is natural and orderly in appearance. Tintoretto and Veronese, on the other hand, were fond of the unusual and

the surprising. *Tintoretto* especially gloried in selecting puzzling points of view and in overcoming all ensuing difficulties of light and perspective. The spectator often seems to be stooping and to be looking from an angle at the things portrayed, or to be raised aloft and looking down upon a scene the various occurrences of which he could not possibly see from an ordinary standpoint. But he does not weary, for everything that *Tintoretto* spreads before him is interesting. This artist, in short, is not a mere trickster satisfied with playing his trick; on the contrary, he is always ready to reward the spectator for his imaginative labor. In impetuosity and violence of conception he is almost the equal of *Michelangelo*, whose noble flights, however, he cannot reach. His contemporaries called him "Il Furioso," and a whirlwind in the field of art he truly seems to have been. Some of his figures, nevertheless, are singularly graceful, while his coloring is superb.

Veronese was of a more quiet disposition. He, too, delighted in surprises, in complex compositions which to the studious eye were yet as orderly as the simple stories which his predecessors had told. He was a master of color, and perhaps the first to divine the singularly decorative quality of finely colored paintings. He combined with a vivid imagination an ardent love of things real, and frequently introduced portrait heads of himself and his friends in events of the distant past. Crowds of people masterfully handled as mere accessories, and groups of massive architecture to shed its glory on the scene portrayed, are characteristic of his style. His love for pomp and splendor was inordinate, but his treatment and his use of color was so perfect that it never fails to excite one's admiration.

"Paolo Veronese came," in the words of Professor Van Dyke, "on the very crest of the Renaissance wave, when art, risen to its greatest height, was gleaming in that transparent splendor that precedes the fall. . . . Those who came after brought about the decline by striving to imitate his splendor, and thereby falling into extravagance."

THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES, AND IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY THE FORERUNNERS OF THE LATE STYLES

By the side of the great artists of the sixteenth century others of equal skill, perhaps, but of less individuality are found, whose work partakes of the general dignity pervading the creations of their age, but at the same time it is characterized by some peculiarities which suggest impending decline, and grow in prominence as time advances. According to these peculiarities the artists of the sixteenth century who first exhibited them, and those of the next centuries who followed them, are commonly classified as Mannerists, Eclectics, and Naturalists. In Venice color continued to be the paramount issue, so that her sons are often treated separately. Several artists, finally, who did not rise to the level of great leaders, but were, nevertheless, too independent to be carried away by any of the three or four main tendencies of art, are best grouped according to the places of their activity.

The most famous of the Mannerists was *Bronzino*. Like the other artists of this group he developed a style of precise and exaggerated forms, and resorted to lines which could have served as vehicles of mighty thoughts for no other reason than that they pleased his individual taste. Such lines were not infrequently inappropriate, and added to the pictures an element of deceitful unreality. Gradually they deteriorated into an unpleasant pompousness of expression which quickly led down the road of accomplished decay. In the hands of *Bronzino* this style is least objectionable, so that some of his pictures actually deserve much of the admiration which they have received. They are, however, not well to live with; for an observant eye soon feels their vanity. In his portraits this is least noticeable, for the character of the subjects supplied the necessary ideas, which the artist in his other pictures seemed to be singularly unable to grasp.

Vasari is another Mannerist noted not so much for his paintings as for his biographies of Italian artists, — books which are the most complete source of information concerning these men, although recent investigations have proved that they are not reliable in details. In his writings *Vasari* reveals himself as a man of keen appreciation. He loved the best; he admired the noblest. Some of his statements are unsurpassed as expressions of sound principles of art; and yet, although he was a man of no mean skill, he has not painted a single picture of great merit. This leads one to reflect with sorrow that the periods of creative power are briefer than those of appreciation; that however rich an age may be in ideas, they soon have found their expression, and that considerable time has to elapse ere new ideas are formed, or the old ones present themselves in new forms, and thus regain their power of rousing enthusiasm. And enthusiasm, of course, is the basis of all great art.

The Eclectics were men of wide learning, filled with admiration for the creations of their great countrymen. They were earnest students of earlier works, and were able to appreciate the peculiar charms of several masters. The drawing of one, the color of another, and perhaps the composition of a third appealed to them as the acme of perfection. The best possible course, they thought, was to combine these several elements in a single picture. If they had been able to combine them also in a single spirit or inspiration, or to subordinate them to a masterful personality, their course would not have been bad. Few of them, however, rose masters over their environments. They became the slaves of their eclectic admiration, and soon trod the downhill path as certainly as the Mannerists.

The men of strongest personality among them were the *Carracci*, of whom Ludovico was the leader of the movement and Annibale the most important. In addition to the color of Titian, the form of Michelangelo, and the inimitable grace of Raphael they endeavored to copy the effects of light and shade of Correggio,

and were thus led to paint pictures which fell below their several models in every respect. This could not be otherwise because their very mode of procedure compelled them to make allowances to all the considerations with which each one of the earlier masters had compromised for the sake of attaining his own peculiar ends.

The Carracci, themselves, toward the end of their career, seem to have realized their mistake and to have turned their minds to nature as a safer guide. Not so their pupils and a large number of successors, who persevered along the lines first indicated by Annibale and Ludovico.

One of their contemporaries had come early to the study of nature, and, being a man of strength, had been able to form a school of his own, the so-called school of the Naturalists. *Michelangelo da Caravaggio* was a native of Naples, to which place this new movement was largely confined. He copied street types in all his pictures, irrespective of their appropriateness or lack of it in the settings which he gave them. And influenced, probably, by the low and sad surroundings of his subjects, he infused into his work an element of morbidity which often prevents the spectator from enjoying even those excellences which his pictures actually possess. Like his great predecessor Andrea del Sarto, who took his types from the street, he showed such an inordinate love of massive shadows that it "stood," as Professor Van Dyke remarks, "as an earmark of his whole school."

Giuseppe Ribera, called Lo Spagnoletto on account of his Spanish descent, and Salvator Rosa are the two famous followers of Caravaggio. Lo Spagnoletto should not perhaps be called the follower of any one, for he was an independent man, believing of his own accord in the same principles in which Caravaggio had believed. He, too, sought the salvation of art in close observation of nature, and was enamored of the mystic charm of shadows.

Salvator Rosa, starting from the same premises as his two immediate predecessors, drew somewhat different conclusions. His was an

emotional nature. He was, however, a man of strength, so that all his work, although truly naturalistic, stands out with a fervor of its own. Rosa is, moreover, notable as one of the first landscape painters. The tender charm of quiet nature did not appeal to him. On the contrary, he painted desolate and rocky shores, huge forests, and anything else that was destined to overawe the observer. In everything he played on the emotions, and he played hard.

Before turning to the Late Venetians two men deserve mention, — Carlo Dolci and Guido Reni, both of whom were Eclectics. *Carlo Dolci*, like Salvator Rosa, was essentially emotional; but he was softer. Rosa almost makes one shudder; Dolci makes one weep, and not rarely ashamed of having yielded to one's sentimental instincts. His drawing, however, is exquisite, so that his work, in spite of its faulty sentiment, will doubtless continue a favorite with large classes of people.

Guido Reni is almost the equal of Carlo Dolci in excessive sentiment; but his compositions are often very beautiful and deserving of praise, provided they are judged by their appearance alone, and not by their power of expressing ideas. His well-known picture, "Aurora," in the Palazzo Rospigliosi in Rome, shows him at his best. He has entered into the spirit of the antique, and has not only drawn beautiful forms but has also shown his skill in chiaroscuro and delicate coloring. At first Guido was almost a realist, later he grew fond of ideal forms, and finally his style deteriorated, like that of the other Eclectics, into a meaningless reproduction of stereotyped forms intended to be beautiful.

In Venice fine decorative paintings continued to be done long after the night of sluggish decay had closed in on the rest of Italy. *Il Padovanino* and *Pietro Liberi*, two well-known Venetians, were contemporaries of the important Eclectics and Naturalists. Il Canaletto, Belotto, Guardi, and Tiepolo, however, each of whom painted at least some pictures of worth, belong to a later century, and bridge the gulf from the late Renaissance to the reawakening of art in the nineteenth century.

Il Canaletto (Antonio da Canale), his nephew *Belotto*, sometimes also called Il Canaletto, and *Guardi* are deservedly known for their views of Venice and other places which they visited in their frequent travels. With unfailing certainty they knew how to select the proper point of view and to give to their pictures a characteristic atmosphere.

The most gifted of all the Late Venetians was *Tiepolo*, in whose work the full ceremonious splendor of color, known in the Cinquecento, once more asserted itself. But Tiepolo was restless not only in conception but also in execution. He was the child of his own time. Had he lived two centuries earlier, his admirers assert, he would have been one of the greatest. Born, however, into an age that knew no rest and that needed the exaggerations of a rococo style in order to be interested in a work of art, Tiepolo found it difficult not to make allowances to these demands. The poise and dignity of some of his pictures, as, for instance, "The Feast of Cleopatra," in the Palazzo Labia in Venice, testify to the remarkable genius of the man who knew how to raise his art from the low level of imitation to a height approaching that of his greatest predecessors.

Tiepolo may be considered the last of the famous Italians who faithfully followed the vision which the early men in the Gothic period and the Quattrocento had been the first to perceive. The vital power of this vision had gradually faded. It was necessary that new thoughts and new ideals should rise before another generation of active masters could be expected. If one realizes the complete absence of such new ideas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—the age of Dolci, Reni, Carracci, Caravaggio and Tiepolo—and the dimness of the vision which had guided men for more than five generations, one's attitude toward the painters of the so-called Italian decline undergoes a change. From disappointment and criticism one almost turns to a sense of admiration; for without a guiding star they dared to proceed, and made their way through the gloom on the whole not discreditably.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

It is difficult to recognize in the Italian painters of the nineteenth century the descendants of the great Renaissance artists. The aims and accomplishments of the moderns are fundamentally different from those of earlier ages, so that the technical skill of the artists alone can give evidence of a long and splendid descent. Individually these artists are, with possibly one or two exceptions, less great than the masters of the Quattrocento and the Cinquecento. The very fact, however, that they do not aspire, as a class, to imitate their famous forerunners, but are eager to work along their own lines, is sufficient guarantee of considerable worth. They are striving after truth; and although the conquest of truth depends on breadth of vision suggesting the proper approach, serious and continued search cannot fail to result ultimately in comprehensive culture and success.

The early nineteenth century was marked by a certain indecision as regards the proper path which art should follow. Some men still turned their eyes to the past and endeavored to create worthy pictures by combining the best elements of earlier works. The greatest of these Eclectics was *Camuccini* in Rome, who only late in life began to feel the influences of the new ideals which had grown up in the north of Europe.

It was largely the classic school of a Frenchman, David, which had begun to find ardent admirers also in Italy. *Appiani* of Milan espoused its cause, and, being a man of considerable worth, succeeded in painting pictures which even to-day deserve praise. Other artists, such as *Coghetti* of Rome, sought inspiration in contact with the German Romanticists, the best of whom then lived in Rome. The Classicists and the Romanticists alike were attracted by historical subjects, so that historic and historico-religious pictures were the best to be found in Italy in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Next to history, genre proved to be a favorite of the Italians, probably because in it the

artist can show his skill. He is not bound by accidents of nature, and may design an entire picture according to the dictates of his artistic intentions. To these dictates Masaccio, early in the Quattrocento, had been the first to make allowances, establishing thus the modern art of painting. Properly coupled with truthful representations of nature they form the foundations of good art. Exempted, on the other hand, from this union and made the leading motive, they give to pictures an air of artificiality. The charge which is justly made against most Italian genre painters is that they have laid too much emphasis on their artistic intentions, disregarding the worth of their subjects and choosing costumes, poses, and actions which, because they are not based on truth, appear to be unreal and artificial.

If these Italian genre pictures have, nevertheless, pleased many people, it has been due to the scintillating brightness of their color schemes, which, real or unreal, has the power of creating an actual sense of physical pleasure. For many years, therefore, these pictures have had a good market. But this in turn has reacted on their quality, for most of them, doubtless, were painted with no higher motive than that of realizing a handsome price.

In justice to some Italian genre painters it must be said that if they disregarded truth in the selection of their subjects, painting fanciful ease of living, dancing, joy, and never a bit of work, as if their poor country abounded in wealth, even they strove after truth in execution. Their colors easily convey the irresponsible and thoughtless pursuit of pleasure which their subjects suggest.

An entirely new mode of genre painting originated in Naples at about the middle of the century. Here *Morelli* had begun to search after "absolute truth," that is, truth founded on the realities of visible nature rather than of imagination. He and his followers made exact studies of their actual surroundings and traveled much, especially in the East, in order to quicken their observative powers. Their realism, as was natural in the bright lands

where they worked, was coupled with an exquisite brightness of color. In this respect they had, moreover, the marvelous example of the gayest of colorists, the Spaniard, *Fortuny*, who lived among them. "Ah, Fortuny, Fortuny," a great French artist had exclaimed, "you are the master of us all. Even in our dreams we are haunted by the splendor of your pictures." "Their color indeed glitters and sparkles and cajoles the eye," in the words of Professor Gensel, "with the charm of poems woven into oriental rugs."

Essentially different from the traditional genre painters and from the Neapolitan realists, *Giovanni Segantini* of Milan rose to fame in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. He was of a singularly peaceful and dreamy disposition. He loved the quiet harmonies of eventide and saw the steadying influences of humble work well done, but also gladly thought of the moments of rest that follow it. The quiet and seemingly insignificant details of daily life appealed to him, because of the importance which they assumed in his imagination. He was thus, unconsciously, led to carry out the principles of the two contemporary schools of Genre Painters and of Realists with whom he at first appeared to have absolutely no connection. Truth, however, presented itself to him in a new aspect, and one that is akin to the conceptions of most great modern masters.

Several younger men have begun to see things as Segantini saw them, using not only their bodily eyes but also their spiritual vision. Judging by the works seen in recent exhibitions they are in the ascendancy, and eager to supplant the painters of genre pictures, that "superficial art manufactured for the benefit of the foreigner," as some one has appropriately called them. But as yet it is difficult to discern from which quarter the wind of inspiration will continue to blow. The minds of the people have been stirred, while from the heated discussions of twenty years ago as to what constituted the highest kind of truth the artists have settled down to solve actual problems; they have begun to realize that theoretical discussions are valuable, but that in all ethical questions experience alone supplies satisfactory answers.

The places which in earlier centuries led in the pursuit of art are coming to the fore again, but so general is the intercourse of modern life that no special characteristics are attributable to the various centers of painting. As yet Milan and Naples have produced the greatest men, — Appiani, Morelli, Segantini, — with Venice and Rome close seconds, and Turin and Florence not far behind. Surveying what the Italians have thus far done, it needs no prophet's eye to tell one that in the coming century they will once more take their place by the side of the best.

CHAPTER III

GERMAN PAINTING

THE FOURTEENTH AND EARLY FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

In 1359, twenty-two years after the death of Giotto in Italy, the first official recognition was bestowed on a German painter. In this year Emperor Charles IV decreed notable honors to his "Well-beloved Master and Court-Officer, *Nicolaus Wurmser*." Similar honors were granted to the same man in 1364, and to another, *Theodorich of Prague*, in 1367. If the attribution of pictures to these men — the Crucifixion from the chapel of Castle Karlstein to Wurmser, and the other pictures from the same chapel to Theodorich — is correct, one can form a fairly accurate estimate of German painting in their time. The picture assigned to Wurmser is crude, obviously following a conventional type. The drawing indicates some proficiency, perhaps as the result of centuries of practice in text illustrations, while as a painting the picture is decidedly poor. The peculiar tenderness, however, which was to characterize the whole of German art shows even in this early picture, especially in the figure of the sorrowful Mary. Another point of interest is the endeavor of the artist to be true to nature, not in everything, but in some details which happened to have come to his observation. He attempted, for instance, to portray in color the appearance of the surfaces of things, such as the skin, the hair, and the draperies.

The pictures attributed to Theodorich, especially the half-figures of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine now in Vienna, show a marked advance, and give indications not only of a well-developed artistic sense in composition but also of a certain power of characterization.

A famous contemporary of these two artists, working in Bohemia, was *Meister Wilhelm* of

Cologne. He made his power so distinctly felt that even the historians of that time took cognizance of him and mentioned him in their writings, — a most unusual thing for them to do. Since no extant pictures, save a few dim fragments of the wall decorations of the city hall, now in the museum of Cologne, can be definitely attributed to him, one must draw one's conclusions as to his importance from those extant pictures which emanated from his school. This is the less dangerous, since he exerted, as is known, a powerful influence on his followers, and some of these pictures may even have been painted by him.

Characteristic of all is their winsome sweetness. Most of them were not intended for churches, but for the home, to serve as means of private devotion. Admiring love rather than adoring reverence is their keynote. They are simple in composition, not free from technical mistakes, but generally so conceived and composed that they do not glaringly transgress the limits of the artist's powers. In color they are superior to anything painted in Italy at the same time. It seems that the Germans, who were less concerned with the principles of beauty and the problems of technique than with the expression of sentiment, had begun to feel the charm of color earlier than the Italians.

The knowledge of perspective, in so far as it appears in these early pictures, was common property, and was resorted to merely as a convenient means of telling a story. The Germans did not consider it to be a thing of inherent value, worthy to be studied for its own sake, or capable of becoming one of the most desirable points of excellence of a picture. Technical perfection, in other words, was not held to be of supreme importance in Germany. This fact readily accounts for the fundamental

difference between Italian and German art. The Italians demanded a beautiful expression for a beautiful thought, and provided the former was excellent, the latter need not always be of very great consequence. Not so the Germans. To them the meaning of the picture was everything, and consequently all devices were acceptable that were able to convey it.

But this is not the only difference. There is one other which is constantly felt by students, but cannot well be formulated. It concerns the different temperaments according to which the two people are variously affected by what might seem to be identical ideas. Religious and devotional thoughts of God and the Virgin Mary, for instance, do not necessarily result in the same emotions for both races. Love, too, a passion which one would think was the same the world over, affects people who submit to it variously, according to their national temperament. It is this different effect of passions or thoughts, for which there are yet no different words, which places its unmistakable stamp on the national art of a people. Being an elusive quality, it is only understood by experience. To a certain extent it affects the technique and everything that collectively may be called the "exterior" of a picture. And since this again is intimately connected with the general conditions under which art develops, the latter often shed valuable light on the differences of character which are responsible for the peculiarities of a national art.

Painting in Germany developed under very different conditions from those in Italy. Here the people had a glorious past to which they attempted to join their own endeavors. The elevation of men by means of universal learning was their aim. Men of an all-round education were to be found in every walk of life. Art pleased all; it was one of the manifestations of the fullness of life. The princes, the nobility, and the communities gave their patronage, and every individual added his sympathy. The artists, like those for whom they worked, were people of culture, of general refinement, of taste.

In Germany there was no glorious past of knowledge and light; there were neither princes nor nobility who cared for anything but worldly power. A blind, one-sided, and scholastic pursuit of letters was the highest culture known. It was, moreover, distinctly out of touch with life. The people at large—the burghers, the city folk—neither knew of it, nor would they have cared for it had they known it. They were practical people, in the sense that they desired their natural needs to be satisfied. When they found the Catholic religion unsuited for practical use they threw it over and established a new faith. One of their natural needs was an appeal to their sentiment,—*Gemüt*,—which is a very different thing from sentimentality. This appeal was made by their artists. Like the large masses of people, these artists were innocent of much, sometimes perhaps of any, learning. They lacked culture and the perception of the right proportion of things, which goes with it. Their art was like a garden which the wise gardener, *Taste*, had never visited; where weeds and flowers had grown up together, but where, thanks to Heaven and favorable conditions, the flowers were not choked and gone. In the Italian flower garden of art *Taste* was busily engaged all the time. Nothing was permitted to grow that came not of noble stock, and many a plant was cropped because the stern eye of the master preferred it should develop in other ways.

Taste, however, is sometimes innate in a man who follows its dictates even before he has acquired culture. But lest men of such particular gifts should be imagined to have altered too powerfully the undisturbed and original growth of German art, one other factor is to be remembered. Painting in Germany was a trade like any other. There was the period of apprenticeship, then the three years of journeying,—*die Wanderjahre*,—and finally, when fortune favored, the enrollment into a union and the acquisition of the title of *Meister*. The pay was accordingly. The *Meister* received the commission; but he who gave it knew that the *Meister* could have the underpaid assistance

of apprentices and journeymen, and, giving his order generally in fulfillment of a vow, the donor was anxious to save as much money as possible. Rarely, moreover, was he a man of means, and never a judge of æsthetic beauty. If the picture satisfied the demands of his sentiments, he, too, was satisfied.

Under these conditions the shortcomings of early German art are not nearly so surprising as its many points of excellence. Its virtues were not accidents; its faults, however, were fairly sure to disappear as soon as the general standing of the people was raised to a higher level. If ever there was a national art in the sense of its being the expression of the uninfluenced and unbiased ideas of the people, this was the art of Germany in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.

By the side of the men already noted one other deserves mention, — *Meister Stephan*, who, like *Meister Wilhelm*, belonged to the school of Cologne. His altar piece in the Cathedral of Cologne is perhaps the best of all early German paintings. In the center the adoration of the Magi is represented. From the left St. Ursula and her virgins, and from the right St. Gereon and his knights, draw near. On the backs of the doors of the shrine the Annunciation is depicted. This latter scene is the only one in which the artist has endeavored to reproduce space. The other pictures are more or less flat. They are filled with noble figures, not ill arranged and individually well characterized, but uniformly lacking in dramatic force.

This is one of the many German shortcomings, — the inability to portray action. As an explanation it has been suggested that most German biblical pictures are based on impressive scenes from the religious plays, — *Mysterienspiele*, — none of which were performed by skilled actors. The artists were thus satisfied with reproducing what they had actually seen, instead of visualizing the action which they endeavored to reproduce.

One pleasing result of their basing their accounts on the *Mysterienspiele* is that all their characters are humanly near to the spectator.

Be it God himself, Christ or Mary, the apostles or the saints, all appear in forms which are easily understood. This makes a closer bond of union between the spectator and the characters of the picture than even the noblest creation of an ideal conception could produce. And since no lack of reverence ever spoils them, they rank, in spite of their technical defects, among the very best religious pictures of any age.

THE LATE FIFTEENTH AND THE SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

The intercourse between nations even in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was such that no one people could remain entirely uninfluenced by any of the others. For German painting, strangely enough, the achievements of the Italians at that time were of little consequence. The northern artists rarely crossed the Alps, while they frequently passed, during the years of journeying required of them, down the Rhine and into the Netherlands. Of all Dutch and Flemish painters the influence of Rogier van der Weyden is most clearly felt in German art; and as time progressed there entered into this art more and more of the point of view cultivated in the Netherlands. The great masters of the sixteenth century also paid attention to Italy and her art, but during the brief course of fine German art Italy did not become the center of ambitious study. The eyes of the people did not turn to her until the early seventeenth century, when German art, like Emperor Barbarossa of old, had to succumb to a long sleep of national inactivity.

Northwestern Germany had been the seat of the rise of the national art, barring the two men working for Emperor Charles IV in Bohemia. Gradually the center of excellence shifted. The greatest artists worked in the southern half of the country. The transition from the half-crude pictures of the early Germans to the almost perfect work of Holbein, Dürer, and Cranach is incredibly swift, and only few of the intervening personalities stand out with sufficient clearness.

Martin Schöngauer is one of them. He is the first really great German painter, and although few of his paintings are extant, his importance is none the less certain, for it is attested to by his numerous engravings. He coupled the realistic tendencies of his predecessors with a delicate sense for the ideal, and was distinguished by an individuality of conception which readily raised his work to an unwonted height of perfection. His technique, learned no doubt in the Netherlands, where he had been a pupil of Rogier van der Weyden, was good and enabled him to do justice to his essential tenderness of thought and expression.

The achievements of Schöngauer were still further developed by a somewhat younger man of the same school, — *Hans Holbein the Elder*, an artist who has suffered in appreciation, owing to the yet greater importance of his son, Hans Holbein the Younger. Holbein the Elder had the good fortune of being born in a city of wealth. Augsburg was commercially successful, and was actually vying with the rich city of Venice in splendor and in lavish favor bestowed on art. Holbein thus found a fertile field for his great natural gifts, and succeeded by continually earnest work in raising the standards of German art, at least in some respects, to the level of the High Renaissance in Italy.

In his early pictures he showed the influence of Schöngauer, and incidentally that of the Netherlands. He was an excellent draughtsman and composed his pictures well; he also had the gift of catching convincing poses and facial expressions, but failed to combine the several details into a uniformly satisfactory ensemble. His feeling for the ornamental and the telling use of architecture was considerable; but his color was not always pleasing, and his execution not rarely seemingly careless. Withal he gave indications of being a gifted man of high ideas, yet one whose own elevation was not sufficient to obtain for him that comprehensiveness of understanding which characterizes the really great artist.

His son, *Hans Holbein the Younger*, surpassed him in every respect, notably in what has

properly been called "the free painter's quality." Like his father he had a clear eye for things as they are, and the gift of selecting the essential, and, what is even rarer, the power of indicating, by never a line that overshot its mark, the spiritual attitude of his subjects. Holbein the Elder had possessed to some extent the gift of dramatic representation, which had been singularly absent in early German art; the younger Holbein developed it to its highest point of perfection. With the smallest means and in a fashion that was as convincing as it was admirably simple, he succeeded in portraying actions of importance. A passionate love of beautiful forms, which may be discerned in many figures of his father, was characteristic of him in everything; and, to make only one more comparison, the fine sense of color which his father had cultivated toward the end of his career was so marked in his own work that it must have been his by natural endowment rather than by acquisition.

The young Holbein traveled extensively, he knew the art of all countries, and learned his lessons from them without losing his individuality. His constant study was nature, so that it is probable that the works of others interested him only in so far as they gave him new points of view of already familiar objects. By far his best works are his portraits, in which he is often held to have been, and still to be, unexcelled. They are excellent likenesses, but they are more; they are records of characters. One comes into immediate contact with the person, and not alone, as is frequently the case, with that side of him which happened to appeal to the artist. In viewing most portraits three people may be said to be present, — the spectator, the artist, and the person portrayed. Holbein always effaced himself by setting before one the full complex personality of his subject. This is realism at its best, and that it is not attained by so-called realistic copying of nature is self-evident. It is the result of a wise selection of essentials.

Albrecht Dürer, the other great German painter, was the equal of Holbein in excellence

of artistic achievement, but in everything else fundamentally different from him. Dürer was fervently imaginative, Holbein cool, observant, objective; when Dürer was engaged on one thing he never forgot all the other things which his all-round personality had taught him to know; Holbein could sink himself completely into the task at hand, and in his best works effaced his personality. The character of Dürer, on the other hand, conscientious, thoughtful, fervent, and inspiring, is evident always. He has been called a hero of earnest labor. One almost sees him toiling for the realization of his ideal. Holbein also gives us the best in his power, but in such a fashion that we never doubt he gives it easily.

A close bond between these two great artists is their common love of nature, although they approached her differently. Dürer's imagination enabled him to take interest not only in men and beasts but also in plants, rocks, and water. The whole world was his, and nothing was too insignificant for him to take to his big warm heart. He was a religious man. Christ ruled him in his later life as surely as when he was a boy listening to the noble precepts of his parents.

With this essentially spiritual nature Dürer coupled sound common sense and an intellect of no mean order. In this respect he has been compared with Leonardo da Vinci, who also never ceased pondering on theoretical problems.

Unlike the majority of his German predecessors, Dürer was a man of learning in the Italian sense of the word. Twice he visited Italy, and he knew well both the antique and the Italian Renaissance. After his first visit he endeavored to attain in his works that exquisite beauty of line which characterized the Florentines, while after his second journey he turned his mind more to the admirable Venetian use of color. Throughout, however, he remained German; and his subjects continued to be such as would naturally appeal to the German mind.

Critics to-day, although quick to acknowledge the importance of Dürer, do not agree in their estimate of his work. Some praise it as

among the best that has ever been done. Others, little mindful of the thoughts expressed, and judging of the technique alone, find many faults. These are thus summed up by Professor Van Dyke: "There is in Dürer a naïve awkwardness of figure, some angularity of line, strain of pose, and in composition oftentimes huddling and overloading of the scene with details. There is not that largeness which seemed native to his Italian contemporaries. He was hampered by that German exactness which found its best expression in engraving, and which, though unsuited to painting, nevertheless crept into it."

The last of the great German painters was *Lucas Cranach the Elder*. His works covered a large variety of subjects and were extremely uneven. He was at his best in his portraits and in his madonnas, some of which are properly reckoned among the noblest creations of German art. He was a prolific artist and deserves the credit of having made known the achievements of the south also in the north and east of Germany. Here his name is even to-day more highly esteemed than those of Holbein and Dürer, although he was not their equal either in grandeur of conception or in technique. His popularity is doubtless due partly to the fact that as a friend of Luther he was one of the first to embrace Protestantism, and partly to his astounding versatility, which makes it difficult to conceive of any emotion which he did not satisfy in at least one of his pictures. He was, moreover, a man of keen humor and knew how to sketch telling parodies of things and men. His color was very brilliant at first; later, when the subjects and not their execution absorbed his attention, it became duller, and gradually grew to be fairly cold. His chief defect was his ignorance, or his neglect, of the principles of chiaroscuro and of even the simplest laws of aerial perspective.

Like Hans Holbein, he had a son of his own name, *Lucas Cranach the Younger*. But while the younger Holbein possessed all the good qualities of his father to a larger degree than his father, the younger Cranach is generally

considered to have been a weaker edition of the older man. This view, however, has recently met with much disapproval; for it has been pointed out that several pictures heretofore assigned to the father were painted by the son. The latter, therefore, may have been unjustly judged; and possibly deserves a reputation equal to that of Lucas Cranach the Elder.

If one compares the best Renaissance German art with that of Italy, one realizes that the Germans did not discover anything new. As regards the subject, they had a different point of view from that of the Italians, and had different emotions to express; but neither in drawing nor in color, that is, in what regards the technical side of their art, did they take a step in advance. If anything, they remained behind the Italians. Only Holbein with his easy mastery of difficulties and his keen perception of the dignity of essentials, even when the subject itself appeared insignificant to less observant eyes, contains a hint of a much later phase of art, and one that was to give new life to painting in the nineteenth century. For centuries, however, this importance of the master remained unnoticed; for his successors, unlike himself, could not study Italian art without becoming enslaved to it.

The remarkable spectacle, therefore, is offered of a whole nation turning, as it were, against the achievements of its own great men and following the example of another people, just as if Dürer, Holbein, and Cranach had not lived, and had not painted pictures worthy to hang by the side of the best works of any age and any nation.

THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

The seventeenth century in Germany as well as in Italy ushered in the age of the imitators, "those who follow after," or the epigoni, as they have been well named. That Germany fared worse than her neighbor across the Alps is not difficult to understand, because the Italians at least imitated what came natural to them, — the work of their own great men, — while the

Germans did not even dare to look up to the achievements of Holbein and his contemporaries. They sought salvation in the study and imitation of what had been conceived by men of very different ideals from their own. The splendor of Rome and of Venice made them purblind to their native art. To paint like the great Italians was their desire, and this of course being impossible, they failed to do even the best that they otherwise might have done.

The blame, however, attaches not entirely to the artists. The people at large, it appears, had lost all interest in the pursuit of quiet ideals. Something new, something startling, seems to have been their desire. It was an age of restlessness, when the meaningless scrolls and volutès of the baroque and rococo styles rose to unwonted popularity. Viewed in this light, the artists who succeeded in keeping alive at least the memory of the noble art of the past may be said to deserve more praise than blame. They were not original, they were not great, but they believed in noble things, and by their imitation made it easier for their successors to find again the proper path.

Perhaps the best known of these men was *Adam Elzheimer*, of Frankfort, who spent most of his life in Rome. Although not great in the sense of Michelangelo or Titian, he was yet a man of no mean powers, and succeeded in summing up the lesson of the Italian Renaissance as no other could have done. Only in the Netherlands were there artists left to profit by his teachings, and to them he became truly the link by which Italian influences were transmitted. Elzheimer, moreover, was not a slavish imitator. To a certain extent he kept his German personality and welded it cleverly with his conception of the Italian character. His pictures, nevertheless, are to-day of little more than historic interest.

His contemporaries admired his landscapes for which he took the subjects from the neighborhood of Rome. He did, however, not work directly from nature, but from his memory, and filled his pictures with strange creations of fancy. The ensuing "poetic" quality of his

work was formerly much praised. His pictures are "composed" not only according to masses but also according to values of color, and of light and shade. He was skilled enough to do justice to his intentions, — and to this extent his work is good, — but not wise enough to disguise them, which gives to most of his pictures an undesirable element of artificiality. What he most lacked was the reckless quality, as one might almost say, of the true artist who is willing to make compromises. He desired to have his pictures perfect in every respect, and consequently failed to paint a single picture sufficiently excellent in any one respect to carry the spectator to the land where noble art alone can pass.

Johann Heinrich Roos, slightly younger than Elzheimer, spent some years in Italy and finally settled in Frankfort, the native place of the latter. He is best known for his animal pictures, some of which would be excellent, judged even by modern standards, if they were not overladen with fanciful ruins and landscapes which Roos remembered having seen in the Roman Campagna. They add to the compositions an element of unreality which not even the well-conceived and skillfully painted cattle are able to dissipate.

The early eighteenth century finds Germany even poorer in artistic talent than the preceding period. Only few men achieved a reputation that survived them, and hardly ever was even this short-lived recognition based on actual merit. *Rugendas*, *Denner*, *Graff*, and *Chodorowiecki* are the best known names. The last was an artist of note, but not so much painter as draughtsman. *Rugendas* is remembered as a spirited painter of battle scenes, while *Denner* cannot be forgotten on account of the crass and often ugly realism of his portraits. He imitated minutely every accidental detail of nature, — freckles, wrinkles, warts, and unshaven skin, — in which respect he is the very opposite of *Holbein*. Sometimes, nevertheless, he succeeded in painting remarkably well-characterized heads, and is thus favorably distinguished from most of his contemporaries. His main fault was his inability to combine into one uniform whole the many

details of nature, for all of which he had a sharp eye. A better portrait painter than *Denner*, but a man of less power, was *Anton Graff*.

To this list of once famous names that of *Daniel Gran* should be added. He was the best representative of the decorative painters of his age, whose compositions were bold and sometimes almost grand. They attempted regular *tours de force* in perspective, and were not afraid of the most dazzling effects of light and shade, and of an almost sensuous use of color.

The works of all these men from *Elzheimer* to *Gran* was to count little for the future; for these artists drew their inspiration, if such it may be called, too directly from the immediate past to enable them to be original. In the middle of the eighteenth century, however, a new school arose. Again, the same antique that had served once before as an awakening force, when light began to dawn in Italy in the fourteenth century, was to exert its undiminished power. To-day, when problems of much vitality separate us from this second period of classical revival, we are apt to apply the term "classicists" to men of whom we desire to show our disapproval. Like ungrateful children, we have forgotten the means which once saved us from danger. But it is wise to reflect that in the entire history of the world there are only three periods of really great art,¹ — that of the antique, the Renaissance, and the nineteenth century, — each one of which is based either directly or indirectly on communion with the classic spirit.

Among the German artists who were influenced by the classical revival three deserve notice, — *Mengs*, *Carstens*, and *Angelica Kauffmann*. Rome was the center of their activity. Here *Winckelmann* had settled in 1755, and it was here he wrote his *History of Art*, which was the basis of the entire classical revival. In *Mengs*, who was then director of the newly founded Academy of Painters in Rome, he found not only a congenial friend but also a man who was willing to enforce his teachings with the

¹ This takes no account of the Gothic period of architecture, unless one considers this the natural development of an earlier phase of architecture ultimately based on classic art.

creations of his brush. To say of Mengs that he "soared after the sublime with eclectic wings" is doing him small justice. He seriously approached the conceptions of the antique and wrestled honestly with fresh problems. For once no new interpretation of threadworn subjects was attempted, but a genuine expression of a deeply felt idea. That we who have learned much in one hundred and fifty years recognize the ideas not to be genuinely classic, nor the execution skillful or adequate, detracts little from the praise that should be bestowed on Mengs the pioneer. Technically, *Carstens* was hardly the equal of Mengs, but he entered into the spirit of the antique with more natural vigor, so that he is often called the Father of German Classicism. Once lauded to the skies, and then all but forgotten, he has recently been more justly judged. To look for a perfect artist in him would be asking for the impossible. His influence, nevertheless, was far reaching. Mengs would never have been able to kindle among the rising generation of artists the enthusiasm for the antique with which *Carstens* imbued them. Mengs admired the classic spirit intellectually; *Carstens* loved it with every fiber of his emotional nature.

Hardly the equal of either Mengs or *Carstens*, *Angelica Kauffmann* deserves a place of honor on account of her gentle spirit and her not inconsiderable skill. She is best known for her portraits, which to-day, nevertheless, are generally passed by as "simply pretty." Her classic pictures are well composed and exhibit a pleasing color scheme; but they are weak, for her poetic nature failed to grasp the full meaning of powerful ideas.

Not even the most sanguine could have prophesied at the turn of the century the wonderful development of art that the next one hundred years were to see. The very dullest, on the other hand, could not have failed to see that the caldron had at last begun to boil, that some revival was pending. Equally impossible it would have been to mistake the direction in which art was to turn. The only school which showed latent life was that of Mengs, based on

the never waning power of classicism. Men may temporarily withdraw themselves from the influence of this power, but they have never failed to be filled by it with inspiration whenever they have turned to it as honest seekers after truth.

To study German painting of the eighteenth century without reference to the other periods of paintings or to the general conditions of the country or of the world at large is manifestly unjust. Neither to the Italians of the Renaissance nor to the lovers of the best modern art can this painting appeal as worthy in itself. The student of history, however, — the all-round man, — who has learned to appreciate not only positive but also relative values, finds in it much of interest. In fact, more than once he is called upon to rest in his survey that he may bestow some admiration on men who in an uninspired age preserved with zeal the memory of fine and noble ideals.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

If it is true that one fails to understand the art of a people unless one readily enters into its spirit, and is willing to judge it not only by arbitrary standards but also by the relation which it bears to the conceptions of the people, this is conspicuously true of modern German art. American standards are almost exclusively French. We sympathize with the aims of French artists, and rank a picture by the evidence which it gives of endeavors along these lines. We even persist in doing so, notwithstanding we have learned that the meager means at the disposal of a painter prevent him from doing justice to more than one point of view. This realization should make us charitable, and eager to study the works of those whose aims are different from our own. To study them is the more necessary since our own point of view becomes more clearly defined when it is compared with that of other people.

Subject and technique are the two notable factors in a picture. The artist may place the emphasis on both alike, or on one to the

detriment of the other. Broad classifications are not always helpful, but in the case of most German artists of the nineteenth century it may be said that, in contrast to their French contemporaries, they were concerned with *what* they should paint and not *how* they should paint it, the latter question interesting them only in so far as it is impossible to do anything without a certain amount of technique. "A painter should know how to paint," King Louis of Bavaria exclaimed in disgust when his protégé, Cornelius, too glaringly disregarded the *how* of his art.

As time advanced greater emphasis was naturally placed, even in Germany, on the perfection of the technical side of painting; but the strong undercurrent of the importance of a worthy subject did not disappear. There may, of course, be an honest difference of opinion as to what constitutes a worthy subject, and in the lighter vein of art the character of the people to whom it is meant to appeal must be considered.

To disapprove of the German technique and to condemn the German subject because the American mind finds no satisfaction in it, is obviously unjust. Many Americans have sneered at *Punch* because their sense of humor demanded other jokes and sallies than the English paper contained, and have, after an acquaintance with the English people, learned to appreciate as funny what formerly they called silly and meaningless. With many people the pleasure in little things is as keen as the delight in great things is with others; and the appeal to the former is fully as legitimate as that to the latter. To disapprove of the endeavors of an artist who is pleased with little things simply because we ourselves need more powerful ideas to arouse our emotions is unjust.

The German people as a whole, especially of a generation ago, had the gift of ennobling with proper sentiment the small conditions under which they lived. Some of their great favorites were artists who understood this faculty. "I know," said Ludwig Richter, "what art is and what are her demands. I delight in her many gradations and directions, I know her errors and

dangerous side tracks, and I am happy and content with the little corner where my place is ordained to be." Shall we condemn the work of such a man because he has no message for us, and sneer at the thousands of people who have understood him?

A more broad-minded attitude toward Richter, and the many men who have worked like him, than is customary to-day will dispose of much unjust criticism of German art.

Characteristic of another class of artists who are much misunderstood are Anselm Feuerbach and Friedrich Overbeck. The former wrote, after a visit to Florence, these words: "My future path stood before me clearly. I seemed thus far to have painted only with my hands. Suddenly I had come to be the possessor also of a living soul." And Overbeck said, "My art is like a harp on which I desire at all times to sound psalms in the honor of God." Different as these two men were, the one from the other, they were alike in their belief that a great artist is not only a technician but also, and above everything else, a noble man. The justice of their position will not be denied, and it will be granted that if we call neither of them masters of painting because they were lacking in skill, fairness demands that we do not rank them lower than those of our own artists who have technical skill but fail to give indications of nobility of conception.

In recent years a school of open air (*plein air*) painters has risen in Germany, — the so-called Impressionists, or, as they are better known, Secessionists, because since 1883 they have withdrawn from participation in official exhibitions. None of their works, unfortunately, were seen in St. Louis in 1904 because of the antagonistic attitude of the government. Their point of view is very much akin to that prevalent in America, so that an exhibition of their paintings would have done much to increase the American estimate of German art.

The classic enthusiasm kindled among German artists in the eighteenth century by Carstens and Mengs continued in the early

nineteenth century with Genelli, Preller, and Rottmann, all of whom sought inspiration in the study of the antique.

Genelli was the only one of this trio who was not interested in landscapes. His forte was the human figure, especially in motion. In the best works by *Preller* the figures are only insignificant parts of the picture. Often they are disturbing, for *Preller* did not know how to make them necessary to his compositions. He was a man of vivid imagination, who in his mind peopled the rocks and coasts which he studied on a journey to Naples, and drew from them his famous illustrations to the *Odyssey*. *Rottmann* was the greatest of the heroic landscapists, but he also suffered at times from the erroneous notion that a landscape without figures cannot arouse in the spectator proper emotions. Without being familiar with the much later school of open air artists, he delighted in phases of nature which are characteristic of them,—sunsets, storms, and moonlight. With him they were means of appealing to the emotions, owing to the things which they suggested,—the grandeur of nature and the mystery of life. The open air painters resort to them because of the studies in light and shade which they enable them to make, and the resulting color schemes.

In all their works the German classicists are clearly distinguished from their contemporary Frenchmen known by the same name. Both received their inspiration from the antique, but while the Germans endeavored to sink themselves into the spirit of antiquity, the Frenchmen learned from ancient art their fine technique. With them it was the *how*, with the Germans the *what*, that mattered most.

There is a strong similarity of aim between the German classicists and those other Germans who did not go quite so far back for their inspiration, but sought it in the Middle Ages. These men are known as Romanticists, and since their leaders were deeply religious men, most of them Roman Catholics who loved to tell the story of Christ, they are also called Nazarenes.

The best representative of the Nazarenes was *Overbeck*, who lived for years together with a few friends in the recently abandoned monastery of San Isidore near Rome. He found his masters in the great men of the early Italian Renaissance, and was especially fond of Signorelli and Masaccio. Raphael was not appreciated by the Nazarenes, for in his works they detected signs of the uninspired skilled technician, whom they were wont to call an artisan rather than an artist. Their attitude in this respect is pardonable, for they had to combat the traditional art tendencies which were based on skill alone.

In the pursuit of their studies it was natural that *Overbeck* and his friends should endeavor to revive the technique of their early predecessors and begin to paint again *al fresco*. The man who did most to introduce this technique into Germany was *Cornelius*, who, starting as a classicist, had been drawn into the circle of *Overbeck*, and later, as director of the academies in Düsseldorf and still later in Munich, had made himself a power in his native land.

Cornelius was a great man but not a great painter. Fighting against those who believed skill to be the alpha and omega of art, he went to the other extreme and may be said to have actually neglected it. Moreover, he did not know how to confine himself to those subjects which can properly be treated in painting, and consequently failed in almost all of his undertakings. His influence, however, as the exponent of the importance of matter versus manner was felt in Germany for many decades, and has not yet entirely disappeared.

That neither *Overbeck* nor *Cornelius* nor any of their friends and followers developed a color scheme as bright and pleasing as that of the French Romanticists is quite natural, for the only reason why the latter had turned to the study of an ideal past was that its subjects suggested gay colors. Nor was a great step in advance along these lines to be taken by the immediate followers of the Nazarenes.

The failure of *Cornelius* made the success of his pupil, *Wilhelm von Kaulbach*, appear to great advantage. This man was preëminently

an executing genius, but he lacked the deep spirituality of the other great Nazarenes. He composed well and worked with ease. His drawing was exquisite and his coloring pleasing, although, judged by standards of later colorists, far from perfect.

The greatest influence on the development of German art was exerted by the last of the Nazarenes, *Wilhelm von Schadow*, who succeeded Cornelius as director of the academy in Düsseldorf. Himself a man of many and noble ideas, he conceived his duty as teacher to be to give to his pupils a sound foundation in technique, trusting that if they had this they would become great artists, provided they had the proper personality. Without it he knew that not even the most conspicuous natural gifts would make them achieve successes. Schadow never lost his faith in the essential requirement for a great artist, — a noble character, — but he wisely distinguished between the studio of an artist and an art school. In the latter emphasis should be placed on the *how*; in the former the *what* should receive at least equal consideration.

To-day, after generations of remarkable growth everywhere, the works of the *Düsseldorf school*, which have since been improved upon in most particulars, are no longer held to be masterpieces. The importance of Düsseldorf, however, both for Germany and America, — for many of the earlier Americans studied there rather than in France, — is so firmly established that no amount of ingratitude can shake it.

Three classes of pictures were especially cultivated in Düsseldorf, — landscapes, genre pieces, and historico-romantic incidents. *Andreas Achenbach* and *Lessing* were the best landscape painters, the latter excelling also in historic pictures, notably in a series of incidents from the life of Huss. The most popular genre painter was *Knaus*. These three men and their many friends and followers were characterized by seriousness of purpose, faithfulness of execution, and considerable skill. The problems, however, which had already begun to stir France, — color, and light and shade, and the intimate relationship between

the artist and the life which he portrays, — were unknown to them.

The same was true of the rival schools in Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, and Vienna. Everywhere the purpose was good and the skill more or less adequate, but the great causes in the service of which later artists placed their endeavors had not yet appeared. *Bleichen* in Berlin was perhaps an exception, for he seems to have had a natural sense for the values of colors. He alone, for instance, at that early date, conceived as artistically beautiful the motive of thin blue smoke escaping from a factory chimney into the soft air of evening.

Early in the forties a remarkable change took place. The eyes of the people were opened to the charm of color after they — the countrymen of Holbein — had been insensible to it for centuries. In 1842, when two Belgian painters, Gallait and de Biève, made their appearance in Germany, the whole country went wild over them. What the Germans most admired in them was their realism in composition and their unrestricted use of pronounced colors. That their realism, in fact, was more theatrical than true, and their coloring void of the more delicate shadings, did not disturb their admirers; for from the technical point of view the Germans had seen nothing equally perfect. The result was that art received a new impetus. Especially in Munich the new ideas were firmly established, with *Piloty* as the pioneer of the movement. But *Piloty*, as was natural with a man who sought to accomplish a definite end with a new technique, did not avoid showing his intentions, which gave to his pictures the appearance of artificiality. Every detail was carefully worked out, and the unity of the whole consequently neglected. The figures were posed for effect, just as they are on the stage, and the necessary truth of actual occurrences was forgotten. The word "theatrical" properly describes most of the pictures of the *Piloty school*.

Makart was the most gifted pupil of *Piloty*. Surrounded with wealth and luxury, and worshiped almost like a god by his contemporaries, he poured forth with almost incredible

velocity the most sensuously beautiful symphonies of color that had ever issued from the brush of an artist. For values in the modern sense of the word he had no eye. The slow and thoughtful art of Whistler he would not have understood. His colors were many and rich; they were meant to win admiration by storm, and had no message for those who love to think and dream over a picture. Makart died a young man, rushing through life, a meteor on the art heaven of Germany. And like his life was his art. "Much he had learned from Titian," says Professor Gensel, "and more perhaps from Veronese, but he lacked the essential force and wholesomeness of either of these men."

It is impossible to study the development of painting in the nineteenth century in Germany without feeling convinced that at some time men would arise to combine the *what* of the Classicists and Romanticists with the *how* of the Düsseldorf and Munich schools. These men actually have arisen in the great quartet, properly called the German Individualists, — Böcklin, Feuerbach, Klinger, and Marées. The only thing that binds these men together is their general attitude toward art and the allowances which they make to individual preferences. They hated impressionism, — "transcribing nature as you pass along," — and were equally convinced with Carstens that "art is a speech of emotions. Where expression in words fails, art begins." And they would also have subscribed to the definition of art as "nature seen through a temperament," provided nature were made to include both the visible and the invisible. In their selection and interpretation of subjects and in their mode of execution they were strangely unlike.

Feuerbach preferred the antique. His pictures of ancient people, however, are the result of an emotional rather than of an intellectual study. His masterpiece is a picture of Iphigenia seated not far from the sea, "her yearning soul in search of Greece and home." This picture is good because the artist has put his whole soul into it, and because the soberness of his style is in perfect accord with the simplicity of his subject.

Feuerbach was somewhat affected with *Weltschmerz*, a painful yearning for things unknown. It showed in all his work and introduced an unreal element into his pictures, unless his subjects lent themselves to such an interpretation, as for instance Iphigenia. His coloring, never gay, grew thinner and gloomier as years advanced and he failed to gain the approval of the people. He became discouraged, for he knew that his compositions were of greater worth than those of the Munich colorists which yet were greeted everywhere with bursts of admiration.

Unlike Feuerbach, who died young, *Böcklin* lived to see his art crowned with material success. Ridiculed at first, he finally received indiscriminate praise from high and low. He may be likened to a teller of fairy tales. His subjects were not based on facts, and therefore could not be painted as such.

To claim Böcklin as antique in spirit may at first seem to be absurd. His fanciful coloring, his unreal figures, his heavy forms, all seem to prove him the most modern of the moderns. And yet, if one goes deeper and sees how for him every tree had its spirit of life, how the breakers of the sea suggested a woman playing her harp, and how the silence of the woods at eventide was translated by him into a strange figure on a strange animal making its way alone through the forest, one realizes that here one has something akin to that Greek spirit which peopled the trees and rivers and glens with nymphs and demigods, and could not think of nature apart from such creations of fancy.

Böcklin was a careful and painstaking painter. He had his fairy tales well thought out before he attempted to paint them. Asked what was the most difficult part of his art, he replied, "Not to lose pleasure in painting." He knew the importance of technique without which he could not express himself, but he firmly believed that even the best technique is of no account if the artist has no clearly defined ideas ready for expression.

Delicate eyes are often offended by his harsh color schemes, in which pronounced blues and

greens predominate, while truth to the appearances of things is all but unknown. To the objector who exclaims, "Who ever saw such trees?" Böcklin would have answered, "I! I saw them in a vision"; and he might have added, "Come with me to my *Isle of the Blessed*, and you, too, will see them."

Max Klinger, the youngest of the great Individualists, is not unlike Böcklin in some of his works. But he is less consistent and more versatile. While Böcklin has visions, Klinger has hallucinations. A more gruesome picture than his "Mother and Child" has never been sketched; but it is fascinating. One feels like the old Greek, of whom Plato writes, who, passing the corpses of shipwrecked mariners, was filled with awe and hurried along; but after a few steps was forced to turn back against the will of his nobler self, and, opening wide his eyes, shouted to them angrily, "There, you brutes, see your fill." In Klinger's picture the mother is dead. A heavy pillow has pressed her head forward until it is almost at right angles with her flat body.¹ Her simple catafalque is placed in front of an arch, which suggests the solemnity of a church, and through which one looks out into the even greater silence of a shadowy grove. On the dead mother's flat breast crouches rider fashion her naked child. He has been playing with her lifeless form, and at the spectator's approach has turned his head without altering his position. In his face a transformation seems to be taking place; smiling but a moment before, it has begun to reflect the horror which has seized the spectator at the pitiful sight. The sad stillness of death, the invariable grandeur of nature, the helplessness of man, — these are brought out with wonderful strength and great beauty of lines. The picture itself, with its fine distribution of light and pleasing masses, gives the eye a sense of physical pleasure. The idea expressed in it makes one shudder.

Klinger is fond of solving technical problems, but in his larger compositions he is not free

¹ The decapitated head of Egmont in the picture by Gallait, now in the Museum of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, is joined at a similar angle to the body lying in state by the side of the body of Horn.

from technical defects. Being also a sculptor, he delights in well-defined bodies, and although his modeling is good, he often fails to be convincing. In this respect he is surpassed by *Hans von Marées*, whose figures detach themselves easily from the background and seem to be standing free in space. "They mean nothing," Professor Gensel says, "do not intend to mean anything, and are satisfied with merely being." Their very existence, however, generally nude in simple landscapes, gives expression to the artistic intentions of Marées. He never tried to copy actual scenes of nature or events from life. That would have been prose; he was a poet.

The pioneer realist of Germany was *Leibl*, whose maxim seems to have been that creations of fancy cannot be so valuable as transcripts from life; life if properly studied being more interesting than any dreams about it. He was a man of considerable skill within certain limits which he was wise enough not to transgress. "Figures at rest he can paint," said a rival of him; "but try him on moving figures and you will see his inferior skill." But Leibl continued to paint quiet figures and to achieve success with them. He is a realist in the best sense of the word, not copying every detail as he saw it, but centering his attention on what should give the spectator the impression of the original.

A greater man than Leibl was *Menzel*, of whom it has been said that he tried to do only what he could do, and that he could do everything. He was a man of astonishing versatility, who achieved success in almost every branch of drawing and painting. He had an eye to details and built his pictures around those which were important. The accuracy of his apperceptions was equaled only by that of his brush, while both stood unrivaled. His early works on the life of Frederick the Great were characterized by remarkable historical fidelity coupled with lifelikeness in the figures, and were painted in a style that seemed to foreshadow the technique of the later illusionists. As he grew older his coloring became richer, and he solved many interesting problems of light and shade. Toward the end his works were often sketchy in contrast

to the precision of his earlier creations, but even in these late pictures he showed that he had not lost the power of observing essentials.

Interest in everything was a notable factor of his character. Everywhere he found desirable subjects for his compositions, but while his German admirers maintain that his selections were invariably wise, less biased observers believe that he was not always successful. His great picture of the Factory Forge, for instance, gave him the opportunity of bringing order out of a seemingly hopeless chaos and proving himself a technician second to none, but gave his opponents likewise the chance of pointing to the undesirability of permitting one's delight in technical difficulties to determine one's choice of a subject.

Equally as great as Menzel, but only in a narrowly circumscribed field, *Franz von Lenbach* vies with him in popular favor. He has not only confined himself to portraiture but is even within this single branch of art restricted to a certain mode of representation, painting only the heads and treating everything else as unimportant accessories. In his younger years his color rivaled that of the great Venetians; recently, however, he paints only in browns. His women still retain gayer colors, but they are not his masterpieces. His men have made his reputation, and with them he will live.

Lenbach is a psychologist. He reads character and paints it, without doing it, however, any impersonal justice. In his pictures one does not see Bismarck or Moltke or Liszt, but Lenbach's Bismarck and Lenbach's Moltke and Lenbach's Liszt. His point of view, however, is always interesting, so that his pictures are gainers rather than losers. There may be better painters than he, and more brilliant men, but there are none who equal him in the power of drawing ineffaceable images of well-known personages. If one has seen a portrait by Lenbach, one cannot henceforth think of that man in any other way. And this, it will be remembered, is the same praise that was bestowed in antiquity on the Olympian Zeus by Pheidias.

Unlike Lenbach, *Friedrich August von Kaulbach* is best known for his portraits of women.

He seems to worship at the shrine of womanly beauty, and has the power of convincing the spectator that this beauty is one of the best and noblest forces in the world.

The remaining realists of note differ each from the other in everything except their desire to paint real things so that they shall seem to be real. *Anton von Werner* selects his subjects from the modern history of Prussia, *Franz Defregger* delights in the peasant life of the Tyrol, *Eduard von Gebhardt* reconstructs scenes from the Bible and fills them with deep feeling, while *Munkácsy*, whose real name was Michael Lieb, selected as his subjects whatever gave him the chance of displaying his dramatic pathos and remarkable power as a colorist.

Many of the so-called realists had been actively engaged in solving problems of color and light and shade, so that it is not surprising that also in Germany men should have drawn the natural inferences which the French painters of open air had drawn before them, and should have started the school of the so-called Impressionists, or, as they are known in Germany, Secessionists. *Max Liebermann* may be said to be the father of the movement. At present the list of the Secessionists includes the names of many excellent men. On the whole, however, none of them have probably achieved anything beyond what had been accomplished by their French or Belgian brethren, although many may have, in certain instances, equaled the best work of the Frenchmen.

The government and therefore, naturally, the majority of influential Germans have taken an antagonistic attitude toward the Secessionists, a fact which has tended to widen the breach between them and the other artists, and which will probably prolong the life of the movement. Since, however, all artists have begun to learn what is valuable in the teachings of the Secessionists, the latter will sooner or later cease to be members of a distinct school. And when the sum total of German art is drawn, it will be seen that the emphasis is still placed on the meaning of the subject rather than on the manner of its execution.

CHAPTER IV

FLEMISH PAINTING

THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Unheralded by any now remembered event, two artists make their appearance in the world of art with such commanding virility of perfection that one accepts them as another of the many inexplicable wonders of life. *Hubert and Jan van Eyck* were contemporaries of the Italian Masaccio, but unlike that pioneer of a new phase of art, these two Flemish painters practiced a style as perfect as it was new. The first painters of note of their country, they remained, in some respects, unequaled by the long list of gifted successors. They introduced not one but practically all the distinct characteristics by which the art of their country was to be known.

The van Eycks knew the power of color. Just as the Italians had perceived by the grace of heaven, to speak with Vasari, the principles of harmony of form, so the Flemish artists had grasped those of the harmony of color. Softer and more bewitching was the color of the great Venetians a century later, but a more beautiful color than that of the early Flemish artists the world has not seen.

Tradition credits the van Eyck brothers with the invention of the oil technique. This technique was known long before them, so that their achievement probably consisted in adapting it to the delicate uses of art, while it had often before been used for rough work. The fact, nevertheless, remains that the van Eycks were the first to achieve success with it. It enabled them not only to express more clearly their feeling for color but also to reproduce more accurately their conceptions of nature.

They were ardent students of everything real and have, therefore, been called Realists. To

obviate the ambiguity of this doubtful designation, it has been well said that the real was their ideal. Their attitude of mind toward their subjects was much akin to that of the Italians; their subjects were different. Nevertheless, it is this fact that makes Flemish pictures, which in appearance are very different from the Italian, not unlike the latter in the eyes of thoughtful observers.

In their study of nature and their reproduction of her forms the Flemish painters worked on virgin soil and were entirely uninfluenced by any classic standard, of which they knew nothing. The Italians approached the human form with very definite ideas in mind as to what was the standard of beauty. The complete absence in Flemish art of any prejudice, however well founded in fact, gave the artists exceptional latitude and threw them on their own resources. Faces of perhaps no artistic value had to be raised to higher levels by their treatment. Their form could not dominate the picture; this had to be done by their expression and by their coloring. And so again the artists were driven to lay emphasis on the harmony of color.

It must not be supposed, however, that because classic standards of beauty were unknown, others could not be created. Early Flemish art, nevertheless, remains marked by a certain indecision as to the perfect form which, together with the excellence of execution, gives to the pictures the charm of things in the process of growth. Their suggestive power is exceedingly great.

The masterpiece of the two van Eycks is the altar piece of Ghent. Only the center is still in Ghent, the remaining pieces being now in Brussels and Berlin. Nothing else by the brush of the older brother Hubert is preserved. Jan has left several pictures, small madonnas,

and a few portraits. Of the latter, one representing a man and his wife in the National Gallery in London is of special interest, because it contains an inscription in which the artist states that he painted the picture in the very room in which he portrayed the figures as standing. Through a window at the left rays of light illuminate the wall in the background. Here, therefore, for the first time we have an instance of an artist painting from actual nature not only figures and objects but also the effects of light and shade. These had been studied and painted by the Italians also, but never for their own sake. They were introduced with the view of adding to the reality of the figures. Correggio filled his compositions with wonderful contrasts of light and shade; the people of the Netherlands, however, were the first to be charmed by the delicate play of light on the actual wall of a room.

It was fortunate for the world that the van Eycks found two highly gifted successors, *Rogier van der Weyden* and *Hans Memling*. The former was a man of fine poetic feeling, who was akin to the Germans in depth of sentiment, and was therefore eminently well suited to serve as a means of influence on German art. It was through him that Flemish painting came to be known in the land of the Teutons.¹ He was the equal, it seems, of Jan van Eyck in every respect save one: his work lacked the external charm which characterized the creations of Jan. He knew how to express deep feeling; his color was beautiful, but his lines were often hard.

Memling, on the other hand, had a soft and graceful touch, and was one of the most amiable artists of the entire Flemish school. He had studied Italian art, but in all but a few external matters had remained distinctly Flemish. One charming madonna picture by him, now in Florence, is framed in an arch from which hang heavy garlands in the style of Luca della Robbia. They are held by naked putti of such beauty that they easily rival the best of Donatello. Barring this Italian setting, however, the entire picture is Flemish. In spite of the exquisite

sense of tranquillity which it exhales, it is full of action and suggestions of life, not the least of which is the farmhouse and broad stretches of fertile fields in the background to the right.

Here again is a difference between the painting of Italy and that of the Netherlands. The former is rich in suggestions, which carry the spectator to where noble thoughts and fancies freely flow. The latter frequently includes scenes of useful activities.

In the sixteenth century the development of Flemish art suddenly halted, as if to gather strength for the tremendous leap it was to take a hundred years later. Uncertain whether their native art could successfully support them, the Flemish painters looked abroad, and soon fastened their attention on the works of the High Renaissance in Italy. They had thoughts and ideas of their own, and also skill, although not to the remarkable degree which had come to be second nature with the Italians. In van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, and Memling the Flemish artists had proved their natural aptitude; now came their period of serious schooling. During the sixteenth century they acquired many external means which were to stand them in good stead in the future. They also learned to concentrate their powers, and realized that nothing was gained by crowding pictures with many ideas. In consequence there were developed clearly defined classes of pictures, — historical scenes, portraits either of individuals or of groups, genre, landscapes and architectural pieces, marines, still life, and flower pieces. Each one of these classes seemed to follow its own peculiar spirit, and so well was this division made that it survived until the nineteenth century when it was overthrown by entirely new conceptions of the artist's attitude toward his art.

The growth of another clear demarcation line can be traced in the sixteenth century, that between the Flemish and the Dutch. Before this time little more than a geographical line distinguished the two people; afterwards each had its own well-defined aims. "A preference for dramatic subjects full of pathos, a convincing

¹ Rogier van der Weyden also visited Italy.

representation of them by means of lively action, hard modeling, generally in bright clear tones, and in landscape great clearness extending even to the far-distant horizon, visible pleasure in splendid architecture, — these were," says Professor Zommermann, "Flemish traits. Scenes full of peace, pleasure in the harmonious combination of men and of their surroundings, deep rich colors, exquisite modeling, the power of clear characterization, truth in landscapes, persuasive presentation of everyday life, — these were the aims of the Dutch."

The historical events of the sixteenth century tended to accentuate these growing differences between the two people. In 1477, when Maximilian married Mary of Burgundy, the Netherlands had come into the power of the Hapsburg dynasty. Under the government of Margarethe of Austria, from 1506 to 1530, the country flourished by commerce and grew rich. The Spanish rule, which threatened to undo all the earlier achievements, began in 1556 and soon led to much internal strife, during which a wave of iconoclasm destroyed many works of art. In 1566 took place the revolution, from which the northern provinces came forth victorious as a flourishing Dutch republic, while the Flemish people in the south, although not independent politically, gradually regained material prosperity.

One of the best known Flemish artists of the sixteenth century was *Quentin Massys*, who first introduced Italian influences into his paintings, and permitted the native pathos to degenerate into a sentimental and supernatural expression. He was a man of power, who apparently was misled by his desire to paint "energy of expression."

As portrait painters *Antonis Mor*, *Peeter Pourbus*, and *Joost van Cleef* hold high rank without being in any way the equals of their famous successors in the next century.

Two artists of the name of *Brueghel* are also favorably known. The elder Peeter Brueghel is noted for his remarkably active genre scenes of low life and his love of uncouth farmers. The younger Jan, distinguished from a later

namesake as Jan Brueghel the Elder, goes under the name of Velvet Brueghel because of his velvety color and his sense of refinement.

Calvaert, like Jan Brueghel, best known as a landscape painter, entered into the spirit of Italian art even more completely than most of his compatriots. He finally settled in Italy, where he was known as Dionisio Fiammingo.

He was thus an exception; for most of the better painters remained in the home country, acquiring skill and preserving for their successors the rich inheritance of the preceding century.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The modern student of Flemish painting is impressed by the directness with which all early achievements of this school point to one man, *Peter Paul Rubens*, and how completely the art of this man has placed in the shadow even the greatest successes of those who followed him. Unlike Holbein in Germany and Velásquez in Spain, who gave expression to the noblest ideas of which their people were capable, and who might have lived in any age, Rubens was distinctly the child of his own time. It is impossible to think of him in any other period than that of the baroque style; for its fundamental spirit of restlessness dominated his work. But so great was Rubens that he rose master over it, and changed to a seeming fancy of his own what with others was a fated necessity.

In Italy art had reached its summit in the preceding century, so that the Italian contemporaries of Rubens were handicapped by the very fact that they were epigoni, while in his own country the full development of art coincided with the period of his activity.

In the early stages of growing art it is not unusual to find men capable of summing up, as it were, the achievements of their predecessors. Nature seems to take this precaution to avoid waste of time and energy. To have a man of power however, and one in himself capable of growth at the very time when the blossom of art is opened at its fullest, is unique. Such a man was Rubens.

He began by doing what Flemish artists had done for generations,—he turned to Italy. Venice attracted him first, but he studied with equal zeal the other art centers. His favorite masters were Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto, da Vinci, Michelangelo, Correggio, and especially Giulio Romano. All of them, however, appeared to him to be distant, unattainable ideals. His real masters were the living Caravaggio, Carracci, and Elzheimer. He resided in Mantua, whence he made frequent excursions, and only the news of his mother's last illness induced him to leave Italy after a sojourn of eight years there. Fate decreed that he should not return. He was showered with favors in his own country, where after some years the Italian influences as appreciable external factors in his works disappeared and left their traces only indirectly in the full development of his powers.

Then began about 1612 what is called the middle period of his activity. He lived almost royally and was esteemed for his art by high and low. Singled out with favor by the rulers of his country, he was intrusted with important diplomatic missions, and thus visited many interesting countries. Best of all, however, he enjoyed in his home the companionship of a wife whom he loved passionately, Isabella Brant. Such continued good luck would have spoiled a lesser man; Rubens was in his element and did his best. The incredibly large number of his works is equaled only by their almost uniformly high quality, which is the more astonishing as he had to leave much to his assistants. Often he only sketched the designs and retouched the finished pictures. His personality, however, was so masterful that it completely dominated all the works that left his studio.

The last period of his activity was brief, dating from about 1630. He died in 1640. After seventeen years of happy companionship his wife had died in 1626, while his patron, Isabella, the governor of the country, died in 1633. With her death the diplomatic career of Rubens ended. He stayed more persistently at home, and bought the old castle of Steen near

Mecheln, where he spent his summers and grew very fond of the beautiful scenery, so that most of his famous landscapes date from this period. Seven years after the death of Isabella Brant, when he was fifty-three years of age, he married again. His second wife was Helene Fourment, a beautiful girl of sixteen. Her portrait dominates the types of women of his last period, as that of his first wife had dominated those of his middle period.

To summarize the art of Rubens is a Herculean task. Himself a Hercules of mind and body, his most prominent characteristic was a sense of fairly uncontrollable health.

A consumptive Venus à la Botticelli is inconceivable in connection with Rubens. The idea of sickness did not exist in his world of thoughts, except in his first Italian period, where it may have crept in at times as the result of unconscious imitation. In all his other creations there is fullness of life and joy in the tangible present. Nothing interested him so much as the human body. To him it was not the seat of a divine soul, or the image of God, but a body pure and simple, the most mysteriously beautiful thing of creation. He cared little for so-called noble or ignoble suggestions, most of which have their origin in the minds of those who receive them. He loved the human body for its own sake and because it enabled him to express his wonderful poetry of color. That his restless spirit should have found greater delight in full-developed bodies, even those where fat and wrinkles caused a rich play of light and shade, than in lean and classically beautiful forms is natural, and explains why his paintings often seem coarse to the modern taste.

The same love of contrast in light and shade that made Rubens select bodies rich in flesh is noticeable in his landscapes. The best of them picture the end of a rainstorm with the sun struggling through the clouds, or the evening glow with parts of the country already hidden in shadows, or again the first rays of the sun scattering the darkness of the night. Rubens was nearing the end of his career when he began to be enamored of landscapes. In them

he found a medium of expression readily understood by modern minds. They possess, therefore, the key to an appreciation of his other works which are less akin to the modern mode of thinking.

Other explanations of the seeming coarseness of his figure pieces have been given, and deserve attention because they, too, tend to destroy current prejudices concerning Rubens. "He conceived things largely," says Professor Van Dyke, "and painted them proportionately, — large Titanic types, broad schemes of masses of color, great sweeping lines of beauty. One value of this largeness was its ability to hold at a distance upon wall or altar. Hence, when seen to-day close at hand, in museums, people are apt to think Rubens' art coarse and gross."

Some truth may also be attached to the assertion that he had inherited from his father, a man of irregular modes of living, the turn of mind which admires the merely physical, or, as we are apt to call it, animal side of man. If this is so, it certainly was coupled with a remarkably refined instinct for the nobler side of human life, as appears most clearly in his portraits of himself and Isabella Brant.

The general preferences of his age doubtless had something to do with his selections. People then knew nothing of prudishness, and were able to appreciate fully the beauty of his coloring even when it was bestowed on bodies which we can no longer admire.

As a painter, that is, as a man who uses colors and expresses himself by their means, Rubens takes rank as one of the greatest. Titian and perhaps Velázquez are his only peers. He was freer and more independent than either of these men, but seems to have had a less clearly defined sense of the essentially possible or impossible in art. The same indomitable spirit of robust health that characterized his types characterized also himself, and consequently prevented him from perceiving niceties of artistic distinction in the selection of subjects, which either of the others found naturally easy to understand. Exuberance of life and limitless pleasure in its manifold beauty is the keynote to the work of Rubens.

The most famous of the direct pupils of Rubens was *Antoon van Dyck*, or, as he is frequently called, Sir Anthony van Dyck. Born in 1599, he entered at an early age the studio of Hendrik van Balen, whom he left, probably in 1618, in order to associate himself with Rubens.

Temperamentally different from his new great master, he was never in serious danger of losing his own personality, as was the fate of most of those who placed themselves under the instruction of Rubens. Antoon van Dyck was a tender youth, not at all the equal of his master in masculine virility either of mind or of body. His leanings were toward romanticism and mysticism. The portrayal of powerful actions and exuberant love of life were not his forte, but he knew how to express strongly felt emotions. He was modest in his attitude toward nature, and yet perceived all her details with an unflinching keen eye. He had, moreover, an innate sense of the propriety and delicacy of what is noblest in life, and could not fail to sympathize with the point of view of his most cultured contemporaries. All this qualified him to be an excellent portrait painter, especially of nobility. As such he is most widely known, and although he painted many other pictures, his reputation rests most securely on his portraits.

Like Rubens he spent several years in Italy, and derived the greatest benefit from his studies there, after he had returned home. At first the example of Rubens was too great for him to withdraw himself from it easily. Several of his compositions, his "Crucifixion" for instance, were based on pictures by his master, and revealed little of his own genius. His madonnas, however, were early imbued with a peculiar sweetness, for rarely have artists understood how to portray the gentle home life of the sacred family as he did.

Portrait painting had already attracted Van Dyck in Italy; his best work along these lines, however, dates from about 1627. In 1632 Charles I called him as court painter to England, where he remained, with the exception of a few years spent at home and a few short visits to foreign lands, until he died in

1641. During the last years of his life his work grew less careful, and his color grayer and colder. He did his best, however, even then, whenever he was called upon to portray his royal master or the princely children.

The external earmark of all his portraits is their aristocratic appearance. One does not so much understand what kind of man the sitter was, as how he looked and how he carried himself. Long graceful hands had a fascination for the artist, and are prominent in most of his pictures.

Rubens had excelled in all manner of subjects, — history and figure pieces, landscape, genre, animals, still life, and so forth. After him few men excelled in more than one line. In genre Rubens was equaled, or perhaps even surpassed, by Adriaen Brouwer and David Teniers the Younger, and in animal pieces by Frans Snyders.

Brouwer, although a Flemish artist by birth, is frequently assigned to the Dutch school because he was a pupil of Frans Hals. He was not a popular painter with his contemporaries, and has been rediscovered only recently after centuries of neglect. He was essentially picturesque and gifted with an exquisite color sense, both of which qualities are in vogue to-day. He was, moreover, vigorous and always original, and took his types invariably from the lower walks of life, just as he found them, without the least veneer of refinement. Nothing was farther from his mind than to teach a moral lesson with his pictures.

In this respect he is the very opposite of *David Teniers the Younger*, whose love of pointing a moral is so great that he shows it even when he is depicting scenes from the Bible or popular legends. He, too, painted with preference the lower classes of the people, but not infrequently introduced also more cultivated folks. In composition he was refined, looking at low life through the spectacles of the educated man. The same fine taste distinguished his color, which was often exquisite not only in its general effect but also in all its particulars. Later in life he grew weaker in artistic capacity. He frequently copied himself, and painted with little more than the skill of a self-sufficient artisan.

By far the most important animal painter of the Flemish school was *Frans Snyders*, a pupil of Pieter Brueghel the Younger and Hendrik van Balen. He was a friend of Rubens, with whom he had spent several years in Italy, and with whom he continued on intimate terms throughout life. He was the first to paint animals life-size and to introduce in this kind of work a style of distinctly monumental and decorative qualities. In the plumage of birds, the fur of animals, and the surface of fruit he is unsurpassed. In figures, however, he was weak, so that Rubens or some other friend supplied them whenever they were needed in his larger compositions. Such combination of work was nothing unusual at that time, when, with the exception of Rubens, most artists were specialists along certain lines. It began in the sixteenth century and lasted for several generations. Some notable instances of this kind are found in the works of Jan Brueghel, who was proficient only in landscapes and whose figures were frequently supplied by Hendrick van Balen.

By the side of these few famous contemporaries of Rubens many others were active who rose at times distinctly above the level of mediocrity. Occasionally they painted pictures which almost equaled the work of the master himself, but if one takes a comprehensive view of the entire period, one realizes that the greatest achievements of Flemish painting began and ended with Rubens.

THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES. BELGIAN PAINTING

The dearth of great men is nowhere so conspicuous as in Flemish art of the eighteenth century. The genius of Rubens had completely dominated his contemporaries and immediate successors, so that not even the germs of individual ideas had been able to subsist. With Rubens gone there was not a man who could lead, and it almost seems not even one who could have followed a leader. Only *Verhagen*, the portrait painter, slightly rose above the low level of art, and for this reason rather than for any intrinsic merit deserves passing attention.

With the dawn of the nineteenth century the long Flemish sleep of artistic inactivity ended. David, the great French Classicist, woke the people from their lethargy. He was a born leader, so that the Flemish, or, as they are now called, the Belgian artists, naturally flocked about him when after the fall of Napoleon he settled among them an exile. The Belgian national sympathies, however, were not with the classic tendencies which David represented. When once the Belgians had received from him their incentive to art they soon turned to their own master, Rubens, for inspiration. They did this the more eagerly because their country in 1830 had declared its political independence, and a newly born patriotism had taken hold of the people. Soon an era of historical painting began. Huge canvases were filled with scenes taken from the history of the nation. Hugeness and accuracy of drawing do not go hand in hand. Color, however, lends itself well to the decoration of large-sized canvases. Color, moreover, had been the distinctive mark of Rubens, and as such made also a sentimental appeal to the people, not to mention the fact that their national character is probably such that it is better able to appreciate the beauty of color than that of line.

Gallait was the best representative of the new art tendencies. *Leys* had much in common with him, but unlike him studied the old German masters in preference to Rubens. In consequence there is noticeable in many pictures a harking back to the Middle Ages whence also the German and French artists, known as Romanticists, had sought inspiration. They, too, had emphasized color and placed themselves in opposition to the Classicists. This explains why also the Belgian artists of the *Gallait* and *Leys* type are called Romanticists. It is, however, a noteworthy fact that the conditions which led to the Romantic movements in the three countries were different each from the other. In

Germany it was the subject-matter and in France the interest in the technical manner that had given rise to the new schools. In Belgium the Romantic school was the natural result of a national temper reasserting itself, and of a newly born and almost fanatic patriotism.

Love of fatherland shows not only in admiration of its public men but also in appreciation of the peaceful conditions under which the lower people live. *Brackeleer* and *Madou*, therefore, contemporaries of *Gallait* and *Leys*, delighted in scenes for which they found the prototypes in the pictures of their great countryman, *Teniers*.

In all these pictures the attitude of the artist towards his subject gradually grew to be of greater interest than the subject itself, so that the Belgians were singularly well prepared for the lessons of the French landscapists of *Barbizon* who had discovered the "paysage intime," the kind of landscape painting which appears when the artist endeavors to perceive the moods of nature.

The skill of the Belgian painters has grown in the nineteenth century with a luxuriance comparable only to the growth of a plant which a clever florist has kept back for a season that it may blossom forth at the appointed time with unusual brilliancy. Nothing is too difficult for the Belgians to-day. The solution of all the modern problems on which school after school of nineteenth-century artists have labored seems to be theirs easily. And what adds a special charm to their pictures and singles them out at all exhibitions is their freshness and youth. Like a young athlete who gracefully jumps a pole and, forgetful of the difficulty, seems to enjoy more the beauty of the performance and the control of his body than the magnitude of the task, so the Belgians appear to delight in skill not for its own sake but for the freedom of expression and beauty of execution which it vouchsafes.

CHAPTER V

DUTCH PAINTING

In the north of the Netherlands, the Dutch country, the arts were not so flourishing during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as they were in the south,—Flanders or Belgium. This was due less to a dearth of artistic talent than to the fact that the south offered better opportunities. Many so-called Flemish artists were of Dutch extraction. Some scholars, therefore, prefer not to distinguish between Flemish and Dutch art during the early centuries, but to discuss both together as the art of the Netherlands.

The most famous of the Dutch painters who remained at home were Bosch, Engelbrechtsen, and Lucas van Leyden in the fifteenth century, and Cornelisz, Scorel, Aertszen, and Corneliszen in the sixteenth century.

Bosch is remarkable on account of his intimate understanding of his subjects, based no doubt on broadness of character and correct observation. He has been called a psychologist, and such he is, but not in the sense of a learned professor who knows a thing because he is familiar with all its details, but in the sense of a noble person who understands things by intuition. Bosch, in addition, was a man of fancies, who often painted grotesque figures. His well-developed sense of the fitness of things, however, preserved him from painting, as did several of his successors, what is physically painful because it is organically impossible.

Engelbrechtsen is best known as the teacher of *Lucas van Leyden*, who learned from him the desire to portray emotions, that is, to think of his figures as possessors of souls, and to please the eye with graceful lines and well-balanced compositions. The pupil surpassed the master. Lucas lived his brief life sumptuously, gratifying his senses and filling many canvases with figures as delightful to the eye as they are pleasing to the imagination.

Unfortunately few of his paintings are extant, so that he is to-day better known as an engraver than as a painter. He was especially great in portraying the niceties of visible character expressions, such as gestures and poses, for their immediate spontaneity delighted his observant eye. Facial expression, however, was beyond his skill, nor did his experience suffice to make him avoid painful omissions or exaggerations.

The influences of Italian art, which during his lifetime began to gain ground in Flemish art, affected him less than most men, least of all in his engravings. They are, nevertheless, to be felt in some of his paintings, notably in a madonna in Berlin. In the sixteenth century these influences grew more powerful in Dutch art, until the genius of Rembrandt finally stemmed the tide.

Jacob Cornelisz is, in his rôle of relater of events, truly Dutch. He too attempted to portray passionate feelings, but not infrequently ended by painting contorted bodies. His knowledge of the human form was insufficient, and since he loved to paint details he failed to disguise this fact. The same love of details, however, was the cause of many beautiful bits of drapery or landscape in his compositions.

The foremost representative of Italianized Dutch art was *Jan Scorel*, who had visited the Holy Land in 1521 and on his return had spent several years in Rome. He introduced into Holland the art tendencies of the Italian High Renaissance, and at times painted pictures that vied with those of his masters. Frequently, however, he fell far below their standards because his knowledge of the movements of the human form was very meager. In this respect he was surpassed by *Cornelis Corneliszen*, whose skill in anatomy and perspective was surprisingly great. This artist spent

many years in Italy, and deserves a higher place in the history of art than is generally accorded to him. Since most of his pictures are lost and known to us only in engravings by Goltzius, it is excusable that he should have been passed by as less important. If the engravings by Goltzius may be used as an argument, Cornelis Corneliszen was an excellent portrait painter.

More distinctly Dutch and less influenced by Italian art than either Scorel or Cornelis Corneliszen, *Pieter Aertssen* has properly been called the last great Dutch painter of the sixteenth century. He was a gay portrayer of Dutch life and an eager worker on the distinctly Dutch problem of light and shade. He too studied Italian art, but sought to profit only by its technique. The exaggerated pathos of its subjects had no attraction for him.

The development of painting in Holland was thus not unlike that in Flanders; for while Italy in the sixteenth century dominated the minds of most artists, there were found not only in the south but also in the north of the Netherlands some men of worth who continued the national tendencies of their art. Here as there the fifteenth century can boast of a few great men, while the sixteenth century is a period of growth of skill, largely under the influence of the masters of the Italian High Renaissance.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

While trumpets sounded and soldiers marched through the land peace reigned in the pictures of the Dutch people in the seventeenth century. Their political independence was of recent and seemingly fragile growth, but their love of home and peace was the stronger, as the one was only recently freed from intruders and the other was eagerly coveted. No wonder, therefore, that the quiet pleasures of an undisturbed home life should have appealed to the artists, and that they should have seen common things from uncommon points of view. Perhaps it is not far from true to say that this power of seeing in a noble light circumstances which in

themselves are commonplace is characteristic of the whole of Dutch art in the seventeenth century. The subject itself is rarely so exalted that it ennoble the picture. It is the artist's conception of it and his attitude toward his art that account for his success.

The technical skill of the greatest men was so perfect that no lack of it ever prevented them from expressing themselves well. It enabled them, on the other hand, to let their fancies play, especially in the use of light and shade. This use often was arbitrary and wholly subject to the dictates of the painter's artistic intentions. Since these, however, were convincingly based on a thorough understanding of art and her requirements, the willful choice of the artist actually appears to be a faithful rendering of exceptional but perfectly natural conditions.

Just as the personality of Rubens dominates Flemish painting, so Rembrandt is easily the first of the Dutch; but while only few of the Flemish could approach Rubens, there were scores of Dutchmen who in one way or another equaled Rembrandt. At no other time in the history of the world, and in no other place, have so many great artists been active as in Holland in the seventeenth century. Not even Florence at her best could boast of an equally large number.

Portraiture, genre, landscape, still life, — all branches of art had their worthy representatives in Holland, nor were they confined to any one particular school. Amsterdam and Harlem were the most active art centers, but Delft, Dordrecht, The Hague, Leyden, Rotterdam, and Utrecht were not less favorably known, while some good men could be found in almost any of the many smaller Dutch towns. Often men changed from one place to another, so that it is difficult to assign them to definite schools.

Rembrandt was born in Leyden, but spent most of his life in Amsterdam. Although the son of a miller, he received a good education, and attended the University of Leyden, studying at the same time with the artist Swanenburgh. Later he entered the studio of Lastman in Amsterdam. He did not visit Italy, and

received his knowledge of Italian art through the Dutch and Flemish followers of Elzheimer. If knowledge of nature makes a man a naturalist, Rembrandt certainly was a naturalist. If, on the other hand, the power of seeing in common things more than other people see in them makes one an idealist, then Rembrandt was also an idealist. There is not a detail of nature which he did not represent so that it seemed to be replete with fascination and human interest. Rembrandt undoubtedly was the most human of all artists. All persons who showed their character either in their faces or their demeanor Rembrandt selected as his subjects. Fashionable portraits, on the other hand, he rarely painted, for the veneer of society is apt to destroy the marks of individuality. The beggar, the farmer, the artist and artisan, the poor man, and, thanks to his racial seclusion, the European Jew, are all people whose features and gestures are apt to be expressive of character. These then were the favorite subjects of Rembrandt. In addition he often painted himself, and his mother, and his wife. He rarely made portraits for money.

The designs of most of his pictures were not arranged with an eye to drawing, or balance of masses, or rhythm, or any of the customary principles, but according to light and shade. This preëminently determined the disposition of the features, and in larger pictures that of the several figures. The latter is a more difficult feat than the former, for it is easier to select salient features than entire forms, and to permit the spectator to imagine beneath the shadow those features which are not represented than those figures which have failed to receive clear outlines. In his large compositions, therefore, Rembrandt is less uniformly successful. His selections are not always according to the dictates of good taste. In his smaller pictures he is unsurpassed. Things, persons, and ideas that in fact have their existence only in his imagination he represents with such convincing straightforwardness that one accepts them as real; and others which are commonplace he transforms into scenes of much dignity.

Rembrandt's walk through life was not sunny. He lost his dearly beloved wife, Saskia, forfeited popular esteem by an unfortunate love affair, which his enemies turned into a scandal, and went bankrupt because he had spent too much money on his collection of art objects. He had only a small coterie of faithful friends and did not receive much popular recognition. Perhaps his misfortunes quickened his natural gift of selecting essentials and fortified his conviction that beauty of expression and coarseness of conception are two incompatible elements. The art of Rembrandt is always pure, which is noteworthy, since the same could not be said of the art of Rubens.

The two most famous painters of genre in Amsterdam contemporary with Rembrandt were *Gabriel Metsu* and *Pieter de Hooghe*. The former prefers fashionable people, whom he arranges in convincing and natural groups. They are dignified always, often listening to music or thoughtfully composing a letter; not rarely enjoying an early repast and generally held together by a bond of gallant flirtation. Unlike Metsu, Pieter de Hooghe paid less attention to the figures themselves, and more to the room in which he placed them. The charm of his interiors is unsurpassed. One actually feels the peacefulness of their atmosphere, and lest a too clearly defined character disturb one's musing, his generally solitary figures are introduced with their backs to the spectator. In order to provide some variety for the eye, de Hooghe often represents an open door in one corner of the back wall through which there is a vista into a well-lighted room or into a courtyard. At times he is too studied in the disposition of the various objects which he paints in his rooms. A slipper here or a small greyhound there detracts from the simple charm of his first conception.

The same peace that shows in the genre pieces of the Amsterdam painters emanates from their landscapes, and is best seen in the works of Paulus Potter and the much younger Meyndert Hobbema. *Potter*, who died a young man, thirty-one years of age, is unsurpassed in

his landscapes and animals. He tried his hand also at other work, although less successfully, and often introduced figures in his landscapes which would have been better left out. His observation of nature was remarkable; he represented her with fidelity, but had so keen an eye for essentials and such skill in overcoming technical difficulties and, moreover, such love for his subject that his best pieces fully deserve the admiration which they have received.

Meyndert Hobbema painted landscapes exclusively. He was a pupil of Ruysdael of Harlem, and although very popular to-day, was little known to his contemporaries. This may have been due to the fact that he seems to have left painting for business when he married in 1668. Trees and their disposition in landscapes were his greatest successes. His most famous and probably best picture is the "Avenue near Middleharnis" in the National Gallery in London. It is dated 1689, but there are good reasons to doubt such a late date. In this picture the peace and loveliness of his native land appear to the best advantage. Here also he has shown how cleverly the artistic intentions of a painter may transform an ordinary landscape into a scene of poetry and beauty. The monotony of a straight perspective is avoided by the omission of several trees in the center, by the road leading off at the right to the farmhouse, and by the tower on the hill in the background on the left. The value of all these devices is perceived when one compares the picture by Hobbema with others of actual avenues.¹

The greatest of the contemporaries of Rembrandt was *Frans Hals the Elder*, who, however, was not as many-sided as that master. He was a figure painter, — portrait painter, one might say, for even his genre pieces partake of portraiture. Himself a "jolly good fellow," he painted with preference people in gay moods, — smiling, laughing, even shaking with boisterous hilarity. Their mirth is not born of surprise at humorous

incidents, but of complete satisfaction with their existence. And it is this that makes them delightful. Even the lonely toper who laughs at his empty mug ingratiates himself by his optimistic outlook on life. He seems to have something of the character of the artist himself. Born of noble parents and fairly successful in his profession, — his contemporaries appreciated him less than the moderns do, — he found himself, nevertheless, often penniless. He drank a good deal and had to promise once before the magistrates that in future he would remain sober and be a more considerate husband, and at another time his possessions were sold at auction to pay a debt; but he did not lose his good nature, and continued his gay and irresponsible walk through life until he died penniless in 1666.

Like many of his contemporaries, Rembrandt included, he painted also *Doelenstukken*, large groups with portrait heads. Such pictures have less interest to-day, for their artistic possibilities are slight. The accidental connection of people who have met at a dinner or at an operation, as in the case of the famous picture by Rembrandt, robs the picture of the desirable unity, most especially since the well-finished portrait heads offer the spectator ever-changing centers of interest. In the best of these pictures one admires the skill of the artists who have extracted from the subjects all the charms of which they are capable; but one cannot overlook the fact that in making allowances to popular demands the artists were obliged to undertake a thankless task.

Gerard Terburg, whose sphere of activity was as circumscribed as that of Frans Hals, is best known as a genre painter. Since he was a pupil of Frans Hals, he is listed as belonging to the school of Harlem, but he was a restless genius, flitting from place to place, until he finally settled in Deventer. He knew England, Italy, Spain, and Germany, and was in one sense of the word a cosmopolitan; in another sense, however, he was distinctly provincial. He knew human nature and all the delicate shades of its varying moods, but to

¹ One of them was recently published in *The Independent* (New York), June 15, 1905, portraying an avenue near Orléans in France.

portray them he selected almost exclusively his own countrymen and their familiar surroundings. Like his master, he preferred few figures in his compositions, but these few he characterized and posed with an accuracy and freedom that reveal the great artist. Only once he was called upon to paint a large picture of many figures, and then he absolved himself of the task most creditably. He happened to be in Münster, in Germany, in 1648 and received the commission to paint the peace ratification there between Spain and Holland. With this exception, he painted genre pure and simple.

In this style of painting he had a long list of forerunners and followers, generally known as the *Dutch Little Masters*, a somewhat arbitrary designation of the many genre painters in Harlem, Amsterdam, and elsewhere, who delighted in portraying the everyday incidents of both high and low life in their native land. Their rendering is generally full of suggestiveness, and not rarely adds poetic charm to subjects which to the unobservant eye are commonplace. Sometimes, however, these artists overshot their mark and, carried away by their love of detail, presented liberal transcriptions from life; and then these pictures are pleasant only for a momentary glance because the artistic intentions have too small a place in them.

Landscape painting was even more flourishing in Harlem than in Amsterdam, and can boast of two of the best Dutch names, *Wouwerman* and *Ruysdael*. The former was a careful student of nature, but no literal transcriber, for in utilizing his studies he seems to have relied on his memory. Since he was also greatly interested in figures, these form important parts of his compositions. He often painted battle scenes, and was thus one of the few Dutch painters who in their art made reference to the stormy years of the early seventeenth century. His fancy, however, toned down the fierceness of actual warfare and made allowances to the refining and restraining influences of his time.

Jacob van Ruysdael was of a more thoughtful turn of mind, often almost melancholy.

Lonely woods and glens and the mysterious breezes in the tree tops were his chosen province. No one ever painted nature in her serene, one might almost say inconsiderate, moods, as he did. He loved the contrast of woods and water, and also painted some excellent marine pictures. His sense for nature and how she would appear under given conditions was perfect, as is best perceived when one studies his pictures of mountain torrents which he had never seen. Besides these characteristic pictures Ruysdael painted, especially in his youth, others of a more idyllic appearance. But he had grown somber early. His life was not happy. In 1659 he left Harlem for Amsterdam, but being unsuccessful there he returned home a pauper. He died in 1682 in the Harlem poorhouse.

His coloring was altogether subordinated to his love of light and shade, and in this respect is the very opposite of the silvery tone that characterizes the work of his uncle, *Salomon van Ruysdael*. Salomon was of a tender disposition and apparently gifted rather with a sense of beauty than with dramatic force. His pictures are not very strong, but they are always charming. He too loved water and trees, and was most fertile in devices of introducing both in ever-varying combinations.

The only representative of the other Dutch schools who deserves a place by the side of the great men of Amsterdam and Harlem is *Gerard Dou* of Leyden. He was the son of an engraver, and probably inherited from his father his love of precision. All his good pictures are small in size and painted with the delicacy which such a size demands. As a pupil of Rembrandt he learned the intricacies of clever light and shade, although he rarely permitted it to encroach on the beauty of his color scheme.

Roughly speaking his pictures are of two kinds, — a single figure at a massive window with the light falling full on his or her face and the deep shadow of the interior as background, or a few figures in a room more or less brightly lighted through large casement windows. In these latter pictures heavy draperies pulled to one side often add to the rich aspect of the

room. His types are few, most of his young men resembling himself, his older men looking somewhat like his father, and his women showing pretty features with round eyes, small noses, and delicate mouths.

Although he had but few figures in his pictures, he was fond of filling his interiors with a great variety of objects, — pieces of furniture, musical instruments, household articles, and so forth. These he always arranged in a fashion similar to that of artists of still-life pictures.

The art of Gerard Dou was carried to its logical conclusion by the artists of the Mieris family. *Frans van Mieris the Elder*, a pupil of Dou, was the best of them. He was gayer in color, and selected his types from the richer classes rather than from the middle classes, which Dou had liked best. The older he grew the less replete with actual worth became his pictures. His son, *Willem*, who belongs to the eighteenth century, continued the mannerism of the later works of his father; and his son again, *Frans van Mieris the Younger*, continued on the downward road trod by his immediate forerunners.

Before leaving the men of the seventeenth century mention should be made of the painters of flowers and still life in the various schools, many of whom rose to places of great distinction, and are considered by those who like this style of work to have remained unsurpassed to the present day. Their skill was marvelous, but their art was placed in the service of a thankless task. A modern artist, on being asked why he had painted an exquisite still life, answered, "To show the critics that I know how to paint." Similar intentions may not correctly account for the Dutch still-life pictures, but they give a hint as to some of the causes that led to the low level of art in Holland in the eighteenth century. The noble attitude of the artists toward their art, which had characterized the best men in the seventeenth century, had given way to an inordinate interest in the means by which the earlier successes had been achieved. And such is the perversity of fate, that if one fixes one's attention on the

thing which is but an accompaniment of the worthiest achievement, one loses it as surely as one has lost sight of the thing which alone deserves to be coveted.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The truth of this observation is singularly well apparent in the art of Holland in the eighteenth century. It is a sluggish period. Fewer men devoted themselves to painting, and of these few hardly any reached a level of consequence. Jan van Huysum and Rachel Ruysch alone deserve mention.

Jan van Huysum showed his skill in fruit and flower pieces and still life, and is to this day extremely popular among collectors of such pictures. He had a most delicate touch and a marvelous eye for the minutiae of his subjects. Almost equally excellent in flower pieces was *Rachel Ruysch*. At that time it was an unusual thing for a woman to accomplish much in any profession. The importance of her successes, therefore, was naturally exaggerated, and she is still reaping the benefits of her unusual position. She was, considering the age when she worked, a good artist. If one ranks her, as is frequently done, among the best, one places her not by her attainments with the brush but by her success in gaining recognition for her sex which till then had received only scant justice.

Of the remaining artists of the eighteenth century little need be said. They tried their hands at all kinds of work and did not achieve one masterpiece. Several of their pictures are not bad, but, on the other hand, they are not better than most works done by men of little inspiration and some, or even much, skill.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The nineteenth century did not open auspiciously for Dutch art. The level was low, yet not so low that a reversion to better things followed as a necessary conclusion. The powerful personality of David of France made itself

felt also in Holland; but neither the artists nor the public took kindly to the principles and ideas of his classic school. Classicism, therefore, has hardly a place in the history of Dutch art.

Jan Willem Piencman, indeed, might be called a Classicist, but not one of the pure style, because he too permitted other influences to shape his career, notably those of the French Romanticists. It is better, therefore, to refer to the early Dutch artists of this period as Transition Painters, and to realize at once that the salvation of Dutch art did not come from the outside but from the inside. David's Classicism served as the initiative not because it was accepted but because it was rejected. It could only be kept out of the country by having opposed to it another force, and this the Dutch began to look for in their own past. They began to compare their modern pictures with those of their ancestors, and to their credit discovered that the subjects and technical aims were the same, but that the honest attitude of the artists toward their art had lost its place with them. This defect they set out to mend, and thanks largely to the work of three men — *Josef Israels*, *Bernardus Blommers*, and *Adolf Artz* — they succeeded remarkably well. Fixing their attention on the really worthy things, they also rediscovered the lost skill, so that to-day, judged even by this standard, they take their place by the side of the best.

Their greatest man is *Josef Israels*, once a poor despised little Jew, to-day respected both as a man and as an artist far beyond the boundaries of his native land. There is something eternally sad yet wonderfully sweet in his art. We pity the woman sitting by the deathbed of her husband, and now alone in the world, but we rejoice at the thought that folk capable of such love still people this earth. With similar emotions we join the little group of the fisherman and his children, who are returning from their mother's funeral. He holds the baby in his arms, and we know that although the mother is dead the children will not want in love. Or let us look at the lonely Jew lost in thought, or at any other picture by *Israels*; everywhere

we find the same noble outlook on life. He does not make it gay by "patching the old rags with motley strips and stripes," but by infusing into it the tenderness which is the result of right living and right thinking.

His technique is sufficient to his needs, although professional men have no difficulty in detecting its weak points. He himself is quoted by Professor Gensel as having remarked to *Liebermann*, "Barring *Millet*, there is no other artist who knows so little of drawing and painting as I, and has yet painted such good pictures."

Sunnier than the art of *Israels* is that of *Adolf Artz*, an excellent genre painter, who follows more distinctly the endeavors of the Transition Painters, notably of *Jan Bosboom*. The latter was especially good in the light of his church interiors; *Artz*, however, is best in his genre pieces of the lower and the middle classes. Fully his equal is *Christoffel Bisschop*, whose art has been well characterized by the title of one of his pictures, "Sunshine in Home and Heart."

Bernardus Blommers is the vigorous writer in prose compared with the poets *Israels*, *Artz*, and *Bisschop*. His coloring is gayer and his lines are less refined, — more suggestive of the active life that physically healthy people lead.

Several of these figure painters prefer a landscape to an interior as the setting of their figures; and show the same intimate understanding of silent nature as of human beings. The Dutch landscapists, in fact, are as important as the figure painters. Their best known representative is *Anton Mauve*, who in his cattle pieces almost equals the sweet melancholy of *Israels*. He considers the surrounding landscape generally as carefully as the animals, and as a colorist seems to pay special attention to those colors which appear in the high lights.

The two brothers *Willem* and *Jacob Maris* have a broader outlook than *Mauve*, intending to reveal the stable dignity of their country in their landscapes, although they too prefer to make the final appeal by some fine cattle or an impressive windmill. Sometimes the sun is

shining, but more frequently marvelous cloud formations remind one of the peculiar Dutch atmosphere.

Hendrik Willem Mesdag loves his native land as well as they, but he sees its greatest charm in the sea which bounds it. He has noticed the ever-varying aspect of the waters and the accompanying changes of the effects of light. To paint these is his delight and his strength. He is undoubtedly one of the best modern painters of marines.

When men have the gift to see essentials externals have less interest for them. When the subject charms them they pay less attention to its expression except in so far as it is absolutely necessary to serve their ends. It is, therefore, not astonishing that the Dutch artists should have been little influenced by the various continental schools, most of which were based on a search for new and better technical means. They did not actively enter into the hunt for such means, though they accepted the best results. This was natural also for one other reason. Most of the more recent schools have struggled with the problem of intensely bright sunlight. Such light is rare in the moist climate of Holland, and since Holland in its varying moods is the subject of the Dutch artists, these latter, of course, had little occasion to join the impressionistic movement. No people, on the other hand, could entirely withdraw from the struggle for something new in the outward appearance

of pictures, which swept over Europe like wild-fire during the latter decades of the nineteenth century. In Holland, therefore, several artists joined these movements, not as active participants, but as distant although most interested spectators. They took over into their own art whatever pleased their fancy. These painters may be called Individualists. Widely differing one from the other, they still have this in common, that they believe in the right of every artist to select subjects and expressions according to his own peculiar liking. Rarely, however, have they regarded such freedom to be a license, as many of their impressionistic neighbors have done.

Modern Dutch art has made no great stir in the world. It is quiet and appealing rather than dazzling and surprising. It is not brilliant, but it is exquisite. It is deservedly well liked by people of a contemplative turn of mind, and is passed unnoticed by those who pay attention only to the execution and forget that execution should not be the whole of the picture.

The development of Dutch art is singular. Without much heralding Rembrandt made his appearance, and with him the host of great men. Then there came a period of rest, and while after that all eyes were turned to France and people believed that only from France there could come salvation, the Dutch quietly went to work and created a new art as fine in its way as anything that had ever been done in Holland.

CHAPTER VI

SPANISH PAINTING

The prime of Spanish art was not coincident with the greatest political splendor of the country, but, as is not rarely the case, followed it; and since, politically, the rise of Spain had been very rapid, the great intellectual achievements were accomplished long after the zenith of worldly splendor had been past. In painting, only one period, the seventeenth century, can boast of men of world-wide reputation, Velásquez and Murillo.

The early years of Spanish painting were uneventful. From the tenth century only a few miniatures are preserved, while the first larger pictures date fully two centuries later. Again, two hundred years later foreign influences began to be felt, doubtless as the result of the Gothic style of architecture which had made its way from France southward. Italian and Netherlandish artists also visited the country and dominated the local schools for many generations. The rise of what might be called a national school of painting dates from the introduction of naturalistic tendencies into the country during the fifteenth century, although it was soon again superseded by foreign imitation.

Antonio del Rincon is the earliest Spanish artist of note who devoted himself to the two branches of his art which were to continue in popular favor in Spain, — portraiture and religious pictures.

The next century, the sixteenth, was slightly richer in reputable artists, and from now on it is possible to group them in three classes, according as they belonged to, or may be said to be affiliated with, the Castilian, Andalusian, or Valencian schools of artists. The first comprises the center of Spain, the second includes the south, and the third extends along the eastern coast of the country.

Among the Castilians *Alonso Sánchez Coello* is the most interesting. He was a pupil of Antonio Moro and a serious student of the fine collection of paintings by Titian in Madrid. Like Velásquez, three quarters of a century later, he was court painter and painted many portraits of Philip II and his courtiers.

In Andalusia *Luis de Vargas* tried his hand at fresco painting, a style of art which had been singularly neglected in Spain. He was noted for his skill, and to this day one of his pictures in the cathedral of Seville, in which a very cleverly foreshortened leg appears, attracts much attention and is commonly known as "La Gamba" (the leg).

Juan de Juanes, in Valencia, was a painter of religious pictures and was characteristically Spanish in his superstitious acceptance of the realities of divine tradition. But he also painted portraits and, although less individual in this branch of art than in the other, is generally ranked highest as portraitist. He had studied with Raphael, and on his return home founded an art school in Valencia.

His son-in-law, *Francisco de Ribalta*, surpassed him in religious pictures. He, too, had studied in Italy and showed this in his work. In the fervor and ecstasy of his conception of divine subjects, however, he does not belie his origin. His great pupil, *Ribera*, settled in Italy, where he was known as the Spaniard, — Lo Spagnoletto.¹

Unlike these latter men who were carried away by their admiration of foreign achievements, the greatest of the Spanish artists, Velásquez, studied the art of the foreigners diligently without losing his characteristically Spanish individuality.

¹ Lo Spagnoletto is discussed with the Italian artists on page 106.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

*Don Diego de Silva y Velásquez*¹ was born in Seville in 1599. His father's name was de Silva; his mother's family name Velásquez. Following a Spanish custom, the latter name was joined to the former in the case of the son, and by strange coincidences it has so happened that the artist to-day is exclusively known as Velásquez. As soon as his artistic talents began to show he was placed in the studio of Francisco de Herrera the Elder. This man, however, had a coarse and irascible nature, so that the boy was repelled by it, and changed to the studio of a less powerful artist but more attractive man, Francisco Pacheco. Pacheco, it seems, was one of those people who know things in theory but are failures in practice. He was an author too, and his book, *Arte de la Pintura*, contains discussions of many sound doctrines of art. Incidentally it is a source of information concerning the earlier years of the career of Velásquez.

While still in Seville Velásquez painted many pictures of groups of people of the middle or the lower classes, generally in interiors. Such pictures were popular at the time, and are known as *Bodegoncillos*, or *Bodegones*. All these early works show the quiet light of the studio where they were painted, and give evidences of a remarkably keen observation of the forms of nature.

In 1623 Velásquez removed to Madrid and was appointed court painter to Philip IV. He had been in Madrid once before, but then had not met with success. This time, however, his success was immediate. The king became his friend and remained faithful to him to the last. Commissions to paint either the king or members of his family and household were incessant, so that from now on Velásquez may be said to have been portrait painter with only an occasional digression into other branches of art. At

¹The proper spelling of the name is Velázquez. The popular spelling — Velásquez — has, however, received the sanction of the Spanish Academy, and may therefore be considered correct.

first his style does not noticeably change; it remains sober, objective, remarkably accurate, but with harsh shadows and little attention to the artistic possibilities in the treatment of light and color.

Rubens visited Madrid in 1628, and although Velásquez saw much of him, no direct influence of the Flemish master on the Spaniard is noticeable. It was, however, probably at the suggestion of Rubens that Velásquez visited Venice in 1629 in the company of the famous general, Spinola. The results of this Italian journey soon showed in his work, so that what is called his second style dates from about 1630. All points of excellence of his earlier work he retained, but he grew softer, paid more attention to the problems of light, and was less willing to sacrifice the general tone of his pictures to the harshness of sharply defined shadows.

Ten years later Velásquez went again to Italy, this time in the service of his king, who desired him to buy antique statues and casts for the royal Spanish collections. When Velásquez returned home in 1651 he had once more altered his style. He had overcome the last vestiges of an artificial studio light and was master of the extreme wealth of technical means. His purpose had not changed, for he remained natural and objective in the extreme. With unflinching certainty he selected the simplest and most adequate means of expression. His keen eye knew which features were essential and his hand painted them with precision. At this time he also made use of a device which reveals the delicacy of his vision, and which after centuries of neglect has only recently been tried again. It consists of duplicating the lines of important contours by means of extremely thin strokes of the brush, so that the spectator seems to see more than one view. This redeems the portrait from fixed stability and gives it the appearance of lifelike mobility. The luminosity of his colors he frequently increased by not mixing his pigments on the pallet but by placing them side by side on the canvas. At a proper distance the color rays which the several pigments reflect are combined,

so that their effect is the same as if the pigments had been mixed before they were put on the canvas, with this exception, that no luminosity is lost in their chemical combination.

Different from Velásquez in every respect save one, *Bartolomé Estéban Murillo* is yet the only Spanish painter who deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with him. The point of resemblance is found in their command of natural forms and movements to their minutest details. But while Velásquez was a sober man of the world with much common sense and a personality that faded into the background before the existence of facts, Murillo was a warm-hearted idealist, a deeply religious Catholic, a lover of people not for what they seem to be (their appearance) but for what they are (their character). Velásquez with masterly command of color delighted in obtaining results with the simplest means. Murillo in his emotional ardor poured out the whole wealth of sensuous color schemes.

His religious pictures are most characteristic, for just as sincerely as he believed in the reality of the miracles taught by his church, just so really he painted them. Dreams, visions, and supernatural occurrences are his favorite subjects. St. Anthony sees the Christ-child brought down to him by the choir of angels, and holds him in his loving arms, forgetful of all else but the grace of God. And we too are unmindful of the strangeness of the scene, and believe. Or the Virgin is carried up to the boundaries of heaven, and there with the angels at her feet proves to the spectator the truth of the doctrine of the immaculate conception. In most of these religious pictures Murillo shows himself master of the most glorious light and shade. He is here fully the equal of Correggio, and in the richness of his color vies with the best of the Venetians.

Another class of pictures, most of which he probably painted in his youth, reproduce with loving care types of the common people, frequently children. For these and for angels he always had a warm heart.

Murillo often painted the same subjects many times, but since he always made use of new

natural forms he was generally successful. The modern taste has been less pleased with him than with Velásquez. He is too emotional, too fiery, not only in suggestion but in visible action, and not sufficiently intellectual. But if a man permits himself the luxury of dreams despite his reason, and loves a fellow-creature, however poor, despite common selfishness, then Murillo is the painter for him. Aside from the subjects treated Murillo was one of the great painters of the ages. Men may slight his emotionalism, but they will find it difficult to equal his use of color, his drawing, grouping, and especially his treatment of outlines, vanishing into the glory of the light that surrounds them.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The greatest Spanish painter of the eighteenth century, and one who summed up once more the characteristic tendencies of his people, was *Francisco José de Goya y Lucientes*. He was a clever technician but, above everything, a man of a fierce, almost wild, impetuosity. He was a naturalist, too, and had he been born in a colder clime, where people act and live less intently, he might not have reached the perfection to which he sometimes attained. That he did not always succeed was due to his recklessness, for his execution often was as hasty as his disposition was fiery.

Goya is unrivaled as a portrayer of Spanish national customs, while his satirical vein made him naturally the painter of popular superstitions and social frailties. Light and shade dominate over color in all his pictures, so that they appear somber as befits the intensity of emotion which his subjects suggest.

Like Velásquez, one hundred and fifty years earlier, Goya was appointed court painter to the king of Spain. He lived gayly and was surrounded with splendor and luxury during the reign of Charles IV. Later, however, he had a disagreement with Ferdinand VII which resulted in his withdrawal from the court. He removed to Bordeaux where he died in 1828.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Naturalism based on the most grewsome occurrences is one of the keynotes of modern Spanish art. "Nerves accustomed to bull fights," says Professor Gensel, "one needs if one views the exhibits of the *Musco de Arte Moderno* in Madrid. Close together one sees there on the walls of one gallery 'The Insanity of Johanna of Castiles,' 'The Decapitation of Torrijo and his Followers,' 'The Bell of Huesca' with the fifteen cut-off heads, 'Johanna Insane at the Coffin of her Husband'; and in another gallery 'The Chief Inquisitor Torquemada Ines de Castro' with the fearful representation of a corpse partly decayed, 'Nero viewing the Dead Body of Agrippina,' and so forth. Everywhere insanity, blood, decomposition, and everything, life size!" The only redeeming feature of the long series of historical pictures is their exquisite technique. They are in composition and in execution equally grand.

It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the same artists excelled also in another style of painting, the simple genre. The greatest of

all Spanish genre painters was *Mariano Fortuny*, who died young before he, too, had tried his hand at bloody history. His scintillating color schemes, his studied effects which yet impress one as singularly true, and the nobility of his conception have raised him to the highest rank among painters. In 1859 he accompanied General Prim in the campaign against Morocco, and learned to know and to admire the gayety of African life. Later he was in Paris, and after a few years at home returned to Italy where he had been as a student. He was an indefatigable worker whose remarkable successes had no other effect than to spur him on to new achievements. He died in Rome in 1874.

Recently some exquisite portraits and landscapes have also been painted in Spain. Whenever the subject offers an opportunity for the display of that fiery temper which Spaniards love, the picture is a masterpiece; for the Spanish painters possess a good technique and, owing to their fondness for naturalism, present the very personality of their sitter. In their best work one feels the influence of the clear color schemes of Fortuny.

CHAPTER VII

FRENCH PAINTING

In France, as in most northern countries, manuscript illuminations and miniatures were the beginnings of painting. The first crude extant frescoes are found in the Church of St. Savin in Poitou, dating from the twelfth century, while several cathedrals, notably those of Chartres, Reims, Rouen, Tours, Bourges, and Le Mans, possess colored windows of the thirteenth century. However, no names of important artists were recorded during these two centuries. The first Frenchmen deserving recognition as individual artists were the two *Clouets*, father and son, who are best known as portrait painters. Unlike most of their contemporaries, they were little influenced by Italian art. The elder Clouet had come from the Netherlands, and had brought with him a simplicity of style and quiet beauty of color entirely at variance with the studied and luxurious elegance which the second-rate Italians were then importing into France. The younger Clouet also leaned more toward the Germanic tendencies of art than toward the Latin, so that his portraits sometimes are compared with those of Holbein.

The only other Frenchman of note of the sixteenth century was *Jean Cousin*. He belonged to the so-called school of Fontainebleau, a company of artists who were entirely under the influence of the florid, superficial elegance which had been introduced by inferior Italian painters; for these unfortunately had gained more power in France than the great masters who, since the time of Giotto, had paid occasional visits to the country.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The same tendencies, with only slight modifications, continued to prevail in the early seventeenth century. *Simon Vouet*, a shallow but nevertheless clever imitator of Italian masters,

enjoyed a remarkably great reputation, and although his pictures fail to excite admiration to-day, he still deserves much credit, for he was the teacher of three of the best artists of the century, — *Eustache Le Sueur*, *Pierre Mignard*, and *Charles Le Brun*. The latter throughout his long life completely dominated the art of France. He found favor with King Louis XIV and seems to have well represented the national tendencies of his age. Moreover, he did much to raise the art standards of the people; for he did not despise making designs for furniture, tapestry, pottery, and anything else that contributed to the beauty of their surroundings. Everywhere he revealed sureness and dignity of conception, which he probably had acquired when he was a young student in Italy. There he had diligently studied the antique and had joined Poussin, whose love for nature had to some extent also passed over to the younger man.

The multiplicity of work undertaken by Le Brun and the showy life at court necessarily left their traces upon him. Scenically beautiful, his pictures are nevertheless often shallow. One admires a fine appearance, one misses a soul.

Nicolas Poussin, who, like Le Brun, was an ardent admirer of the antique, based his work on it and on nature. His figure pieces are studied and lacking in temperament. In his landscapes, however, he marked a departure of such importance that he fully deserves the recognition which he has received. He was not a landscape painter in the modern sense of the word, — one who renders faithfully what nature offers to the eye. On the other hand, he was not a copyist of traditional types, but gave his own conceptions of nature simply and truly. His study of the antique had made him love the heroic, so that in nature, too, he saw only this

one side. He was, however, poetically gifted, so that none of his compositions are tedious and few are unimpressive.

Greater even than Poussin, *Claude Lorrain* painted Italian landscapes with unparalleled perfection. He painted Italy "as she lives in the soul of the visitor from the north." His landscapes are "arranged" so beautifully and with such attention to detail that one does not doubt their actuality but rather believes himself transported to the Elysian Fields. They possess the charm with which one habitually clothes the civilizations of bygone ages. The happiness of innocent enjoyment of nature has nowhere been more persuasively represented than in them. They are dreams, but of that wholesome kind which makes real life doubly worth the living.

Claude Lorrain had a singularly keen eye for the various effects of light, according to whether it was morning, noon, or evening. He loved the sunshine, and at times even dared to paint the sun sinking below the level of the water. Water is found in most of his pictures, but even his marines present the sea in its relation to the shore. Everywhere he aspired at depth, and generally placed, in order to increase it, heavy trees or architectural masses to the right and left of his compositions. His figures conform to the general atmosphere of his pictures, — playful shepherds in Arcady or the reincarnated blessed of an imaginary world. They are always designed as integral parts of the compositions, although their execution was often left to others, as was the custom of the time.

To guard against forgeries Claude Lorrain made drawings of many of his pictures, two hundred of which are preserved in the gallery of the Duke of Devonshire under the name *liber veritatis*. He spent most of his life in Italy, although in his youth he traveled much. He was born of French parents in a small German town near the Mosel, and did not enter on his life's work until the Italian painter Tassi, whose valet he was, discovered his talent and had him taught. Although greatly influenced by the Carracci and Elzheimer, he soon developed his

own peculiar style and continued it through life. His coloring was richest in his early works. When he was full grown it became softer, and finally grew to be somewhat dull as compared with the gold and silver tints of his younger years. These, however, are such fine distinctions that only the most learned feel justified in dating his pictures by them. To the ordinary observer they are all alike, grand conceptions of a divinely beautiful world.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

While art was at its lowest level everywhere else in the eighteenth century, and only in England the foundation for a new and powerful art was laid, France forged ahead with giant strides. She alone did not lose what earlier generations had accomplished; she alone held an ideal so high that it kept ahead of the most eager endeavors and secured for her the place of leader in the field of art, which she has successfully held for two hundred years.

Compared with their contemporaries, the names of almost all the French artists of the eighteenth century deserve to be printed in bold-faced type. Judged, however, by the standards which the masters of the ages have set, only Watteau may be considered the equal of the great artists, with some ten others as more or less worthy seconds.

In portraiture *Antoine Pesne*, who spent his best years in Berlin, is still remembered as a man of forceful characterization and great beauty of color.

The best style of painting of this century was the social genre, and in this *Antoine Watteau* excelled. To him the world was a beautiful playground, and the passions of love a delicious pastime. His life was short — not more than thirty-seven years — and filled with labor and illness; but his work was so sunny and persuasive that it transports the beholder beyond the limits of worldly care. His best pictures are labeled *Fêtes Gallantes*. Ladies and gentlemen, sometimes dressed as shepherds, deport themselves decorously but joyously in glorious

parks, or gather at the shore to embark for the Isle of Cynthia where Venus reigns, the goddess of love. Every one of these pictures is a voluptuous delight to the eye. Reason tells one that they are not true, but the senses and one's love of beauty are beguiled as readily and as willingly as by a finely staged play. Watteau was not only a painter, or a poet painter, but, if one may be permitted to coin the term, an actor-poet-painter. He watched the scenic effect. Perhaps this was due to his training, having been apprenticed to a painter of decorations and having worked later as a "theatrical artist," designing sceneries for new plays. More probably, however, it was his nature.

He was an ardent student not only of actualities about him but also of older masters. His wonderfully rich and bewitching color must be the result of his familiarity with the works of the Venetians and of Rubens, whose pictures he more than once had the opportunity of studying carefully. Like Claude Lorrain before him, Watteau attained the level of perfection in the particular kind of art which he had decided to pursue. It is true that he also painted a few other pictures, largely under the influence of Teniers, but he will always be known as the creator and perfecter of the *Fêtes Gallantes*.

The next generation followed the example of Watteau, but the artists lacked his instinctive grace and refinement. Conditions also had changed. The era of dignified splendor under Louis XIV had given way to the sensuous, superficial, one is almost tempted to say hypocritical, age of Louis XV. Nothing was real; everything was but an empty show. To make this show as attractive as possible was the aim both of those who lived the life and of those who painted it. This again tended to develop the purely decorative qualities of painting. Judged by this standard the French pictures of the eighteenth century rank as the best of any age. Unfortunately the greatest of the later painters, *François Boucher*, was a man with no background to his considerable talents. The beauty of his pictures is "made up," their moral tone is often low, and their execution

rarely above reproach. Like *Pater*, *Lemoyne*, *Laurent*, and *Carle van Loo*, he took his subjects almost exclusively from the life at court.

The simple dignity of the bourgeoisie first appealed to *Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin* and to *Jean Baptiste Greuze*. The former was by all odds the greater artist, — simple, true, and forceful, — but he never achieved the reputation of Greuze, whose merely pretty faces of young girls have not failed to interest people for fully one hundred and fifty years. This is the more remarkable since, in the words of Professor Van Dyke, "as art they lack in force, and in workmanship they are too smooth, finical, and thin in handling."

Most of the French painters used oils; a few, however, painted with pastels. The pastel technique originated in the sixteenth century, with Dumontier as one of its best representatives in the seventeenth century, but was not perfected until the eighteenth century when *Jean Étienne Liotard* and *Maurice Quentin de La Tour* devoted their energies to it. The latter is best known by a large collection of portraits of famous contemporaries, eighty of which are in the museum of St. Quentin; the former, who was a universal genius, has gained a peculiar reputation in the United States by the fact that one of his pictures, "La Belle Chocolatière," has come to be the trade mark of the firm of Walter Baker & Co. Through the extensive advertisements of this firm the picture has become known to every American man, woman, and child, while the name of the artist, Liotard, is familiar to only very few of the scores of thousands of people who have derived pleasure from looking at his "cocoa girl."

The great result of the artistic activity in France in the eighteenth century was the break with the conventional art based on Italian models. The best artists studied nature or took their motives from their own national life. They generally confined themselves, it is true, to the glittering, unreal society of kings and courtiers, so that the fullness of life was not theirs. Nevertheless, they had taken a tremendous stride forward. They had demonstrated

that good art based on one's experience rather than on imitation was possible. All that was left for their successors to do was to shift the centers of interest and to place attention where it deservedly belongs. Technically, also, Watteau, Chardin, and Liotard had shown that advances are made by developing individual styles and not by copying old masters or by making selections from the various achievements of great men. But these eighteenth-century Frenchmen are interesting not only as the forerunners of the fine era that was to dawn with the fall of the royal dynasty but also as the perfecters of a certain style of painting. In decorative quality their works are still unexcelled.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The complete history of French painting in the nineteenth century will never be written; for so incredibly extensive is the work and so universal and comprehensive the genius of the men who from France dominated the art of the world, that no lifetime is long enough to understand these men and their ideas in detail. Movement followed upon movement with lightninglike rapidity, and hardly was the essence of one grasped before it was absorbed by another, or irresistibly swept away by a third. The men themselves changed. Starting with one idea and pursuing it sincerely, they soon detected another worthier one and followed that. In France, as everywhere, there were second-rate men during this period, but rarely was the list of first-rate men so full as it was in the nineteenth century. And the momentous thing is that every new idea found not one but many a genius eager to serve it. Art in France was advanced, to use a simile, not by a team of average perfection but by one of picked men.

If one desires to understand, or at least to begin to understand, the several movements of French art, one must first familiarize oneself with the conditions which made them possible.

The success of the French Revolution and the establishment of the galleries of the Louvre

as *Musée nationale des Arts* are the most important factors. The people, not kings, are sovereign. Art, like everything else, exists for them,—for all of them and not for a chosen few. In future the artists will have to appeal to the people; and since the people as a whole are naturally more diversified in tastes than was the comparatively small class of men and women whose position depended on the approval of a court, the variety of their tastes demanded a far more variegated art than had been exacted of the artists formerly. Or, to look at the reverse of this proposition, an artist of new individual ideas could now hope to find approval in some quarters at least, while heretofore the disapproval of the court would have meant failure for him. That the people at large were more readily swayed by the force of a new genius than the conservative aristocracy had been is also easily perceived, so that the rapidity with which this or that school gained prominence in the nineteenth century is not surprising.

These remarkably favorable conditions for the growth of individual art had not come to pass with one bold stroke; not even the establishment of a republic could have done that. For more than a century the way for them had been prepared by trifling events and almost unnoticeable evolutions of popular sentiment. As regards popular interest in art the establishment of public exhibitions had been of great importance. The first exhibition took place in 1673 and, beginning with 1737, others followed regularly in the *salon carré* in the Louvre. It is this salon which has given the now famous name to the annual exhibitions of the *Société des artistes français*, which to-day are held in the *Palais de l'Industrie*, while rival salons are conducted by the *Société nationale des beaux arts* in a gallery on the *champ de Mars*. The first large English exhibition took place in 1760, and the first German exhibition in 1786.

Moreover the growth of the public press, desirous of speaking with authority on all subjects, stimulated public interest, especially when the company of art critics appeared and began to make extensive use of its columns. Soon

art magazines were established, at first without illustrations, but later with reproductions of constantly increasing worth. In short, everything was done to familiarize the people with what occurred in the world of art.

Thus far all the causes which stimulated the growth of art are readily understood. The most important factor, however, is not so easily perceived. One may well ask what it was that turned the minds of the people so forcibly to painting rather than to sculpture or architecture. What was it that made more men of genius arise in France at this time than had ever before appeared in any one country at any one time? Was it Heaven, to speak with Vasari, who had taken compassion on humanity? These are questions which cannot be answered with precision, but which every one should endeavor to answer for himself, or which he may leave unanswered, content with realizing that some inexplicable forces were at work shaping art and pressing the various men into their service.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the classic revival held its sway. "Form is everything" was the watchword of the school which David led. But hardly had the men of this school formulated their creed and begun to practice it when Géricault and most especially Delacroix pointed out that sentiment and passion are more satisfactorily conveyed by color, light, and indistinctness than by clearly defined outlines. "Let each man express his passions and emotions; let him feel what he is doing," was the maxim of the so-called Romanticists. In their technique they strove to develop color, as the Classicists labored to master drawing. At first both schools had their ardent admirers, and later each had followers who endeavored to learn the best of both without going to their extremes. And then there were some independent workers, and others who laid less stress on how they painted than on what they painted. The Napoleonic era tempted them to paint military pictures, while the interest of great numbers of people who did not understand the fight between the

Classicists and the Romanticists induced them to paint genre pictures, or, in a lighter vein, to portray humorous anecdotes and manners. Others again, dissatisfied with existing political conditions, painted incidents which were meant to teach lessons in sociology.

While all this took place there appeared the champion of a new cause. "You paint men and beasts and trees," Courbet seemed to shout, — "subjects which are taken from nature, — but you are not true to nature either with your lines or with your colors. Truth to nature is the only right thing in art. Don't reason, don't dream. Just open your eyes, see, and then paint what you see." This was the maxim of the Realists.

Strangely enough, with one important modification, it was also the maxim of the great landscape painters of the Barbizon school; for although "Back to nature" was their motto, they held that there is more in nature than you can readily see. You must study her with an open mind and an open heart. Only thus will she reveal to you her mysteries. Practicing what they taught, they created what is called "the intimate landscape," — *le paysage intime*.

Then out of this movement quite naturally grew the one called Impressionism, which has always been singularly misunderstood. The time had come when people drew logical conclusions from the trend of art, which had been away from nature as people think of it and toward nature as she is. To the followers of this new movement, nature as she is means as she appears to the observant eye. Naturally the observant eye for them was their own eye, so that large play was given to individual idiosyncrasies. Often, indeed, nature was probably held responsible for defects of the artist's own vision. The excesses which were thus perpetrated brought ridicule on the movement. Its tenets, nevertheless, are fundamentally so true that they have revolutionized the entire art of painting. Abstract nature in pictures has disappeared, and everywhere allowances are made to the peculiarities of human vision. Most especially is this true of the use of color. The great

problem which the Impressionists set themselves was to represent outdoor light in all its brightness. To do this actually is impossible. No pigment is sufficiently luminous to reproduce sunlight. Devices, therefore, had to be introduced by which colors would seem to do what they actually could not do. No people have been so successful in accomplishing this as the French, and the master of them is Monet.

By the side of these Impressionists another school grew up, composed of the so-called New Idealists. These artists learned many points in technique from Monet and his followers, but differed fundamentally from him in their conceptions of what constitutes a worthy subject. To them the world of ideas was as real as that of physical vision. Borrowing their forms from the latter, they created another of great beauty, appealing everywhere to the nobler, the contemplative side of men. In the pursuit of this aim they did not always feel bound by strict adherence to truth; and since many of them leaned toward the decorative style of art, they often sacrificed actuality to pleasantness of outline.

Jacques Louis David was the first man of genius to break with the traditions of the eighteenth century. A distant relative of Boucher, he was at first closely wrapped up in the teachings of this great man, although his own teacher, Joseph Marie Vien, had already begun to set out on a path of his own. David won the *prix de Rome* when he was twenty-seven years old, and before setting out for Italy solemnly declared that the classic movement, which had begun with Winckelmann's publications in 1756, should not corrupt him. "The antique," he said, "lacks action; it does not move." He had, however, hardly reached Rome when this maligned antique drew him into its nets and made him its most zealous proselyte. No other lover of the classic ideals has had such influence on art as David. He swept everything before him — France, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands — and there is probably no country that has not felt the power of his personality. David could never have accomplished his successes if, in

addition to being an admirer of form, he had not been also a painstaking and loving student of nature. "His one great fault," says Professor Gensel, "was that he did not seek after beauty in the individual, but in the average." As a result his art was not "natural and free, but cold and pedantic." Cold it is, to be sure, but it is that coldness which suggests grandeur and nobility, and which compels the admiration of the spectator in spite of himself.

Four hundred and twenty artists of all nationalities are mentioned as pupils of David; few, however, have made names for themselves. The personality of the master was too powerful. As a result his school soon declined, and would have done so even sooner if *Jean Dominique Ingres* had not infused new life into it. Ingres was attracted not only by the antique but also by the later paintings of Raphael, which taught him grace. His color was always subservient to his drawing, while his modeling, especially of nude figures, revealed the unexcelled master of form. He was at his best in portraits and in pictures of single figures, but he was unsuccessful in large compositions.

The fact that Ingres sought inspiration in part from Raphael makes a bond between the classic movement under his leadership and the so-called Romanticists, for these men also turned to the masters of a more immediate past. The fundamental difference between the two schools lies in the contempt which the Romanticists showered on the antique, and the ardor with which they depended the superiority of color over form. *Théodore Géricault* was the first of this school, but he died too young to become its leader. This honor was reserved for *Eugène Delacroix*. The art development of this man is best summed up in the words which he himself entered in his diary shortly before his death, "To be a feast for the eyes is the first merit of a picture." Color and all its enticing charms were the stars which he followed, unmindful of the classic-academic disapproval. They called him "the painter with the intoxicated brush," or "the scourge of art," but he steadfastly followed his ideals. The

singular greatness of his artistic personality is clearly seen in his decorations of the library in the Bourbon Palace and in the Apollo Gallery in the Louvre. Unlike most contemporary painters of wall decorations, he knew how to adapt both his conceptions and his compositions to the spaces which he had to decorate.

The first Frenchman to visit the Orient and to bring home with him a haunting love of the gayety of southern light and warmth was *Alexandre Decamps*. Delacroix journeyed to Algiers directly afterward, and it soon became the custom for artists to visit these foreign countries. Naturally fond of colors, their sojourns in southern climes could not but increase their endeavors to produce voluptuous symphonies in color. Sometimes they succeeded, sometimes they failed. "Color cooks" they have been called, but it must be conceded that their dishes are often delicious.

In the matter of subjects the Romanticists delighted in anything that promised a rich and suggestive coloring. Their minds were thus readily turned to the history and legends of the Middle Ages. It is this choice of subjects which connects *Paul Delaroche* with the followers of Delacroix, although he was more interested in the subjects themselves than in their execution, and in this respect was more closely akin to the German Romanticists than to his French confrères.

The most famous of the pupils of Delaroche was *Thomas Couture*, who combined exquisite drawing with beautiful coloring, and who gained even greater influence by his remarkable gift as teacher than by his pictures. In his most successful pictures he struck a lighter vein, showing himself a man of humor in his scenes from the lives of Harlequin and Pierrot. Similarly ready to break away from tradition, *Georges Michel* may be said to have been one of the first to discover the beauty of French landscape. He painted Nature not as she looked in Italy but as she was at home. In his lifetime he was little known. Running away from school, eloping with a laundress ere he was sixteen, ostracized from the *salon* in 1814, and

poor all his life, still he worked on steadily until he died in 1843 at the age of eighty. Sometime during his long life he made a business of restoring pictures. In this profession he probably became acquainted with the great Dutch artists, whose influence shows in many of his compositions, notably those portraying scenes in Montmartre.

The exploits of Napoleon I on the battlefield suggested to many artists the desirability of painting military scenes. *Horace Vernet*, best known for this class of work, was one of the first to take it up, although he painted along other lines in his youth. Perhaps the most successful of all military painters, barring Meissonier, was *Alphonse de Neuville*, whose pictures are spirited and at the same time delicate in finish, giving evidence of the fine caliber of his artistic disposition.

Ernest Meissonier, the "darling of the gods" — if success in one's lifetime is an indication — and the great favorite of the people, followed a style of painting so utterly at variance with the artistic tenets of to-day that he has been displaced from his pedestal of fame, — unjustly, we may be sure, for popular verdicts are apt to go to extremes. Meissonier held that as all objects of nature were composed of well-arranged atoms, many of which are too small to be seen by the naked eye, so in a picture all details deserved to be finished with such care that the full complement of their beauties could be detected only under the magnifying glass. The effect of the whole, in consequence, is sacrificed to the charm of details, but if one takes time to study these, one discovers new beauties, both of coloring and drawing, and understands why his pictures have sold at the rate of over one thousand dollars per square inch.

At first Meissonier painted small genre pictures, but later he turned to military scenes, and by these made his reputation in the world at large. He painted only what he could actually see, and for his large compositions had everything prepared, down to the detail of an overturned cannon or the traces of horses' hoofs in the melting snow. The longer one

looks at his pictures the more points of scenic interest one finds, and the farther and farther one grows away from the mood into which the first view of them might, and certainly should, have placed one. Meissonier appeals to the orderly intellect. The whole mysterious province of human sensibilities he leaves untouched.

The same is true, although to a lesser degree, of some of the so-called Semi-Classicists, who really are the successors of the David school, although they have not refrained from learning lessons from various other movements. *Alexandre Cabanel* and *Paul Baudry* were essentially painters of the seductive beauty of women. *William Adolphe Bouguereau* won fame with the elegance and sensuality of his mythological, historical, and religious pictures. His technique was perfect, so that one may justly regret that he did not aspire to a higher and more lasting level of art.

The best known of all the Semi-Classicists was *Jean Léon Gérôme*, a versatile man, a scientific observer, and at heart a lover of details. The wealth of his subjects makes it difficult to classify him; he painted mythological, historical, and oriental scenes, and later did not despise even genre. Everywhere one finds the same perfection of technique and the same intellectual and orderly disposition of details, all of which are carefully executed. "A man of great learning in many departments," so Professor Van Dyke says of him, "he is no painter to be sneered at, and yet not a painter to make the pulse beat faster or to arouse the æsthetic emotions."

If it is difficult to classify Gérôme with any particular school, it is impossible to do this with a large number of artists who showed so much independence that they deserve to be mentioned as individuals.

Pierre Paul Prud'hon seems to have offered a place of refuge in his pictures to everything that David considered unmanly and unworthy of art. "He is the Boucher, the Watteau, of our time," David nevertheless said of him; "suffer him to be as he is; his influence on our school, as it is at present, will not be harmful." And

Professor Gensel quotes Prud'hon himself as saying, "I cannot and I will not see with the eyes of others; their spectacles do not fit me." He was fond of soft light, youthful bodies, and the charm of innocence.

As portrait painter *Mme. Élisabeth Vigée-Lebrun* has made a name for herself, being best known for the pictures of herself and daughter, in which the same ideals that guided Prud'hon can be recognized. Her best work dates from the eighteenth century, although she lived half her life in the nineteenth century and died in 1842, eighty-six years of age.

Born one year after *Mme. Lebrun* had died, *Henri Regnault* early promised a brilliant career. Unfortunately it was cut short by his untimely death in the Franco-Prussian War. Naturally his fellow-citizens consider his promise as almost the equivalent of actual achievement, and rank him as one of their best artists. In color he has been declared to be the equal of Delacroix, but in choice of subjects he stands alone. His fiery temper made him select scenes of horror, in which the most somber of his Spanish contemporaries might have delighted. It is impossible to judge what he would have accomplished if he had lived longer.

Jules Élie Delaunay made his mark as an ardent admirer of the early Italian Renaissance, and, although not a genius in the sense of David or Delacroix, infused into his pictures a spirit of artistic dignity which will preserve his name as that of a true artist when many of the Classicists and Romanticists will have been forgotten. He was also singularly successful in portraiture.

With *Gustave Courbet* there came a revolution into the world of art. He has been called a "painter-animal," and indeed the delicacies of human intercourse were unknown to him both in painting and in life. He was for French art what George Bernard Shaw has set out to be for the English stage, both men endeavoring to supplant idealism, as they interpret existing conditions, with realism. "The galleries should remain closed for twenty years,"¹ shouted

¹ Quoted from Muther, *A History of Modern Painting*, Vol. II, p. 510.

Courbet, "so that the moderns might at last begin to see with their own eyes. . . . As for Mr. Raphael there is no doubt that he painted some interesting portraits, but I cannot find any ideas in them. . . . I have studied the art of the old masters and of the more modern. I have tried to imitate the one as little as I have tried to copy the other, but out of the total knowledge of tradition I have wished to draw a firm and independent sense of my own individuality. . . . I am a sheer realist, which means a loyal adherent of the truth which is true. . . . Realism can only exist by the representation of things which the artist can see and handle. . . . The grand painting which we have stands in contradiction with our social conditions, and ecclesiastical painting in contradiction with the spirit of the century. It is nonsensical for painters of more or less talent to dish up themes in which they have no belief, — themes which could only have flowered in some epoch other than our own. Better paint railway stations with views of places through which one travels, with likenesses of great men through whose birth-place one passes, with engine houses, mines, and manufactories; for these are the saints and miracles of the nineteenth century."

Courbet was as uncompromising in his art as he was in his speech; he was a straightforward man, but had the finer qualities left out of his make-up. He despised the choice of pleasing subjects and was antagonistic to the sensuous charm of color, so that a certain somber brown characterizes his pictures. One cannot love either the man or his work, but one stands aghast with a sense almost of admiration before the boldness of this "painter-animal."

Other men followed the lead of Courbet without entirely losing their place by the side of a beauty-loving humanity. Among the best known are *Théodule Ribot*, who has been compared with the Spaniard, Ribera, and *Carolus Duran*, who began with powerful themes taken from the life of the common people, and who later achieved notable successes with his strong portraits of women. He was one of the teachers of the American, John Singer Sargent, by whom

he has been surpassed in brilliancy of color, while he has remained without an equal in the spontaneity and convincingness of his conceptions. Another excellent portrait painter is *Léon Bonnat*.

The teachings of Courbet, whose motto, one might say, was "Back to nature," were followed by a set of artists who assembled in the neighborhood of Barbizon and Fontainebleau. These artists, however, followed Courbet's teachings in their own peculiar way; for with his coarseness, for instance, they had nothing in common. *Jules Dupré*, the oldest of four famous landscapists, delighted in the play of the clouds in the heavens, so that his land is often but a necessary complement of the composition. Light is the charm of his pictures, and color a means of expressing its multifarious aspects in a clouded sky. "He constantly sought new color recipes, and put the pigments on the canvas so thick that his landscapes are easily recognized." *Narciso Virgilio Diaz de la Peña*, a Spaniard who died in France, had perhaps the least powerful personality of the Barbizon quartet, but he was an amiable painter of exquisite taste, both in design and in coloring.

The man of strength among these artists was *Théodore Rousseau*. He really was the first to appreciate that nature has a heart, that there is a life which only the contemplative mind perceives. He was a no less ardent student of nature than Courbet, but he went deeper and did not stop with external accidents. With him began the so-called intimate landscape.

The best qualified by nature, however, to understand her mysteries was *Jean Baptiste Camille Corot*. The points in which he differs from Rousseau are thus summed up by Professor Muther: "In Rousseau a tree is a proud, toughly knotted personality, a noble self-conscious creation; in Corot it is a soft tremulous being rocking in the fragrant air, in which it whispers and murmurs of love. Corot did not care to paint the oak, the favorite tree with artists who have a passion for form, nor the chestnut, nor the elm, but preferred to summon amid the delicate play of sunbeams the aspen,

the poplar, the alder, the birch with its white slender stem and its pale tremulous leaves, and the willow with its light foliage." The feeling of Corot toward nature is beautifully set forth in one of his letters¹ to Dupré. "One rises early, three o'clock in the morning, before the sun is up, and takes a place at the foot of a tree. One looks and waits. At first one does not see much. Nature resembles a white veil whence barely the profile of a few masses detach themselves. Bing! the sun brightens, he has not yet torn away the haze beyond which lie hidden the meadow, the valley, the hills of the horizon. . . . Bing! bing! the first ray of sunlight — a second ray. The little flowers awake with joy. On all there sparkles a drop of dew. The leaves stir in the morning breeze, and in the foliage invisible birds raise a song. . . . The gods of love on wings of butterflies descend on the meadows and stir the tall grass. Nothing is seen, but everything is there. The entire landscape is behind the transparent veil of mist. And then the mist rises — rises, and discloses the river streaked with silver, the pastures, trees, huts, and the fleeting background. At last one recognizes everything at which one before only guessed." And so Corot lives with his friend through one of his glorious out-of-door days, and closes thus: "Nature goes to sleep, while the fresh evening air sighs in the leaves of the trees, and dew studs with pearls the velvety lawns. Nymphs flutter away, hide themselves, and wish they were seen. Bing! a star in the sky; it sticks a little head on the surface of the pond. Charming star, whose twinkle is increased by the shivering waters, you are looking at me; you are winking your eye and smiling. Bing! a second star appears in the water. Welcome, welcome fresh and charming stars! Bing! bing! bing! three, six, twenty stars — all the stars of the heavens — have met at a rendezvous in this happy pond. Things grow darker. The pond alone shines; it is swarming with stars. The sun has set, but the inner sun of the soul, the sun of art, is rising. Good! good! My picture is done."

¹ Only extracts from the letter are here translated.

Little needs to be added. He who lives one day thus with Corot understands the art of this great, lovable man. Corot lived to be almost eighty years of age and spent the last forty years in close touch with nature. "Last night," he said on his deathbed, "I saw in a dream a landscape with a sky all rosy. It was charming, and still stands before me quite distinctly; it will be marvelous to paint." How many landscapes, we may exclaim with Professor Muther, may he not have thus dreamed and painted from the recollected vision!

Closely allied with these four landscape painters were several painters of animals. *Constant Troyon* is unequalled in the intimacy which he reveals between the grazing cattle and the pasture land. *Émile Van Marcke* and *Rosa Bonheur* have gained considerable reputation, especially in the United States.

Not animals but peasants in their natural country surroundings appealed to *Jean François Millet*. Years of deprivation made his art somber. He rarely saw the sunny side of life, and always seems to have remembered as a text God's awful curse to Adam: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. . . . In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." He entered, as intimately into the personalities of the hard-working peasants as Corot had entered into the mysteries of nature, and knew so well how to combine his farmers and laboring men with the stretches of landscape about Barbizon that he deserves a place by the side of Corot. Visions of beauty that came to the latter passed him by unnoticed. Often his subjects are ugly, but he always surrounded them with the charm which is born of sympathy and of intimate knowledge.

Less true, and consequently less forceful, are the peasant pictures of *Jules Breton*. He, too, is a fine painter, but he seems unable to penetrate below the surface. His peasants are of the kind which one popularly accepts as inhabiting the country. They are illustrations of conventional ideas, but they lack the spontaneous pathos of the work of Millet.

With *Édouard Manet* begins an entirely new movement of art, the tenets of which are summed up by Gensel as follows: "Things should be represented not as experience teaches us they are but as they appear to the eye of the painter. All colors in nature are bright; even the shadows are not black, for they are only of lower tints. Space illusions are produced by delicately graded tones, since the air which intervenes between the spectator and a certain object changes the intensity of a color. Things should be painted where they are; landscapes, therefore, should be painted out of doors exclusively. Life is picturesque."

When Manet exhibited his first canvases painted in accordance with this creed people stood aghast. Their eyes were offended by the unaccustomed brightness of tones, by the absence of deep shadows, and by the attention bestowed on the effects of light to the exclusion of many other qualities which they had heretofore admired.

The adherents of this style of painting have been reviled as no painters have ever been before. But with the fervor of martyrs they have persevered, and certainly have taught that air and light deserve to be painted just as much as men, beasts, and scenery. The mistake which many Impressionists have made is that they believed air and light were the only worthy subjects. In consequence they have been tempted to try experiments which have been inartistic and pedantic. The greatest of them, however, have achieved notable success with their new technique; and over all towers *Claude Monet*, who still astonishes all the world with his beautiful landscapes. The subject counts for little, since air and light ennoble everything. He delights in catching the various moods of the hours of the day, often rendering the same subjects as they appeared to him in the morning, at noon, and when the shadows began to lengthen. There is an atmosphere in his pictures which is entirely due to the combination of colors, and has nothing to do with the objects to which these colors happen to be attached. However light and fleeting the shadow may

be that darkens a certain spot, Monet catches it. His eye is quick, sensitive, and wonderfully accurate. His color is very gay, and to enjoy his work one must be familiar with it. A single Monet in a gallery of other masters is a distressing discord.

While Monet paints landscapes, *Edgar Degas*, by means of the new technique, puts nude women on canvas with uncompromising accuracy. He sees only their form; their soul life does not interest him, for he cannot see it with his physical eyes, and his soul seems to have been created blind. The same, unfortunately, should be said of many modern men.

Practically all subsequent artists have learned much from the technique of the Impressionists, however varied may be their interest in the spheres of life whence they draw their inspiration.

Jules Bastien-Lepage painted peasant pictures à la Millet, but with the new technique; *Léon L'hermitte* did much the same, while *Pascal Adolphe Dagnan-Bouveret*, beginning with genre scenes, is the only one of all the men who are more or less closely identified with Impressionism who developed into a great painter of religious subjects.

Giovanni Boldini, an Italian living in Paris, is one of the most charming portrait painters of high life, and *Jean François Raffaëli*, one of the most spirited portrayers of views of Paris and of cosmopolitan types.

All these men and many more have boldly applied what is best in Impressionism to their own art, and have taken good care not to offend the public taste with the excesses which the Impressionists themselves have often committed.

With few exceptions the trend of French art in the nineteenth century kept step with the rapidly developing accuracy of human vision. But people do not always wish to see; sometimes they want, or at least should want, to dream. In *Pierre Puvis de Chavannes* they have an artist whose work satisfies this need. In viewing his pictures one receives the same impressions of a divinely pure and blessed world which the sacred pictures of the great

Italians used to inspire. In the hurry of a busy life Chavannes causes one to stop awhile and dream and feel. He has achieved this with the noble simplicity of his conceptions, and technically with the long sweeping lines and light colors which soothe the eye. Most of his pictures are symbolic, but they are never frostily allegoric like the pictures of the later Classicists. They are readily understood and need no learned commentary.

Gustave Moreau worked not unlike *Puvis de Chavannes*, but he lacked his wholesomeness. *Chavannes* takes one to the Elysian Fields, *Moreau* to the mountain of *Venus*. *Jean Charles Cazin*, on the other hand, surrounded actual landscapes with melancholy charm, and not rarely introduced figures which were suggestive of sadness. *Eugène Carrière* and *Edmond Aman-Jean* drew a veil over actuality, thus offering plenty of food for speculative contemplation. *Adolph Monticelli* was a dreamy and tender successor of *Diaz* of the *Barbizon* days, while *Paul Albert Besnard* drew very one-sided but singularly impressive conclusions from the movement of the *Impressionists*. *Besnard* has

been called a *luminist*. Past master of the art of color, he has solved some of the most mysteriously beautiful problems of light, such as the interchange of the rays of the moon with those of a street lamp. His interiors are full of delightful effects of light, and his portraits of women suggestive of a fairy world.

To pass in review, even briefly, the achievements of the French painters in the nineteenth century means coming in contact with every branch of modern art. In every movement a Frenchman of genius was the leader. Perfection of technique seemed to be born with them. It is natural, therefore, that all nations should have come to them to learn. Unfortunately, however, many painters have left them impressed only with their technical versatility, so that people at large have not rarely considered French art to be an unscrupulous exercise of manual dexterity. If in recent years the French influence has been less distinctly felt, for instance, in America, this is due to the growth of American art, which is able to stand on her own feet, and not to any diminution of the worth of French painting.

CHAPTER VIII

BRITISH PAINTING

Standing somewhat outside the whirlpool of European political history, and by geographical position compelled to go her own way, Great Britain used to hold a unique place in the field of art. She relied almost exclusively on foreign talent down to the middle of the eighteenth century, but showered with magnificent honors those great artists who came to her. When finally, with the advent of Reynolds and Gainsborough, she rose to a place of independence, she followed no contemporary's lead, but proved herself an exclusive aristocrat in most things. France, with her versatility, was democratic; Germany, with her sentiment, was no less so; but England, with her poise, was preëminently the land where refinement reigned not as an accident but as a prerequisite of art. To walk through a gallery of early English pictures is like visiting with high nobility. Nobility is not always cold; it has its emotions just as other people have them, but it shows them less. One must know it well if one wants to understand it. He enjoys Reynolds and Gainsborough best who is able to grasp their essentially aristocratic preferences.

Another point of difference between Great Britain and the Continent was that she was hardly touched by the movement of the Classicists. Her art continued, without a break, the traditions of the artists of the seventeenth century, most especially those of men who, like van Dyck and Sir Peter Lely, had long lived in the country, and whose courtly grace was the starting point of the new national art.

British art has never seen a revolution which aimed to dethrone respected ideals for the sake of inaugurating an age of freedom. Whatever disturbances she has experienced were occasioned by those who preferred to make new ideals paramount. Coarseness has been

unknown to her. Her painters either have not known or have passed in silence the gamut of powerful passions which must be fought by those who make their way through life unsheltered by worthy traditions.

Many of her painters, moreover, have been thinkers, preachers, poets, believing in the dignity of their art as an elevating, instructive, and guiding force, and have naturally refrained from making of it a tool for the gratification of the senses.

British artists, of course, have also painted some pictures which do not agree with this characterization, but in so far as they have done so, they are not distinctly British.

The history of British painting is brief, covering only about one hundred and fifty years, but it can, nevertheless, be divided into several periods. The first is the age of Reynolds and Gainsborough and their immediate successors, lasting to about the second decade of the nineteenth century. The second is a period of stagnant conventionalism covering only about twenty years; this was rudely disturbed by Mr. Ruskin, and was quickly superseded by the third period, which was dominated by the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. This brotherhood also was of short duration, although its influence lasted through a generation, and in some degree is felt even to-day. The fourth period is less easily defined. One may perhaps call it one of individual preferences, since various ideals are followed by the several men. A fifth period will doubtless appear more clearly to future art historians as having had its origin in the latter years of the nineteenth century, and having emanated from the Scotch school. Here figure pieces are painted as everywhere in Great Britain, but landscapes are raised to unwonted predominance.

PORTRAIT PAINTERS

Reynolds and Gainsborough were not the first Britishers of importance, for they were preceded by *William Hogarth*. This man was a satirist whose pictures were often meant to flay existing evils, but they did it under the guise of humorous anecdotes. This satirical humor made Hogarth popular, so popular, indeed, that engravings of his paintings are known everywhere. Though greatly interested in his subjects, people have overlooked the technical beauties of his work and have been apt to rank him far below his real worth as a painter. The careful observer finds in his pictures bits of exquisite color and a remarkably delicate touch. His compositions are magnificently grouped, and not rarely enriched with a very fine play of light and shade. He also painted portraits, showing a fine artistic gift in this line of work, although he did not approach the marvelous successes of Reynolds or Gainsborough.

Sir Joshua Reynolds is generally regarded as the greatest English painter. His drawing is exquisite, his coloring very rich and warm, alluring, and suggestive of a happy, luxurious state of well-being. Before his pictures one almost breathes the scented atmosphere of high society. It is, however, a worthy society; for his people are Englishmen of the type who have done most for the advancement of humanity. He painted good likenesses, and yet for us there is such a strong generic resemblance in all his works that it is easier to recognize in them the conceptions of Reynolds than the individuality of his sitters.

He was elected president of the Academy when still a young man, forty-five years of age, and remained to the end of his life the leader and backbone of the official school of painting. He was also an author, and knew how to enforce his artistic convictions with vigorous speech.

Unlike Reynolds, *Thomas Gainsborough* preserved through life a position of independence. The stamp of officialism was never placed on his work; and not rarely did he paint with the

avowed purpose of contravening a dictum of the Royal Academy. His famous "Blue Boy" owes its origin to his desire of showing that blue could be made the leading color of a composition. In the execution of this picture, however, blue is in reality a very subordinate color, since the texture of the cloth, which the spectator understands to be blue, shimmers in a variety of hues under the peculiar light which is shed about the figure.

Quoting often a famous expression of Kneller to the effect that pictures are not made to be smelled at, Gainsborough introduced a feathery, volatile application of color which gives to his compositions both distinction and suggestiveness. It also disguises a somewhat uncertain touch of drawing, — uncertain, however, only in the sense in which the outlines of a cloud are uncertain because human eyes are rarely quick enough to catch them distinctly.

He painted landscapes comparatively rarely, but here also he showed himself a master. Lest this additional accomplishment of his be construed into a claim of superiority over Reynolds, it must be remembered that this latter artist was his undoubted superior as a portrait-trayer of children.

"Did these two masters equal the greatest portrait painters of earlier centuries?" Professor Gensel asks this question and significantly replies that it may well remain an open one. "The fact is," he adds, "that we experience before their pictures that pleasure which leaves no room for further desires. Reynolds' 'Nelly O'Brien,' with her bewitching smile and her mystery due to the shadow which is thrown by her hat, impresses us as do the most beautiful women by Rembrandt; and over Gainsborough's 'Perdita' and 'Mrs. Siddons' there hovers such indescribable grace and grandeur that we desire to do them homage as though they were alive."

No one of the other painters of the first period was quite the equal of Reynolds and Gainsborough, although several approached them in the perfection of one point or another. *George Romney* was a master of youthful grace

and mature womanhood. *Thomas Lawrence*, who made a name for himself when a mere boy, was often superficial, but at his best revealed a thoroughly refined taste and great technical perfection; while the Scotchman, *Henry Raeburn*, was distinguished by his very successful light and shade.

LANDSCAPE PAINTERS

Richard Wilson, a contemporary of Gainsborough, is the first English landscape painter of consequence. Like Claude Lorrain and Poussin, he was enthralled by heroic idealism; and unlike Gainsborough, he saw even his native land through the borrowed spectacles of foreign grandeur. Gainsborough used no spectacles, but he, too, was less true than imaginative, and drew more frequently on his recollections than on nature herself.

The first man to put himself in intimate touch with nature was *John Crome*,—called Old Crome to distinguish him from his son, John Bernay Crome. Old Crome founded the so-called Norwich school. Admiring the Dutch landscapists, he endeavored to equal their close relationship with nature, and he succeeded. His pictures possess what the Germans call *Stimmung*; they put the spectator in a very definite mood. His subjects are often commonplace and uninteresting, but his love of nature has enabled him to reproduce faithfully her charm or her sadness, whatever his motif happened to be. His coloring was usually of a soft, rich brownish tone.

It is this brown that distinguishes him most convincingly, even for the novice, from his still greater contemporary, *John Constable*, who was the first to appreciate that green and not brown is the predominant tone of nature. He also dared to paint what the most frequently prevailing weather of England made him see constantly,—gloomy days with water-charged clouds. Many critics have not liked these pictures, since they lack the grandeur of a storm or the idyllic loveliness of sunny climes. "Bring me my umbrella," a contemporary of Constable

is quoted as saying; "I want to look at Constable's landscapes." But whether we like it or not, it is true; and to this extent the artist deserves our admiration. He certainly practiced and taught that nothing is so important for a landscape painter as the immediate study of nature. Possibly he is open to the charge that he was unmindful of another important principle, namely that an artist should make selections, and not paint everything he sees.

Together with his follower, *David Cox*, of Birmingham, Constable exerted a powerful influence not only on the landscape painters of Great Britain but also on those of the Continent. It is often said that even the Frenchmen received from him their first introduction to the intimate landscape,—*le paysage intime*.

Outside any particular sphere of influence, *Joseph Mallord William Turner*, a unique personality, climbed the ladder of fame. Generally we admire and understand an artist better when we know something of his life and his aspirations. Even his faults are apt to set off in strong relief some virtues which seem to be the guiding stars of his career. Not so with Turner; the deeper we delve into the recesses of his life the more disgusted we grow. A mean, dirty (physically so), deceitful, selfish, grasping miser, an ungenerous acquaintance, a lying friend; he had only one idea, and that was to be one day the painter of England whom every one should admire. It is a marvel where he hid during his long life the great soul that speaks in his works. Where did he dream those wonderful dreams that even to-day appeal to young and old with singular force? Pick his pictures to pieces, enlarge on their unreality, ridicule their grotesqueness; yet before the smile has left your lips you, too, have been drawn into the magic circle of Turner's beautiful unrealities. Or are they perhaps not unrealities? Is the world of sight at fault? Do our senses lie to us, and has Turner given mortal shapes to immortal, invisible realities?

His paintings have been divided into several classes. Under the influence of earlier painters he at first painted marines, and was somewhat

hard in drawing and monotonous in color. Afterwards he composed heroic landscapes, gradually making allowances for the effect of air, and using more natural tones; and then he suddenly burst forth with his symphonies of light, his color pyrotechnics, when he dared to emblaze his canvas with gold and scarlet, two colors never seen before in any British picture. His final step was in the direction of the Impressionists, dissolving the outlines of everything and retaining only a certain tone of color or of light. In these last pictures he often attained to a mysteriously magic force in which abstract ideas, such as rapidity, gained the upper hand over their concrete manifestations, as, for instance, in his picture of a railroad train rushing through a driving rain storm.

PAINTERS OF GENRE AND OF ANIMALS

In a lighter vein *David Wilkie*, during the lifetime of Turner, introduced his compatriots to peaceful genre pictures, so that in this line also Great Britain took the first step, although the continentals were quick to follow her lead. Wilkie was a man of amiable temper, — a pleasant reciter with whose work one may well while away a pleasant hour. Subjects interested him far more than technique, so that he is readily surpassed in this latter respect by *George Morland*. Morland possessed the recklessness of the great artist, but unfortunately permitted it to rule also his private life. His debauchery brought his life to an untimely end. If he had possessed moral strength and had lived, he might have become one of the foremost artists of England; for he held complete mastery over color and had a well-developed sense of light and shade. He was, moreover, a good animal painter, and at times equaled the successes of Landseer.

Sir Edwin Landseer is the most famous animal painter of Great Britain. He not only loved the dumb beasts but also humanized them. This pleased and still pleases the large masses of the people, but it often offends the more serious student of nature. Distinctly

human emotions are portrayed in dogs or other animals, and are therefore debased or sentimentalized. Nevertheless Landseer mastered the intricate forms of the animal kingdom more completely than any one else in Great Britain. Lovers of household pets will, therefore, continue to rank him with the great painters. Those, however, who expect more of art than a passing pleasure, and who have experienced sensations akin to those which the greatest of mortals have endeavored to express in art, will be less charitable. At best they will concede Landseer a place with the masters of technique.

THE PRE-RAPHAELITE BROTHERHOOD

It is an interesting fact that Landseer stood in his zenith when British art had reached its lowest level, — in the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. It was then that John Ruskin took up his cudgels and began to hammer away on existing conditions, when he declared that Turner alone towered above the decay, and that all official art ideals were false, insincere, and corrupt. The men at the head of the Royal Academy were pygmies compared with Reynolds and his more immediate followers. *Sir Charles Eastlake* alone was an exception, but not so much with his paintings, of which there were few, as with his lectures and helpful personality. In view of these facts it will be seen that any radical change was bound to prove a national success. The present, the reformer said, was bad; it was necessary to go back. Back to what? The answer to this was given by the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.

The artists who formed this brotherhood believed that honesty of workmanship and truth were to be found only in works antedating Raphael. They surrounded the early Renaissance with a halo, partly well deserved and partly founded on their own vivid imagination. They believed in careful and loving workmanship, and declared war on all tendencies to slur over details. Few of them lived up to this ideal very long; for "you cannot paint thus and make a living" was an observation that forced itself upon them only too soon.

A passionate yearning to return to any period of the past always carries with it a strong imagination; for no period in the history of the world has been so truly beautiful that it is a worthy refuge from the present. It becomes so only if we are forgetful of its defects and deck it with the mystic garlands of our own fancies. The Pre-Raphaelites, consequently, were more or less like the Romanticists. They were of a fantastic turn of mind, and in this respect simply followed *William Blake*, the most fanciful of all the British painters, who, however, is better known for his engravings than for his pictures.

The first artist to espouse the new cause, although he was not a formal member of the brotherhood, was *Ford Madox Brown*. This man broke irrevocably with the immediate past, and strove after "truth of color, of spiritual expression, and of historical character." He was always forceful, but not always beautiful, — especially in the ensemble of his colors, because he discarded "the brown sauce which every one had hitherto respected like a binding social law," without being able to replace it with something entirely satisfactory. In contemplating his dramatic energy and sincerity of conception, however, one forgets the acerbity of his color schemes.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti,¹ *John Everett Millais*, and *William Holman Hunt* were the founders of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Looking back to-day to the time when these three men declared war on existing conditions, one wonders what it was that drew together three men of such widely differing tastes. Rossetti was a dreaming, sensuous mystic, Hunt a mere child in the simplicity of his religious faith, and Millais the most one-sided lover of the world of visible and tangible phenomena.

Millais was the first to part company with the Pre-Raphaelites. At first one of the most eager to sink himself in the much-loved perfection of detail, his sober nature soon told him that this was not the road to success, and since he coveted success he left that road, but

carried with him a technique of great perfection. Eventually he became one of the most popular British artists, selecting his subjects with an eye to the taste of the masses, — sentimental or patriotic, — but rendering them with an accurate knowledge of the requirements of a first-class artist. He was versatile, and has left not only well-composed and finely painted figure pieces but also good landscapes.

Hunt began with romantic pictures, but soon chose religious subjects and has continued to do so. His religious fervor reminds one of the German, Overbeck; in his beautiful simplicity of faith, however, he is unique. His technique is good, but his color is rarely without blemish, as is natural with a man who is filled with the divine meaning of his subjects.

The most characteristic of the Pre-Raphaelites was Rossetti, who introduced into art an almost uncanny mixture of mysticism and sensuality. "His women of fairylike beauty charge the air with suffocating sultriness." One hardly dares to breathe; one stops thinking and feels the very depths of one's emotional nature expand in response to the magic wand of Rossetti the Dreamer. A dreamer he surely was, but one of that dangerous class whose dreams are realities, and whose actions are those of waking men. Intellectual people who need a supernatural stimulant to rouse their finer sensibilities will find the influence of Rossetti wholesome. His influence, however, is poison for delicate constitutions who find it difficult to put aside the inactivity of a sense-gratifying ease.

From the merely artistic side his strongest point was his fine decorative sense and his beautiful color schemes. His drawing was rarely masterful, although it was not so arbitrary as that of his famous follower, *Sir Edward Burne-Jones*. This man of an almost sanctified disposition was studying theology when he first met Rossetti. He abandoned theology and, encouraged by his new friend, took up painting. At first ridiculed by the public, he saw himself suddenly raised to fame, and always held the

¹ His real name was Gabriel Charles Dante Rossetti.

place of honor in the newly founded Grosvenor Gallery.

He did not belong to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and was little concerned with truth of details. He had the gift of filling given spaces with decorative grace, but in so doing often did violence to natural semblance. He took similar liberties with color, — aiming solely at artistic effects, — and with the character of his figures, painting, as some one has said, “his men as women and his women sexless.” He will, nevertheless, continue to be a favorite with all who are satisfied with a feast for the eyes, or who, knowing the man, are able to reconstruct from his pictures his inspiring and noble personality.

Even more distinctly decorative than Burne-Jones, *Walter Crane* has succeeded in combining the ideals of the Pre-Raphaelites with classically beautiful forms. He too, like all decorative painters, constantly takes liberties with perspective and other requirements of drawing, but there is in his work “a measured nobility of form” as compared with the “paucity of flesh and plenitude of feeling” of Burne-Jones. Crane is better known for his text illustrations than for his paintings.

With *George Frederick Watts* the Pre-Raphaelite tendencies cease to be a powerful and immediate influence. One feels in his works the same intensity of emotional feeling, although it is there not for its own sake but to serve an end. Watts was a firm believer in the nobility of art and in the fine lessons which she might teach. He was a deeply religious man, but not of the type of Holman Hunt; for he cared naught for dogma or sacred stories. His vision went beyond all such accidents, as he might have said, to essential truths.

In his composition he was remarkably simple; one or two figures generally sufficed him, but these he painted with care and wonderful skill. He was a student of the antique, and one often finds in his draperies echoes from the Parthenon pediments, which, thanks to Lord Elgin, he could conveniently study in the British Museum.

Watts also painted landscapes, but most especially portraits. The latter are exquisite character studies, although they are at times hard and not always soothing to the eye. He no longer wasted his time on details, but concentrated his attention on essentials. To this extent he was opposed to the Pre-Raphaelite tendencies. He also cared less for the slender models of the early Renaissance than for the fuller forms of the later Italians. Their luxurious color, however, he avoided, stating that it was not so much his intention to please the eye as to arouse noble thoughts. These he hoped would speak to the heart and the imagination, and kindle in the breasts of the people whatever was best and noble in them.

By the side of Watts the more recent academicians, with their cool and measured perfection of technique and their great scholarship, are singularly unimpressive. These men endeavor to reconstruct whole periods of the history of culture and, although they never fail to arouse admiration for their command of details, they are rarely convincing. Those, for instance, who know classic antiquities will recognize in the clever pictures of *Frederick Lord Leighton* or of *Laurens Alma-Tadema* the forms and the setting of the antique, but they will miss its spirit. These pictures are pleasant to look at, but, as Professor Gensel says, they “belong neither in museums nor in houses, but solely in the palatial mansions of the landed aristocracy.”

To this class of artists belong also *Edward Poynter* and possibly *Albert Moore*, the latter painting graceful women who exist only for the sake of their own loveliness. *Briton Rivière* was more distinctly a painter of genre; his compositions were magnificent, skillfully combining classic culture and nude bodies with very remarkable studies from the animal world.

George Heming Mason held a unique position, surrounding his landscapes and peasants with sweet dreaminess and poetic glamour. His was a sad life; brought up in affluence, and forsaking the medical profession for painting when he was twenty-seven years of age, he

suddenly found himself penniless, owing to his father's unexpected bankruptcy. He was never a well man and had to struggle hard to make a living. All this shows in his work, which, however beautiful, lacks the vigor of health.

The best known portraitists of the latter years of the nineteenth century were, next to Millais and Watts, *Hubert von Herkomer* and *Walter William Oules*. The former, a German by birth, enjoys the greatest reputation. Since his "Lady in White" first stirred the art world in 1886, his name has been known everywhere. It has, however, been pointed out that much of his success was due to the loveliness of his model rather than to his own perfection as an artist. It is said that before this time Whistler and Bastien-Lepage had handled a similar subject — white against white — with greater success. The best that Professor Muther has to say of Herkomer is that he is a man of "a tame but tastefully cultivated temperament."

In Scotland painting has recently followed its own course. The older movement centered in Edinburgh and was led by men like *William Quiller Orchardson*, *John Phillip*, and *John Pettie*. Their love of color and their honest impetuosity called for attention. Better known, however, is a more recent movement which started in the neighborhood of Glasgow with *Robert Macgregor*, and aspires at freedom from tradition. Macgregor and his friends profess adherence to no school and believe in salvation by the perfection of each one's own individuality. This perfection, they hold, is the result of sincere and serious labor. Consequently a fresh and wholesome atmosphere pervades their work, which, unfortunately, is as yet little known in America. Those who have watched this new Scotch school¹ prophesy for it a glorious future.

¹ The men themselves decry the term "school," which smacks of rules and regulations, and declare themselves free.

No survey of British painting would be at all satisfactory without mention of the important part played by the painters in water colors. As early as 1805 these men founded a society, and at all times have done much to educate the public and their fellow-artists to a proper appreciation of the niceties of detailed work and the brightness of colors. They have undoubtedly exerted a powerful influence on the later landscape painters, and it is very probable that they were the first to call attention to the rather monotonous and unsatisfactory brownish tones which had been in use for several generations. Ruskin himself did some extremely good work in water colors, and it is a noteworthy fact that all the best work in this line has been done by his contemporaries.

The most famous artists of Great Britain flourished at a time when art was at its lowest level everywhere else. Reynolds and Gainsborough have no peers among their successors. The gradual diminution of the worth of British painting was arrested only once, as a dark afternoon may be brightened by an uncanny sunbeam from behind the clouds, by the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Ruskin and all his teachings, in spite of the inspiration which they have brought and are still bringing to multitudes of people, are not so consistently founded on truth and knowledge of natural conditions that they can build up a national art. They can discover defects and shatter false standards, but they are unable to arouse wholesome and energetic individuality.

While there is much that is pleasing in British academic circles, the germ of promise doubtless rests with the Scotchmen. Strangely enough theirs is a democratic art, so that the time may soon come when Great Britain will lose her proud position as the only aristocrat among the artistic nations of the world.

CHAPTER IX

AMERICAN PAINTING

American painting to-day is the worthy second of the best art in the world, and in some branches, perhaps, ranks first. It is sincere and wholesome, technically sound, and inspired by lofty ideals. It also shows much common sense and reveals the vigorous stock from which the artists are recruited. Nowhere does it fall subject to the overdilicate taste of those last scions of highly cultivated races, who are known, less charitably than correctly, as degenerates. It is a pleasing art, often brilliant, and generally well to live with. Of course there are exceptions, but, on the whole, visitors to American exhibitions are well satisfied; they have come in contact with the works of noted men.

Leaving the American section at any of the recent large fairs, a man might easily have asked himself how it is possible that people who have been a nation hardly six score years can produce an art so singularly free from such defects as are due to prejudice, idiosyncrasies, or ignorance. The answer to such queries is supplied by the historian, who points to the beneficial mingling of the races in this large territory, and to the opportunities which the country has offered for the exercise of well-developed faculties. All foreigners who have entered into the spirit of the land testify to the clarifying effect which the free intercourse with men of other extraction has had upon their mental make-up. It is as if minds heretofore fettered by what may be peculiar English, French, German, Slavish, or Italian prejudices were permitted to unfold themselves without restrictions, the bias of the one race acting as an infallible antidote to those of the others. If American painting is to continue its phenomenal development, care must be taken that no distinctly American prejudice is permitted

to rivet new fetters for the scarcely yet liberated mind. People who judge the nation by European standards and push her from her proper sphere of quiet growth into the whirlpool of foreign competition should be considered her worst enemies. People who cry for a national art, meaning an art shaped by distinctly American notions, just as the art of France or Germany is shaped by notions peculiar to the country, will, if they succeed, have done their best to destroy the greatest charm of what is now called American art. People who teach patriotism, as the word is frequently understood, worshiping some national hero because he was an American and not because of some noble traits of character, instill into the coming generation erroneous standards.

The American people throughout their short period of existence seem to have possessed the faculty of assimilating the best products of foreign endeavors. English, German, and French influences in succession have shaped their art standards, no one being able to continue its hold when its prime had passed. The first artists naturally turned to England, being born British subjects, for the War of the Revolution did not take place until this earliest generation of painters had attained to maturity, and even a few of them had died.

John Smibert and *Jonathan B. Blackburn* were respectable portrait painters, settling, unlike their more obscure predecessors, who were traveling artists, in one place for a considerable number of years. Both men selected Boston. Smibert came to America in 1728, while Blackburn probably was born here. Their best pictures are the equal of contemporary British portraits painted just before the sudden rise of British art in the middle of the eighteenth century, and certainly set a standard

of excellence in the new country, not so much by what they actually revealed as by what they aimed at. They were, moreover, not unlike the early works of Copley.

With *John Singleton Copley* the worthy history of American painting begins. He was a born artist whose individual points of excellence far outshone those defects of his art which were due to circumstances and lack of early training. But this does not mean that he began to paint late in life, for at seventeen he had already achieved a certain reputation, but that the technical side of art is so complex that no one lifetime suffices to solve its many problems. A man needs the opportunity of taking over as a whole, so to speak, the achievements of his predecessors. The earlier in life this opportunity offers itself, the easier it is to grasp. Copley went abroad for the first time when he was about forty years of age, and it was then that he first saw masterpieces in sufficient quantities. His work, therefore, falls into two classes, — the portraits of his youth in America and those of his maturity in England. The latter very properly belong to British art, for Copley was born a British subject and left America before her political independence was recognized.

His American portraits are wonderful products of a faithful rendering of nature. The artistic intentions which in grouping, posing, color, and brushwork made the canvases of Reynolds, Gainsborough, and even Copley himself, in his later years, such charming bits of independent realities had little place in his early works. These were national and historical records. In his men and women that whole period lives again. One admires the sure eye and the clever hand of the portraitist, but derives very little æsthetic pleasure from the pictures themselves.

Copley set the tide going toward Great Britain. For more than a generation American artists turned to the mother country for instruction in their chosen calling. It is, however, a noteworthy fact that most of them were men of experience before they went abroad. They knew what they lacked and knew exactly what

they wanted to acquire. In this respect they differed from the later artists who went to Europe when young to receive there their first training. Under these conditions it is natural that the foreign instruction should have variously affected the earlier and the later men, the former never losing their own established individuality.

In early years portraits were the only pictures for which there was any demand in America, so that it was fortunate for the country that her artists turned to Great Britain, where this branch of art was especially flourishing. One of them, *Benjamin West*, was well established in London, thanks to royal favor, where he served as a guide and warm friend to multitudes of men who, unlike himself, returned to America to practice their art. All held West in grateful memory; and although his paintings do not entitle him to a lasting place of honor, the services he rendered the art of his country in this indirect way are such that he may be called in more ways than one the Father of American Art. The only clear effect exerted by West on the development of painting was by his picture "The Death of General Wolfe," where he dared to represent his figures not in classic costumes but in the clothes which they actually wore. Most of his work is historical, but instead of being dramatic it is theatrical, and since its color is monotonous there is little pleasure to be derived from it.

Gifted with the charm of innate nobility of character and possessed of a great warm heart, West was, personally, one of the most accomplished and amiable men of his day. *Gilbert Charles Stuart* was the very opposite of West; as an artist he was his superior, and as a companion he was as unpleasant as West was delightful. He too, nevertheless, had a powerful attraction for people, many of whom he attached to himself, although he frequently offended even his friends by his choleric fits of temper. He differed from earlier portrait painters in his endeavor to represent character, not being satisfied with a faithful rendering of visible forms. He had little use for large

pictures¹ and painted heads almost exclusively, which for a whim of his own he generally placed in the middle of the picture. His technique, which was distinctly his own, is described by Mr. Isham² thus: "He paints with an unequaled purity and freshness of color, very delicate and sure in the half tones, varying it to suit the individual, but with a pearly brightness which is characteristic. The paint is put on thinly, as a rule, in short decided touches."

Stuart was survived fifteen years by *John Trumbull*, although these two men were born only one year apart. With the death of Trumbull in 1843 the middle of the nineteenth century was almost reached. Most of the artists of the second period of American art were then grown to young manhood, and several men who are still progressively active to-day, such as La Farge, Vedder, and Enneking, were born. Trumbull was a pupil of West, a fact which almost links the present generation to the Father of American Painting, and reveals the short space of time covered by American art.

Trumbull on his return home selected New York as his place of residence, an event which closed forever any possibility of Boston or Philadelphia becoming the art center of America. So much has been said about Trumbull's unkindness to younger men who did not bow to him, and the many stumbling-blocks which he placed in the way of their development, that one is apt to forget his remarkable services to the cause not only of art but also of artists. He won the respect of influential citizens and interested the moneyed classes in art; in short, he established a society of sympathetic connoisseurs, — men of means and social position, who were eager to encourage native talent. It may be argued that even without the efforts of Colonel Trumbull, — he had been an officer in

the army, — there would have been men to play the rôle of Mæcenas to American artists; but this may well be doubted, for an honest interest in art matters was not one of the accomplishments of that generation.

As president of the American Academy of Arts³ Trumbull exerted another influence as a conservative power. The restrictions of all academic standards have been so often justly exposed that one readily forgets the value of such institutions. They act like regulators, preventing the pace which some individuals would set from becoming so fast that the entire mechanism of wholesome development is thrown out of gear.

As an artist Trumbull ranked high, although his later work disappointed the expectations raised by his earlier pictures. He was a good portrait painter, but lacked the individuality of Stuart. He is best known for his historical pictures. One of his last commissions, in fact, was an order from Congress to paint four such pictures for the Capitol in Washington. Unfortunately he was then an old man, without sufficient energy or inspiration to acquit himself well of this task. Since these pictures, however, became more widely known than any others, his reputation has unduly suffered on their account, until to-day many fail to appreciate his true worth.

Among the other early figure painters Allston, Sully, and Malbone stand out clearly from the rest.

Washington Allston, once hailed as a genius, is now all but forgotten. He was a most fascinating man, whose reputation rested more on what people expected of him than on what he actually accomplished. From Coleridge to Washington Irving, not to speak of his artist friends, all worshiped him. Allston delighted in portraying emotions, and, like most painters of similar tendencies, was unable to find the golden mean. The sympathetic spectator, nevertheless, who needs but a suggestion to reveal

¹ Stuart generally painted on wood panels, and seems to have used canvas only on rare occasions.

² Samuel Isham, *History of American Painting*, 1905. Mr. Isham has been the first to write comprehensively on this subject. His treatment is so fair and sympathetic, and yet dictated by such strict adherence to sound principles of art, that his book in the very year of its appearance became a classic.

³ Founded in 1802 under a slightly different title, and incorporated in 1808. Trumbull was its first vice president and was elected its president in 1818.

to him the thoughts of the artist will like the work of Allston. There is a dignity, however crudely expressed, in his "Prophet Jeremiah," for instance, as he sits intently listening to the heavenly inspiration, and such a fine contrast between him and the listening scribe at his feet that the man who once has grasped Allston's meaning painfully feels the inanity of Sargent's magnificently painted prophets on the frieze in the Boston Library.

Thomas Sully, who lived until within twenty-five years of the twentieth century, was a graceful painter, often sentimental, especially in his portraits of women, but sometimes wonderfully pleasing. He showed in several pictures, notably the portrait of Dr. Samuel Coates, a feeling for space, such as appears in none of the works of his earlier contemporaries. His color, too, singles him out from the rest, for it has an enchanting warmth all its own.

Edward Malbone died young, when he was barely twenty years of age, so that it is hardly fair to judge his work by the mature achievements of the other men. However, in one branch of art — miniatures — he made a lasting name for himself in spite of his youth. "They are excellent," says Isham, "and would hold a respectable place anywhere."

SECOND PERIOD

None of the earlier men had shown any marked interest in landscape painting. This was reserved for the next generation, and coincided with the growth of a new society in America. After the War of 1812, when the recently won independence seemed firmly established and the ties with the mother country were broken forever, the old aristocracy had ceased to exist, and with it went the men whose noble countenances had dignified the portraits of the earliest painters. "The graces of life" had given way to the virtues, not that the latter had not been included in the former, but that these surely were no longer expected to be combined with the accomplishments of the national leaders. "Good and beautiful" was the Greek designation of a gentleman, and it was applicable to

the American men of note during the Revolutionary era. If "beautiful" refers not only to the outward appearance but also to the general deportment and the way in which the sterling qualities of character are displayed, then this word should perhaps be dropped from the epithet applied to the American man during the decades following the War of 1812. Simultaneously there also disappeared the style of portrait and figure painting which was characteristic of the first period of American art.

Chester Harding alone continued the early traditions, so that he may almost be reckoned in the same class with Copley, Trumbull, and Sully. His style, however, was as rugged as his characteristically American temperament, for which reason he is generally classed with the men of the second and more distinctly national period.

With *William Morris Hunt* the break with the past is complete. Allston is the only one of his precursors to whom he bears the slightest resemblance, and, like him, he was of a thoroughly poetic disposition. Hunt no longer sought instruction from Great Britain, but from France, where he was a pupil of Couture and of Millet. His chief importance lies not in his pictures, albeit many of them are inspiring, but in his ability as a teacher. "He certainly was," in the words of Professor Van Dyke, "the first painter in America who taught catholicity of taste, truth, and sincerity in art, and art in the artist rather than in the subject." The last is the noteworthy thing. It means that technique is very well, in fact absolutely necessary, but that it will create a masterpiece only if the man who wields it has the requisite largeness of character.

George Fuller was even more of a poet than Hunt; he was a man of skill too, but one-sided and apt to disregard the requirements of technique. The subjects and forms of his pictures were generally lacking in worth, but his canvases express "by means of color and atmosphere" singularly poetic emotions. Fuller's life was not successful. Before he was forty years of age family considerations induced him to

leave his artist friends and to settle on a farm in Deerfield. He continued painting until his death, although he practically disappeared from all exhibitions for more than fifteen years. In his younger days he painted portraits in the old accustomed style.

Of far greater importance than the figure painters of this period were the painters of landscape. They were men with the enthusiasm of discoverers. Settling in the mountains which overlook the majestic Hudson, they conceived a burning love for the scenery of their native land. Diversified as were their tastes, they are generally grouped together as forming the Hudson River or White Mountain school.

Thomas Cole was the earliest of these artists. Strangely enough he was of foreign birth, but he quickly became a better American than many men born in the country. He certainly was the first to discover the beauty of the Hudson, and by his views of it he will live long after his other works, such as the series of pictures called the "Voyage of Life" and the "Course of Empire," by which he sought to teach moral lessons, have been forgotten.

John F. Kensett was one of the greatest of these Hudson River artists. It is noteworthy that he endeavored to render nature accurately, with no thought of an artistic rearrangement, which is the more remarkable because he rarely painted from nature but generally from accurate sketches. He had a facile hand and an open eye for the various moods of the seasons and the hours of the day. It is this versatility that raises him above *Asher Brown Durand*, his immediate predecessor, who often attained to greater truth than he, because he painted what he actually saw out of doors and did not trust to his memory or to sketches in the execution of his pictures.

R. Sandford Gifford was moved by different considerations, for he held that the artistic appearance of his canvases was of fully as much importance as their truth to nature; or, as Mr. Isham puts it, "He is the first to base the whole interest of a picture on purely artistic problems, such as the exact value of sunlit sails against an evening sky."

Frederick Edwin Church exemplified an entirely different doctrine, which in its very foundation is by no means so strongly opposed to that of Gifford as may at first appear. He, too, believed in the independent reality of a picture, but he drew from this creed a different conclusion. Art should be more powerfully impressive than nature; therefore the transcriptions of ordinary scenes are insufficient. This led him to hunt over the countries for striking views, and wherever he found one, at home or abroad, he painted it, adding to it from his own vivid imagination such qualities of light or color as would make it most stirring. His artistic intentions, one might say, ran riot with him; but so beautiful were these intentions that the finished product, however studied and lacking in spontaneity, rarely fails to arouse pleasure and even a sense of admiration in the spectator.

Albert Bierstadt was another foreigner who so intimately identified himself with the art tendencies of his adopted country that he appears to be a true American. Like Church he looked for imposing sceneries, and found them in the Rocky Mountains. He had a keen perception of the grandeur of nature, and knew how to make her even more imposing than she is.

The two remaining men of this set of great landscape painters, *Alexander H. Wyant* and *George Inness*, form the connecting link between their fellows and the painters of the present day. They followed an entirely different ideal from that of Cole, Church, or Bierstadt; it was an ideal more akin to that of Durand or Kensett, and one that is universally recognized to-day as the more worthy. Their conception of the value of the visible picture was not less, but their respect for nature was greater; and they knew that the most powerful message is not always conveyed by gigantic mountains or remarkable phenomena, but on the contrary by placid sceneries. The quiet orchard, the still meadows, and peaceful country districts, — all can speak to him who listens. And they listened. They sank their personality into the vastness of nature's great appeal to mankind.

Inness was the leader. He had learned to know nature as well as Corot and his Barbizon friends knew her. "Like a Greek," it has been said, "he felt God in the stream or grove, the immanent presence of superhuman powers"; and like a Greek, he knew how to make the spectator see with his eyes and feel with his emotions. Wyant followed in his path, and, although a less versatile man, added to his achievements such a delicate refinement that he stands unrivaled in this respect by any other American.

THIRD PERIOD

All these men had formed their styles and achieved their reputations prior to the first World's Fair held in America in 1876. On this occasion there were exhibited in this country collections of pictures from abroad, and they made such a powerful impression on the native artists that 1876 is generally taken as the date when the third period of American art begins, — a period during which the technical skill of the artists has been developed to such a degree that it may be said to be inferior to none. In the preceding period most of the men who went abroad sought instruction in Germany, first in Düsseldorf and later in Munich. After 1876 most art students went to France. Italy, of course, had always been visited by all who could afford it, but not so much for contact with living men as for the inspiration derived from the old masters. Unlike the first American painters, the recent generation went abroad as young and untried men, eager to learn the rudiments of their art from the famous artists in France. If one runs through any modern catalogue of artists, one finds nine men out of every ten listed as pupils of foreign painters, and only quite recently have reputable artists appeared who have received their entire training at home.

It is difficult to draw a line between those men who belong to the second period of American art and those who belong to the third; for many may be claimed for both. If a line must

be drawn, it is wise to group men like Enneking and Homer Martin, who have bravely continued in the front ranks, with the modern men; and others like Hunt, Bierstadt, and Fuller, who to the last have exemplified the spirit of an earlier age, with the artists of the second period.

Versatility is a characteristic of the modern Americans; therefore few men can be said to be painters either of figures or landscapes or marines exclusively. The best men, however, have made their mark in one of these three special branches, which fact enables one to classify them accordingly.

A further classification, but one which is not easily carried to its logical conclusion, has been attempted by Mr. Isham; it aims to classify the artists according to their place of residence, — whether at home, in Great Britain, in France, or in Italy.

It is an interesting fact that the men at home have only recently begun to enjoy the reputation which they deserve, while those abroad have sometimes enjoyed a far wider reputation than their works warranted. And such is the modesty — or ignorance — of the public that it needed the high commendation of Professor Bode of Berlin, who visited the Chicago World's Fair in 1893, to make them realize how great were their artists at home. Their very greatness, however, their lack of ostentation, and their singular freedom from studied and artificial effects had much to do with the neglect which they received.

The portraits by *John W. Alexander*, *Cecilia Beaux*, and *William Chase*; the figure pieces by *Kenyon Cox*, *William T. Dana*, *Joseph R. De Camp*, *Carl Marr*, and *Edmund Tarbell*; and the miniatures by *Miss Hills*, all reveal an art level fully as high as, if not higher than, that of the universally known *John Singer Sargent*. Everything, of course, depends on one's point of view. Sargent is brilliant, dazzling, and of such perfect skill that he who judges an artist by skill alone cannot fail to hail him as the master of all modern painters.

A story which has gone the rounds of the studios tells how quite a number of years ago

Sargent showed a fellow-artist a large collection of his works, including many early drawings. When asked which picture she liked best, this artist pointed to a beautiful drawing which showed much feeling and great delicacy. "Alas!" Sargent is quoted as having said, "that was made in my younger days when I had time to do what I wished to do." If this story is true, all lovers of art will sincerely regret that Sargent's popularity has prevented him from putting a soul into his later works. Wordsworth pitied Sir Joshua Reynolds, remarking what an artist and what a man he would have made if he had not been obliged to spend all his time in the company of people whose portraits he was painting. There is a certain something in Sargent's work that makes one feel that he, too, is depriving himself of those hours of quiet contemplation in which are laid the foundations of great characters.

Fundamentally the opposite of Sargent, *James McNeil Whistler* achieved no less a reputation than his famous compatriot, although he had to bear with many more unkind critics. He did not cater to the popular taste. He had eyes of such remarkable delicacy that few people other than artists can appreciate the height of his accomplishments. He was a colorist, but not in the sense of the man who combines bright hues in pleasant harmonies, but of him who combines the greatest varieties of shades of a few subdued hues in one grand chord. Whistler called many of his pictures symphonies. They were rather chords, — simple, clear, powerful chords that swell and swell until they seem to envelop the whole universe. Whistler was a dreamer, although he would have scoffed at such a designation, for so real were his dreams to him that they had become actual facts. He could stand at night on the embankments of the Thames and see unfolded to his mental eye all the magic beauty of fairyland. He painted it just as his physical eye had seen it, and could not comprehend why every one did not understand it. He saw in the dignified figure of his mother all that this one

word means to everybody, and when people were pleased with his picture and said he had painted more than mortal eyes behold in a mere body, he grew angry at the insinuation, for he desired to paint visible realities only. In the same way his "Sarasate" is far more than a portrait of this famous violinist; it is a perfect embodiment of the idea, — music.

Technically Whistler was undoubtedly influenced by his admiration for Japanese painting, for he was one of the first in the West to appreciate Japanese art, which, however, is based on spiritual and not on physical realities.

The works of the modern school of landscape painters are perhaps the most characteristic of all American endeavors, the attitude of the artists toward nature being at once honest and reverential. What is best in man, and what relates him in reasonable and not in sentimental ways to the powers outside him, is expressed in these American landscapes. If one were not afraid of being misunderstood, one might call them the religious paintings of the present day, for they are much truer and filled with more noble sentiment than most pictures of avowedly religious subjects.

The list of notable landscape painters is very large, so that the twelve names on Table 23 constitute a bare summary of the best known men. Several artists listed as figure painters, such as *J. Frank Currier*, have also achieved great success with their landscapes.

Among the marine painters *Thomas Alexander Harrison*, *Winslow Homer*, and *Charles H. Woodbury* stand out as a powerful trio. The sea has begun to speak to them as truly as the land has breathed its message to the large number of their fellow-artists.

In all branches of painting America has taken her place in the front rank; and in the minds of those who are familiar with her achievements there is no doubt but that she will be able to continue her growth both along technical and spiritual lines. Some observers even feel inclined to believe that before long she may become the leader of the art of the world.

CHAPTER X

RUSSIAN PAINTING

In art as well as in general civilization Russia has been slowly taking her place by the side of the nations of western Europe. Asiatic half culture has held her in a firm embrace. Down to the tenth century of the Christian era survivals of Greek art struggled with barbaric innovations, while Byzantine influences dominated the country from the time when the Grand Duchess Olga professed Christianity in 955 to the accession of Peter the Great in 1682. Since then western Europe has been the inspiration of Russian painting, and it is only recently that a national spirit has shown vigorous signs of existence.

Peter the Great, anxious to equal the splendor of the French court, summoned many foreign artists to Russia, but none of the truly great men cared to visit his land, so that the standard of art was set by inferior artists from France and Italy. That Italian art in the eighteenth century stood on a low level is well known, and since this art was esteemed above all others in Russia, it is small wonder that the beginning of Russian painting is uninteresting. Men there were of diligence and patience, but they knew no worthy leaders and were not big enough to hew out a path of their own. Their training, moreover, was of the kind to stifle every vestige of individuality. The Academy, founded in 1757, prescribed rigid courses of technical study, while nothing was done to develop independent characters. Under these conditions it is to the credit of Russia that several men, nevertheless, rose to a sufficiently high level of art to render themselves worthy of mention among notable painters.

Dmitri Levitski was a good portrait painter, and may be compared with Mme. Lebrun or with Mengs, while *Orest Kiprcnski* surpassed these painters to such an extent, especially in

coloring and in breadth of conception, that Professor Muther actually mentions him in the same breath with Rubens. *Count Fedor Tolstoy* deserves notice as a many-sided artist, sculptor, designer, and painter, who dared to break with academic traditions, just as Prud'hon in France had revolted against the classicism of David.

Aleksander Orlovski was the first good painter of military scenes, and *Aleksyey Venetsianov* the only early Russian genre painter of note.

The successors of these men may be recognized partly in the so-called Academicians, of whom *Fidelio Bruni* is the best, and partly in a group of artists whom one may collectively call Realists. Their realism is of various kinds. *Paul Fedotov* saw things from a moral and anecdotal point of view similar to that of Hogarth; *Vasili Perov* viewed the world with the eyes of a socialist who had felt deeply the sadness of life among the lower classes of his native land; while *Ilya Ryepin* impartially rendered national themes both past and present, just as they offered themselves to his keen artist's eyes. *Aleksander Ivanov* frequently selected his subjects from antiquity, and painted them, like many modern Englishmen, with masterful archæological accuracy, believing that he could thus make real events long past. *Valentin Syerov* is a good portrait painter.

In popular esteem none of these men can vie with *Vasili Vereshchagin*, who always painted the naked truth and had a keen eye for the sensational. That one aim of art might be to please he did not know. He craved excitement and knew better than most men how to stir the soul to its very depth. Surcharged with emotion, his canvases, nevertheless, are quiet in lines. What could be more impressive than his large picture, "Forgotten," where a dead soldier lies alone on a white and barren plain

with vultures hovering over him and a few satiated birds resting about him, while his fleshless arms indicate whence had come their repast! Vereshchagin always expresses himself clearly, just as his great literary compatriots do, but his technique, like theirs, is by no means faultless. Judged by the latter, both are mere infants when they are compared with the great French masters.

Of the earlier men who followed more or less in the lead of the continental Romanticists, *Karl Bryullov*, now almost forgotten, was once worshiped as if he had been a demigod. His great picture, the "Fall of Pompeii," made a stir in the art world not only of Russia but also of Italy, where it had been painted. Tumbling houses, jet-black clouds, and unnatural rays of light illuminating human beings of classically beautiful forms and posed to please the most critical theatrical manager combine in a weird ensemble. The whole is of such pronounced unreality that not even an emotional spectator need experience any but an intellectual horror. This was Bryullov's first picture of importance, and it was also his last. He continued to live on the reputation which it brought him.

Among the landscape painters *Silvestr Shchedrin* holds a prominent place. He died young, but left a series of such exquisite landscapes that those who have had an opportunity of studying many of them rank him as one of the best landscapists of any age, calling him the direct successor of Dujardin, Berchem, and Pynacker, and their equal in spirit.

The only painter of marines who could compete with Shchedrin was *Ivan Aivazovski*. He was a rapid painter who loved loud effects, but who had such a marvelous eye for the grandeur of nature that his pictures are singularly impressive.

The present generation of artists seems to be following the lead of Ryepin, and to have selected as their motto the two words "national" and "realistic." This appeared very clearly from the Russian exhibition at the World's Fair in Paris in 1900, when some one hundred and thirty painters were represented, among whom *Korovin*, *Levitan*, *Maliavin*, *Purvit*, and *Wasnesov* seem to give the greatest promise for the future.¹

¹ Several other Russian painters have recently become known in America through exhibitions of their works. They are well discussed by Christian Brinton, in *Appleton's Booklovers Magazine*, February, 1906.

CHAPTER XI

SCANDINAVIAN PAINTING

SWEDISH PAINTING

The Swedes have been called the French of the North. Their painting is brilliant, experimental, full of verve, and scintillating. But it has not always been thus. They, too, have had their period of growth, although it was short, and they made their *début* on the stage of the world with almost immediate dash and marvelous skill.

At first their artists were not stay-at-homes, so that most of their better men are perhaps rightly claimed for the French or German schools. *Alexander Roslin*, the earliest Swedish painter of worth, lived in a palatial mansion in Paris and amassed a fortune as a successful portraitist of high society. Texture painting was his forte, so that the saying arose

Qui a figure de satin
Doit bien être peint par Roslin.

Karl Frederik von Breda was thoroughly English in style, adhering strictly to the principles of Reynolds and Lawrence, while *Nils Johan Blommér* followed faithfully the German dictum that "the chief thing in a work of art is soul." He was, however, a lover of his native land, and so endeavored to people his landscape with embodied visions of the Swedish national spirit. *Karl Johan Fahlkrantz*, who was a good landscapist, sought his inspiration from the earlier artists of the Netherlands, but blended with their teachings much romantic unreality. At all times he was a poet.

Another lover of the Dutch masters was *Lorenz August Lindholm*, who spent many years in Holland, and whose pictures always showed the quiet spirit and conscientious work which is characteristic of the Dutch "Little Masters."

The greatest colorist among the earlier men was *Eggon Lundgren*, whose travels had taken him as far as India and Tunis, and whose northern heart embraced with truly southern warmth the charms of sunnier climes.

When the school of Düsseldorf was at its height many Swedes identified themselves with its teachings, but none of these men attained rank as masters. It was different with those who went to Paris or were attracted by the dazzling effects of the Piloty school in Munich; for many of them gained fame and a name favorably known wherever there is an interest in art.

The first among them worthy of mention is *Johan Frederik Höckert*; for in the words of Professor Muther he was the first Swede who "saw the world with the eyes of an artist," and who painted pictures for their artistic worth rather than for their subject. He was essentially interested in costume painting because of the color schemes which it enabled him to evolve.

Hugo Birger and *Johan Kristoffer Bocklund* were similarly enamored of costumes, the first especially seeking gorgeous effects of strange garments which he endeavored to paint in novel ways. When he selected a subject from the scenery of his native land, it was always for the sake of the unusual effects of reflected light.

In this respect no greater contrast is imaginable than that which exists between his work and that of *Eduard Bergh*, who loved nature for her own sake. Bergh was a man of power, whose thoughtful mind was more deeply impressed with the suggestive stillness of nature than with her passionate moods. The latter are passing manifestations, and for contemplative minds lack the stirring elements of nature's unfathomable solitude.

Vilhelm van Gegerfelt is another landscapist. He, however, takes his subjects from Italy, and cares more for a pleasing appearance than for truth. The same charge may also be brought against *August Hagborg*, who is best known for his views of the sea and his pictures of fisher folk. In these pictures both his men and women are such by force of their surroundings and their costumes, but in essence they lack the ruggedness of people who know the treachery of the elements and the hardships of life.

By the side of these landscapists several historical painters have won recognition. *Gustav Cederström* has painted historical subjects with soundness and a remarkably strong dramatic temper, besides showing much artistic ability. The latter quality is absent in the works of *Karl Gustaf Hellquist*, whose reputation rests on his honesty and straightforwardness of presentation. *Nils Fosberg* is a more versatile man, whose wonderful command of the nude has won him many admirers.

Georg von Rosen has been a puzzle to his critics because of the unevenness of his work. He deserves the credit, however, of having called the attention of the Swedes to the fine and thoughtful products of the northern masters of the sixteenth century. This was a blessing for them after they had become familiar with the rather coarse workmanship of Courbet and some of his contemporaries. An entirely different stand has been taken by *Julius Kronberg*, who paints *à la* Makart voluptuous subjects in a voluptuous style.

Hugo Salmson is best mentioned as the last of this list of artists, because he is in a sense the forerunner of the modern school of Swedish painters. At first he was influenced by Constant and later by Meissonier, until the success of Bastien-Lepage caused him to become a follower of this master. At all times Salmson has known how to be the successful popularizer of new styles. No doubt he is a genius, but his individuality is not strong enough to make him a master.

The new generation has started with Salmson's Bastien-Lepage style, and has steadfastly refused to follow any but the most modern of

the modern. Among the landscape painters *Per Eckström*, *Prince Eugen*, *Nils Krüger*, and *Karl Nordström* are most favorably known. The solitude of nature appeals to all of them. Winter, too, is one of their favorite subjects. *Georg Arsenius* is an animal painter whose fame rests largely on his gay pictures of Parisian races.

Among the figure painters *Andreas Zorn* enjoys an international reputation. His eye is quick and true and his hand is sure. He sees everything at a glance and seems to paint it with one bold stroke. This gives to his work an immediateness which is most captivating. Zorn is an experimenter in drawing and coloring, but he is always successful. He is the favorite child of the muse of painting.

Equally as facile as Zorn, but not so many-sided, *Carl Larsson* is known as a "coquettish, mobile, and capricious" painter, who has seen much and "babbles about it in a way that is witty and stimulating, if not novel." Like Zorn he does not confine himself to figure painting, but has created some excellent landscapes.

Richard Bergh is less conspicuously brilliant than either of the preceding artists, but is fully as great a man. He is of a contemplative turn of mind and seems to understand the moods of nature. His technique is excellent, but not so coquettishly insistent as that of Larsson or so brilliant as that of Zorn, so that his subject-matter has a better chance of conveying his meaning to the spectator.

The art life of Sweden is constantly growing in worth and in intensity, and the visit to the Swedish section in any exhibition is sure to be thoroughly profitable and enjoyable.

NORWEGIAN AND FINNISH PAINTING

Norwegian painting dates from the secession of Norway from Denmark in 1814, when the national pride of the people began to exert itself in all departments of life. Remembering that the whole country has less than half as many inhabitants as New York City, one stands aghast at the place which her artists have taken in the world of art.

Johan Christian Dahl, like most early Norwegian artists, found his country too small a sphere of activity. He spent the best years of his life in Dresden, but did not tire of singing the beauties of Norway in his excellent landscapes. Equally successful in this sphere of art were *Hans Gude* and *Otto Sinding*, who went to Düsseldorf for inspiration. The latter was a versatile genius of feverish inconsistency, who divided his time between painting and literary or scenic interests. But "in all his versatility," as one of his compatriots has said, "it is difficult to recognize other features than those marked by will and energy." He also painted genre scenes, although in this class of work he was not so successful as a somewhat older man, *Adolf Tidemand*, whom his countrymen are proud to call the first Norwegian figure painter of note.

Thus far the Norwegian painters had looked to Germany for instruction, but the time came when they, like all the world, turned to France and fell under the influence of the open-air painters. Then they realized that a new chord had been struck in art, and they decided to convert their fellow-citizens to the new faith. They went abroad to get their training, but, unlike their fathers, they returned home and endeavored to found a national art. Without definite rules they may, nevertheless, be said to have founded a fighting brotherhood, writing on their banner, as it were, the words "forward" and "home."

Eilif Petersen and *Hans Heyerdahl* mark the transition from the old order of things to the new, combining in their works the best of their earlier training with much of the charm of the open-air painters. Heyerdahl is the greater of the two, without being a profoundly thoughtful painter. "His talent lies in a sense and voluptuous enjoyment of beauty, a love of delicate form, and an intoxication in the sweetness of color."

The real leaders of the fighting brotherhood were *Erik Werenskiöld* and *Christian Krohg*. Werenskiöld was an uncompromising antagonist of academic instruction and the teachings of

old picture galleries. Nature was his mistress, and exhibitions of contemporaneous artists his sources of recreation. All the most modern movements—naturalism, open-air painting, and impressionism—found him a ready follower. He painted a great many subjects, but attained his highest rank in portraiture, in which branch he has not been surpassed by any other Norwegian.

To Krohg the new order of things meant not only an onward movement in art but also one in the moral and intellectual life of the human race. He desired to have his nation lead the world, and believed that it was necessary to convince her of the soundness of the new tendencies in art, if she was to free herself from old traditions both moral and political. His best works are his pictures from Skagen, which "are free from every purpose but that of delighting the eye."

Far more cosmopolitan than either, *Fritz Thaulow* has made an international name for himself. At first he painted beautiful winter landscapes in the open-air style, generally crossed by a river and specked with willow bushes. Latterly he has gone farther afield. Beauty is the keynote of all his work. He seems to derive pleasure from painting, and certainly knows how to transmit it to the spectator.

Gerhard Munthe is well known for his finely colored landscapes; his importance, however, lies in another field,—his fanciful illustrations of northern fairy tales. "From the very first these fancies seemed to be intended as patterns for some kind of art needlework; and since then a number of cloths woven after the old national style have appeared, which, in choice of color and technical execution, are in close imitation of Munthe's designs." It is because he was entirely unhampered in the selection of colors in painting these fanciful subjects that he has created harmonies which have the charm of wholesome novelty for people whose eyes are weakened by an art which has been called "internationally fashionable."

Christian Skredsvig and *Amaldus Nielsen* are the remaining painters of note of this so-called Fighting Brotherhood. Skredsvig, whose

ideal Corot had been, represents the gentler side of Norwegian art. He is a poet who knows well how to create a definite mood. Nielsen is a landscape painter.

The present generation of artists is firmly rooted in the principles for which their elders fought. They are good colorists, who, on the technical side of art, seek for illusory effects, and on the other side endeavor to express the spirit which they believe characterizes their national life. *Gustav Wentzel* is a leader among these artists, a man of force and honesty, who paints correctly and feels deeply. "Most of these artists are still quite young," — these are the concluding words of the official publication on Norway at the World's Fair in Paris in 1900, — "but when we consider what they and their slightly older fellow-artists have already produced in the way of art that bears evidence of feeling, delight in beauty, and the stamp of personality, we have every reason to hope for a bright future for Norwegian art."

In Finland one finds an art that shares the characteristic elements partly of Swedish and partly of Norwegian art. Her painters have not joined the schools of Russia where they politically belong. *Albert Edelfelt* is the best known of the Finnish artists. His pictures have a luminosity that reminds one of the best Frenchmen; his choice of subjects, however, and his depth of feeling stamp him as an adherent of the Germanic principles. If one would realize to the fullest extent what the transplanting of art from Italy in the thirteenth century to northern climes in the nineteenth century has meant, one should compare the "Noli me tangere" (Christ and Magdalene) by Duccio or by Fra Angelico with the same subject by Edelfelt.

The depth of religious feeling is the same in both cases, but its expression is fundamentally different. With the Italians Christ was a heavenly being, very beautiful and benign; with Edelfelt he is not less kind, but he is painted as he once doubtless walked the earth, a man of humble station whom gentle folk to-day might as readily despise as their kindred

did of yore. The royal demeanor and divine character which the old-time halo reflects have disappeared. The fine landscape of ideal charms has given way to a natural although not less beautiful view of a country lane. To accept the Christ of Edelfelt one must indeed be a Christian at heart. Nominal followers of the Nazarene will prefer the Italian king to the Finnish countryman.

Axel Gallén is another Finnish painter of note, who latterly has endeavored to express with simple, severe lines and colors the innermost experiences of a human soul.

DANISH PAINTING

The Danes were the first of the Scandinavians to feel themselves a nation in the realm of art. They have little affinity either with the Swedes or with the Norwegians, and reveal a character that seems hewn out of the same block with that of the Dutch. "What they have to express," says Professor Muther, "seems almost Dutch, but it is whispered less distinctly and with more of mystery, with that dim, approximative, hazarded utterance which betrays that it is Danish."

The earliest Danish painters of note lived at a time when academic classicism ruled the minds of most men; when the *how* mattered more than the *what*. *Nicolai Abraham Abildgård*, a great admirer of Michelangelo, and *Jens Juul*, a graceful portraitist, are gratefully remembered by the Danes as masters of sound learning. The foremost position, however, as a leader in art belongs to *Christoffer Vilhelm Eckersberg*. He was one of those remarkable people who can teach without practicing well themselves. His technique was very one-sided and actually crude. His importance lay in his opposition to the forced sentiment that many continentals at that time were introducing into art. "My good pupils," he once said, "always wish to do better than God Almighty; they ought to be glad if they could do only as well." His pupils and friends understood him, and Denmark developed an independent art of her

own. It was characterized by soundness of conception and accuracy of observation, but also, unfortunately, by crudeness of technique. For fully a generation the desire of founding a national art and the exalted opinion of their work prevented the Danish artists from learning the lessons which the best French and German masters had begun to teach. There was, so to speak, a Chinese wall about Danish art. Within this wall several men did creditable work, although their seclusion prevented them from doing what they otherwise might have done. Their achievements lay along two lines, genre and landscape.

Christen Dalsgård, Julius Exner, Vilhelm Marstrand, and Frederik Vermehren were the best painters of genre; and what distinguishes them pleasantly from other genre painters is their national simplicity. Their figures act as they should act, without undue reference to the spectator. It is as if these painters had too high a regard for the public to stoop to the telling of anecdotes. They told tales from life, but, on the other hand, they did not penetrate the depths of the national character. Their subjects were Danish, but there is nothing to indicate this except an occasional touch of scenery or of costume. In feeling they are no more Danish than cosmopolitan. Almost the same is true, although to a lesser degree, of the landscapists — *Peter Kyhn* and *Peter Kristian Skovgård* — because the moods of nature if accurately produced are less readily disguised. *Skovgård* interprets the beauty of Danish beech woods with singular success, while the poetic eye of *Kyhn* discerns in his native land sceneries that are akin in spirit to the national ballads and fairy tales.

Two of the oldest artists among these crude Independents, *Johan Thomas Lundbye* and *Jørgen Valentin Sonne*, struck out on individual paths. The former painted animals and had an especially keen eye for the "somnolent temperament" of cows; while the latter excelled in battle scenes and pictures of Danish low life. In these he resembles the other painters of genre.

Priding herself on the successes of her artists, and not a little conceited over the triumph of *Thorwaldsen*, Denmark had developed a national school, but at the expense of a thorough mastery of the artistic mediums. The natural result was a reversion of feeling, so that in the sixties and seventies the much cherished national art gave way to a new movement. Artists went outside the narrow Danish boundaries, and stood aghast before the strides that other men in more progressive countries had made. These achievements they desired to emulate, and this left them little time to consider the individual character of their own small country. Very properly, therefore, these men have been called Cosmopolitans.

Karl Bloch was the best known of these cosmopolitans, especially on account of his excellent technique. In subject-matter he was less satisfactory. He continued to paint genre pictures, but had lost the simplicity and spontaneity of his predecessors. He tried to be humorous, but his humor was forced; he had skill, but he was wanting in artistic temperament. And what is true of him is also true of the majority of his friends and followers. Their importance is only historical. The Danes, nevertheless, remember them gratefully, because they taught their successors the importance of a sound technique without which it would have been impossible to reestablish in Denmark a national art on such firm foundations as distinguish it to-day. The men who have labored and are still laboring for this end are called National Individualists.

Roughly speaking, they are divisible into two groups, — those who, like the so-called Impressionists, are open-air painters, and those who have not accepted the tenets of this school. *Per Severin Krøyer* is the pioneer of the entire movement. His technique, which is most excellent, is adequate to solve the most difficult problems of light and composition; and he does this with such ease that only experts appreciate the greatness of the task. Moreover, his artistic personality is no less perfect, thus enabling him to please every one.

Julius Paulsen is almost the equal of Krøyer. Most of the other painters, however, are less versatile, each excelling in his own peculiar sphere. Among the open-air painters who know how to surround figures and forms with poetic charms of light *Vilhelm Hammesrhøy, Joachim Skovgård*, and many others have made a good name for themselves. At every exhibition, in fact, new men make their appearance, who by the invariable excellence of their work prove how high is the level and how secure are the foundations of modern Danish art.

CHAPTER XII

JAPANESE PAINTING

People of western civilizations have so habitually believed that they alone enjoy the favor of Heaven, that they find it difficult to credit the Japanese artists with clear thoughts and noble emotions, such as would give them rank by the side of the best artists of the western world. This rank, nevertheless, they deserve. There are even critics who, after a prolonged study of their art, appear to be in doubt as to whether they do not as a class surpass all the various schools of Europe and America. Even from meager reproductions and those few originals which are accessible to American students one can readily discover that elevated conceptions are as characteristic of the Japanese as their well-known delicacy and refinement of execution. The only fault which a novice may find is a seeming lack of inherently noble forms. But here, too, one soon begins to see with the eyes of those whom one studies, and while one may not always agree, one feels the dignity of the Japanese purpose so irresistibly that one is little troubled by the chosen vehicle of expression.

The unconventional arrangement of the Japanese pictures, their disregard of academic symmetry and any kind of regularity, strikes the observer as a wholesome variation from the more or less strict adherence to these principles in the western world. Moreover, it precludes a too exclusive enjoyment of the visible work of art, and directs attention to the emotions which it expresses; while one of the most remarkable things about this art is that the very idea of irregularity or incompleteness vanishes as soon as the spectator enters into its spirit.

The material which the Japanese use in making their pictures — called *kakemonos* — is of the lightest silk or of beautifully soft paper, on

which they apply the colors with the finest of brushes. The delicacy of their touch is so marvelous that it takes years of study to perceive its gradations, while some Europeans never seem to be able to appreciate it fully. The Japanese themselves judge an artist as much by his drawing and his touch as by the fertility of his ideas. This is the reason why there is a great difference of opinion between the connoisseurs of Japan and of Europe, for instance, regarding Hoku-sai. The latter rank him as the master of masters; the former call him coarse. In defense of the Europeans it must be remembered that the commerce of the nineteenth century has made them familiar with the best works of Hoku-sai, while they still lack the means of comparing his pictures with those of the earlier masters.

Japanese painting owes its origin to Chinese painting. Of its earliest period little is known. From the ninth century onward the Chinese influences were far enough removed to permit one to speak of a growing national art in Japan; but in the fifteenth century several artists again made exhaustive studies of the works of the people across the sea, and thus introduced new tendencies into their own land.

Japanese painting, like European painting, is divisible into schools, most of which, undisturbed by rivals of subsequent origin, have continued to possess adherents down to the present day. Within these schools, however, notable transformations have often occurred. These were due to the general tenor of the times during which the various artists worked; and since environments are not rarely more potent than traditions, some scholars prefer to classify Japanese art by periods rather than by schools. The spirit of these several periods has recently

been discussed with admirable precision by Kakusa Okakura.¹

The earliest periods are the *Asuka* (550–700 A.D.) and the *Nara* (700–800 A.D.). Then follows the *Heian* period (800–900 A.D.), during which the idea of the union of mind and matter grew so strong that the fusion appeared to be almost completed. “It is remarkable to find that this fusion rather centers in the material, and the symbol is regarded as realization, the common act as if it were beatitude, the world itself as the ideal world. . . . The artistic works of this period are full of intense fervor and nearness to the gods, such as is unknown in any other era.” Their concreteness makes their appearance bold and vital, but, as Kakusa Okakura says, they are “not free, lacking the spontaneity and detachment of great idealism.”

The next period (900–1200 A.D.) is called *Fujiwara*, and with it the Japanese national mind has achieved its emancipation. The Buddhist religion had been cultivated in Japan more purely than in China, where Confucianism had supplanted the flexibility of the original creed. In Japan the intensity of religious feeling during the preceding centuries had left the artists no time to turn their minds from the imported gods to their own surroundings. Under the long reign of the Fujiwara family the native instinct asserted itself and led to the establishment of the Yamato, or native, school of painting. No longer did the people believe this earthly life to be the only life, or to be capable of being made ideal; for perfection they now regarded “as attainable by mere contemplation of the Abstract Absolute.” Such a view naturally made the artists lose in vigor but gain in refinement and delicacy. “The halo of the eternal feminine” drew closer not only to the national religion but also to the artistic conceptions.

The end of the Fujiwara period is marked by a social revolution and the establishment of

a military viceroyalty at Kamakura, the city which has given its name to the next period, the *Kamakura* period (1200–1400 A.D.). These two centuries were the feudal era of Japan. “Here we find the idea of individualism struggling to express itself among the decaying débris of an aristocratic rule, inaugurating an age of hero worship and heroic romance akin to the spirit of European individualism in the time of chivalry, its woman worship restricted by oriental notions of decorum, and its religion —by reason of the freedom and ease of the Jodo sect—lacking the severe asceticism of that overawing popedom which held the western conscience in iron fetters.” To a certain extent it was a period of storm and stress, when “to know the sadness of things” or “to suffer for the sake of others” were the mottoes of many.

The favorite lines of work pursued by the painters of this period were portraiture, illustration of heroic legends, and most especially of the spirit of motion; while religious artists depicted with an almost fierce and romantic imagination the horrors of hell.

The next two centuries (1400–1600 A.D.) are called the *Ashikaga* period, from that branch of the reigning family which succeeded to the throne, and are characterized in art by what Kakusa Okakura calls “objective idealism.” “Beauty,” the people of this period held, “or the life of things, is always deeper as hidden within than as outwardly expressed, even as the life of the universe beats always underneath incidental appearances. Not to display, but to suggest, is the secret of infinity. Perfection, like all maturity, fails to impress, because of its limitations of growth.” Such views naturally tended to simplify art, so that high-toned drawing and coloring were largely superseded by simple ink painting. The meanings of the subjects also were altered; for the artists no longer desired to depict nature, preferring to pen essays on her beauty. Their execution was free and easy, almost playful, and was equally delicate whether they painted the images of gods or drew a single flower; for “each stroke has its

¹ *The Ideals of the East*, by Kakusa Okakura. London, John Murray, 1903. The present discussion of the several periods is based on this book.

moment of life and death ; all together assist to interpret an idea, which is life within life."

The powerful social upheaval that laid low the Ashikaga rule shattered all these ideals. Ota-Nobunaga, Toyotomi, and Tokugawa, three feudal lords, succeeded in overthrowing the existing rule. With them unknown families rose to power, and aristocratic refinement gave way to that luxury which every democratic community is apt to experience at the sudden favor of fortune. All this is well illustrated in the art of this *Toyotomi* and *early Tokugawa* period (1600-1700 A.D.), which is more remarkable for its "gorgeousness and wealth of color than for its significance." Some artists, to be sure, strove to return to the purity of an earlier era, but since no man can entirely withdraw himself from the influences of his age, these endeavors were not able to resuscitate the spirit of a by-gone art.

Conditions grew still worse in the *later Tokugawa* period (1700-1850 A.D.), when the rulers, "in their eagerness for consolidation and discipline, crushed out the vital spark from art and life." The Tosa and Kano schools continued as hereditary academies with ironclad traditions and absolutely no free play for individualism. Only in Tokyo, where the emperor resided, although he had practically no political power, did the Tokugawa viceroys not exercise their stultifying discipline. Here new and active schools began to rise and meet with popular favor. The Popular school, which had its origin in the Toyotomi period, gained firmer ground; while O-kio and Gan-ku founded schools of their own. The former was the first Japanese to study western art products. He diligently copied Dutch engravings and finally evolved a distinctly realistic style. Gan-ku was also a realist, but, unlike O-kio, sought his inspiration more distinctly in Chinese art.

The last fifty years of the nineteenth century cover what is called the *Meiji* period. More properly this period dates from the accession of the present emperor in 1868. In art, as in the whole life of the people, two mighty forces are shaping Japanese destiny. "One is the Asiatic

ideal, . . . and the other European science with her organized culture." The latter has induced many artists to forsake their own traditions, while the former has called forth a revival of the best tendencies of Japanese art. As we in the western world have recently had Romantic and Pre-Raphaelite movements, so the Japanese are now having their Pre-Tokugawa movement. Lovers of Japanese art cannot help wishing success to this movement ; for they know the force and vitality of the Asiatic ideal, and therefore believe that it can continue to live a singularly delicate blossom on the tree of art, while they fear its early death if it should become inoculated with the spirit of the West.

If with these several periods of Japanese history in mind one turns to the study of the men who through successive ages have placed themselves in the service of art, one meets as the first tangible personality *Kana-oka*, in the ninth century of our era. At present only three pictures by this master are known to be extant, and from none of them is it possible to imagine how he was once reputed to have painted works of such lifelikeness that special precautions had to be taken to prevent their running away. Scholars who have seen his extant pictures praise the delicacy of their execution and the vigor of their conception.

In the selection of his subjects, if tradition is reliable, *Kana-oka* was versatile, painting not only truly religious pictures but also secular ones, so that he may be said to have anticipated by centuries the artists of the modern Popular school.

Before his fame that of all his contemporaries and immediate successors wanes into insignificance. The name of *Hiro-taka*, however, is well remembered because of his tragic end, — dying while he was putting the finishing touches to his picture of the horrors of hell. This picture, which can still be seen in a temple in Kioto, may be said to mark the beginning of the long series of pictures treating of similar subjects in the subsequent Kamakura period.

Out of the versatile style of *Kana-oka* there developed another school, or academy, which was

founded during the Fujiwara period, probably by *Moto-mitsu*. Down to the thirteenth century this school was called Yamato, while after that it was known by the family name of its founder, Tosa.

The characteristics of this school partook of the distinctive features of the several periods through which it passed, although it possessed, generally speaking, a very unpleasant mannerism of its own, namely an "incorrect and ungraceful rendering of the human form." Another device first introduced by the Yamato artists was that of "spiriting away the roof from any building of which they desired to expose the interior."

The first tremendous step in advance since the time of Kana-oka was taken by *Chō Densu*. This man was a monk, like Fra Angelico in Italy, and of an almost equally superhuman spirituality. His historical position in Japanese art, however, calls rather for a comparison with Masaccio, Mantegna, or, as Mr. Fenollosa said, with Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo. Confining himself almost exclusively to religious paintings, he is correctly spoken of in connection with the Buddhist school; but, like his immediate successors, Shiū-bun, Sesshiū, and Masa-nobu, he was strongly influenced in his technique by the Chinese. He did not aim at realistic accuracy of drawing, and in this respect is more like Fra Angelico than like Masaccio; but since few Japanese tried to do this, it may be fairer to use his color and his force of design as a means of comparison, and in both points he far outranks his famous fellow-monk of Italy. His designs exhibit the force of genius, and his coloring is so true and beautiful that one finds it difficult to dispel one's admiration long enough even to notice his defects. If it is true that perfection is uninteresting because it leaves too little to the imagination, then Chō Densu is supremely satisfactory, because he stops just short of perfection, at a point where our love and admiration are most readily aroused.

Just as the renewed interest in ancient art, from which all western art had sprung, gave

rise to a Renaissance in Italy, so the rediscovery of the superior artistic qualities of Chinese painting ushered in a period of singular beauty in Japan; and, what is most astonishing, both the eastern and the western Renaissance took place during the fifteenth century. In Japan this age is called the Ashikaga period. The impetus was received through a monk, *Jō-setsu*, who, after a careful study of Chinese pictures, established a monastical brotherhood of painters. The real leader of the movement, however, who continued in the way of the master, was *Shiū-bun*. He was so thoroughly imbued with the Chinese spirit that his own surroundings did not appeal to him. Had he been forced, it is said, to make a picture of Kioto, he would have peopled her streets, though perhaps unwittingly, with Chinese instead of with his compatriots. It is this point of view which distinguishes the whole Chinese school from the Yamato or Tosa school. There were then, as now, critics of Shiū-bun who did not like his subjects, and who said of him and his followers: "Is it not true that these persons incline towards a foreign country and despise their own?" But there have been no adverse critics of his artistic powers. At times people have preferred the pictures of earlier ages, just as some Europeans prefer the Gothic period with all its crudity to the Renaissance; but just as surely as no one has ever dared to deny the worth of Leonardo or of Michelangelo, so the mastership of Shiū-bun has likewise remained unchallenged.

Characteristic of the Ashikaga period rather than of the Chinese school was the gradually growing distaste for color, the artists preferring to make simple ink drawings.

Sesshiū was the only great painter of the fifteenth century who actually visited China. He used to boast that Chinese landscapes had been his only masters; but although he founded a new school, his style did not materially differ from that of Shiū-bun. "The grand simplicity of his landscape compositions," says Mr. Anderson, "their extraordinary breadth of design, the illusive suggestions of atmosphere and

distance, and the all-pervading sense of poetry demonstrate a genius that could rise above all defects of theory in the principles of his art."

The same may also be said of the last of the great trio of the Japanese Renaissance, *Moto-nobu*. He was a son of *Masa-nobu*,—the founder of a school which bears his family name, *Kano*,—and was a far greater man. Like *Sesshiū*, he was greatest in landscapes, which reveal a master hand in spite of their unreality, being largely transcriptions of Chinese sceneries, or, to speak with *Kakasu Okakura*, essays on nature. Unlike his famous contemporary, he was a most versatile man, whose birds, flowers, and figure pieces stand unrivaled in the whole of Japanese art.

The seventeenth century in Japanese art, the *Toyotomi* and early *Tokugawa* period, offers another interesting parallel to the development of art in the western world, if this latter is considered as a unit and not divided into countries. In Japan the seventeenth century is a period of shallow showiness, but here and there men of exceptional talents put forth their efforts in the service of noble art, just as they did, for instance, in the Netherlands. Mr. Fenollosa calls their position anachronistic, since in reality they appear to be sixteenth-century men carrying forward the earlier traditions. They were *San-setsu* of the *Kano* school, *Sō-tatsu* of the *Tosa* school, *Chō-ko*, better known as *Itchō*, of the Popular school, and *Kō-rin*, the founder of a school which goes by his name.

Tan-yu, or *Mori-nobu*, on the other hand, the most famous painter of the *Kano* school next to *Moto-nobu*, summed up the tendencies of his own age with consummate skill, and riveted the fetters, as has been said, that were to bind the subsequent generations of artists. Early in life, however, he too followed the style of *Sesshiū*, and his later defection has made lovers of the *Ashikaga* period look upon him with much disapproval. Says Mr. Fenollosa: "Tan-yu, although indeed an artist of great excellence, drew a large part of his inspiration from his great Chinese and Japanese predecessors; and while we admit that he elaborated a spirited

technique of his own, yet he lacks sadly in depth and sincerity. He wakes up the last expiring coals of the great classic epoch into a final brilliant flame, which goes out in almost perfect darkness. So absolutely did he absorb into himself all the art forces of his day that nothing was left for an enormous train of flatterers, pupils, and successors but mechanically to copy his external traits. The very success of his academy is the ruin of the *Kano* art."

While this *Kano* school was gradually deteriorating a Popular school was founded by *Iwasa Mata-hei*. The great wealth of ideas which the life of the people at large, rich and poor, good and wicked, conceited and honest, offered, could not forever remain unused. It is true that earlier artists had occasionally rendered similar motives, but it is also true that they had never considered scenes from this "passing world"¹ especially worthy of their brush.

Late in the seventeenth century an additional stimulus was given to the new movement by the development of illustrated art books, which made it possible for the artists to appeal to the masses. *Hishi-gawa Moro-nobu* was the greatest of these illustrators, selecting his subjects exclusively from the social life of his time. He found a worthy follower in *Mori-kuni*, who rendered, in the words of Mr. Anderson, "a service to the cause of artisan art that it would be difficult to overestimate."

The achievements of both these men, however, disappear before the invincible versatility of *Hoku-sai*. Lauded to the skies by his European admirers, and especially by the French, he is ranked very low by many of his countrymen. His was the refinement of a noble soul and not the culture of an educated man; for he had to work for his living from childhood until he died at the advanced age of almost ninety years. Japanese connoisseurs blame his indelicate touch, and they are right. To foreign eyes, however, even his touch is astonishingly light. His conceptions are just and noble, but rarely if ever as powerful and inspiring as those of his best predecessors. His subjects cover a

¹ *Ukiyo-yé* is translated "passing world."

wide range; Mr. Anderson, in fact, remarks that "he was a cyclopedia of folklore and legend, and has left untouched scarcely one motive that was worthy of his pencil." He knew western art and its principles, notably perspective, but he continued faithfully in the style of his fathers, excelling in fixing the essential characteristics of his subjects by means of a few strokes. In short, his aim, like that of most Japanese artists, was to present conceptions of ideas, and not to give literal transcripts of particular phenomena. The wonderful truth of his pictures may well convince the western mind that the realistic copying of nature is not the finest art. Nature should be studied; but while a man looks at her he should also think about her, or, better still, think with her.

Perhaps the first intentionally attentive student of nature in Japan was *Ō-kin*, who founded the so-called Realistic or *Shijō* school; he did not, however, entirely withdraw himself from Japanese traditions, so that neither his perspective nor his anatomy are accurate.

The works of a rival academy, called by the name of its founder, *Gan-ku*, do not differ much from those of the other realistic schools. *Gan-ku* himself was a man of power, whose pictures, we are told, are readily recognized by peculiarities of coloring and a very individual touch.

Japanese painting is an inspiration to the foreigner. It has had its periods of greatness and of decline, and during the latter the conventionality of the native style has aided in making its standard of art exceptionally low. In the finest periods, however, the great successes of the masters have demonstrated that the character both of the man and his conceptions are of greater importance than the particular style which his tradition and environments place at his disposal. The greater the skill which an artist has the greater will be his art, provided his skill is accompanied by an equally exalted personality. No undeveloped man, even with supreme skill, can be a great artist.

INDEX TO PART THREE

For full names and dates of artists and for pronunciation of foreign names see Part II, List of Artists.

[The heavy-faced figure calls attention to the page on which a description of the artist is to be found; the light-faced figure indicates the page on which simply a mention of the name is made.]

- Abildgård, N. A., 174
 Achenbach, A., 120
 "Adam and Eve," by Masaccio, 98
 Aertszen, Pieter, 132
 Alemannus, Giovanni, 100
 Alexander, John W., 167
 Allston, Washington, 164 f.
 Alma-Tadema, L., 160
 Aman-Jean, E., 154
 American painting, first period, 162 ff.; second period, 165 ff.; third period, 167 f.; characterized, 162
 Andrea Pisano, 97
 Angelico, Fra, 98, 108
 Antonello da Messina, 100
 Antonio da Canale, 107
 Antonio da Murano, 100
 Apelles, 92, 99
 Apollodoros, 92
 Appiani, A., 108
 Arena Chapel, Padua, 97
 Arsenius, G., 172
 "Arte de la Pintura," by Pacheco, 140
 Artistic intentions, importance of, 98
 Artz, A., 137
 Ashikaga period of Japanese painting, 178
 Assisi, Church of St. Francis, 97
 Assyrian painting, 92
 Asuka period of Japanese painting, 178
 Augsburg, 113
 "Aurora" by Guido Reni, 107
 Ayvazovski, I., 170
 Babylonian painting, 92
 Backgrounds, difference of, in Italian and Flemish pictures, 125
 Barbizon school, 147
 Bastien-Lepage, 153
 Baudry, Paul, 150
 Beaux, Cecilia, 167
 Belgian painting, 129
 Bellini, Gentile, 100
 Bellini, Giovanni, 100 f.
 Bellini, Jacopo, 100
 Belotto, 107
 Bergh, Eduard, 171
 Bergh, Richard, 172
 Besnard, P. A., 154
 Biéffe, É. de, 120
 Bierstadt, A., 166
 Birger, Hugo, 171
 Bisschop, C., 137
 Blackburn, J. B., 162
 Blake, William, 159
 Blechen, K. E., 120
 Bloch, Karl, 175
 Blommér, N. J., 171
 Blommers, B., 137
 Böcklin, A., 121 f.
 Bocklund, J. K., 171
 Bodegoncillos, 140
 Bodegones, 140
 Boldini, Giovanni, 153
 Bonheur, Rosa, 152
 Bonnat, Léon, 151
 Bosch, Jan, 131
 Botticelli, A., 99 f.; contrasted with Rubens, 127
 Boucher, F., 145
 Bouguereau, Guillaume (William) Adolphe, 150
 Braekeleer, F. de, 130
 Brant, Isabella, 127
 Breda, K. F. von, 171
 Breton, Jules, 152
 Brinton, Christian, writer on Russian painting, 170 n.
 British painting, 155 ff.; portrait painters, 156 f.; landscape painters, 157 f.; painters of genre and animals, 158; Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, 158 ff.; modern painters, 160; the Scotch school, 161; painters in water colors, 161
 Bronzino, A., 105
 Brouwer, A., 129
 Brown, Ford Madox, 159
 Brueghel, Jan, the Elder, 126
 Brueghel, Jan, the Younger, 126
 Brueghel, Peeter, the Elder, 126
 Bruni, Fidelio, 169
 Bryullov, Karl, 170
 Burne-Jones, Sir Edward, 159 f.
 Byzantine art, 93
 Cabanel, A., 150
 "Calumny," by Apelles, 99; by Botticelli, 99
 Calvaert, D., 126
 Camuccini, V., 108
 Canaletto, Il, 107
 Caravaggio, M. da, 106; influence of, on Rubens, 127
 Carmelite monks, church of, in Florence, 98
 Carolus Duran, 151
 Carpaccio, V., 100
 Carracci, Annibale, and Ludovico, 106; influence of, on Claude Lorrain, 144; influence of, on Rubens, 127
 Carrière, E., 154
 Carstens, A. J., 117
 Cazin, J. C., 154
 Cederström, G., 172
 Chardin, J. B. S., 145
 Charles I of England, 128
 Charles IV, German emperor, 110
 Charles IV of Spain, 141
 Chase, William, 167
 Chiaroscuro, 103
 Chinese school, 180
 Chō Densu, 180
 "Chocolatière, La Belle," by Liotard, 145
 Chodowiecki, D. N., 116
 Christian art, early, 93
 Church, F. E., 166
 Cimabue, G., 91
 Classic art, importance of, 116
 Classicists, Dutch, 137; Flemish, 130; French, 147; German, 119
 Claude Lorrain, 144, 157
 Cleef, Joost van, 126
 Closing of picture galleries advocated by Courbet, 150 f.
 Clouet, François, 143
 Clouet, Jehan, 143
 Coghetti, F., 108
 Cole, Thomas, 166
 "Color cooks," derisive term for French Romanticists, 149
 Copley, John Singleton, 163
 Cornelisz, Jacob, 131
 Corneliszén, Cornelis, 131
 Cornelius, P. von, 119
 Corot, J. B. C., 151 f., 174
 Correggio, 103 f.; compared with Murillo, 141
 Cortona Muse, 93
 Courbet, G., 147, 150 f.
 Cousin, Jean, 143
 Couture, Thomas, 149
 Cox, David, of Birmingham, 157
 Cox, Kenyon, 167
 Cranach, Lucas, the Elder, 114 f.
 Cranach, Lucas, the Younger, 114 f.
 Crane, Walter, 160
 Crome, John (Old Crome), 157
 Crome, John Bernay, 157
 Currier, J. F., 168
 Dagnan-Bouveret, P. A., 153
 Dahl, J. C., 173
 Dalsgård, C., 175
 Danish painting, 174 ff.
 Dannat, W. T., 167
 Dante, 97
 David, J. L., 130, 137, 147, 148
 De Camp, Joseph R., 167
 Decamps, A., 149
 Defregger, Franz, 123
 Degas, Edgar, 153
 Delacroix, Eugène, 147, 148 f.
 Delaroche, Paul, 149
 Delaunay, J. E., 150
 Denner, B., 116
 Diaz de la Peña, N. V., 151
 Dionisio Fiammingo (Calvaert), 126

- "Do not touch me" (*Noli me tangere*), by Duccio, 96, 174; by Edelfelt, 174
- Doelenstukken, 125
- Dolci, Carlo, 107
- Donatello, 125
- Dou, Gerard, 135 f.
- Duccio, 174
- Dupré, Jules, 151
- Duran. *See* Carolus Duran
- Dürer, Albrecht, 113 f.; contrasted with Holbein, 114
- Düsseldorf school, 120 f.
- Dutch Little Masters, 135
- Dutch painting, 131 ff.; of seventeenth century, 132 ff.; of eighteenth century, 136; of nineteenth century, 136 ff.; distinguished from Flemish painting, 125 f.
- Dyck, Antoon van, 128, 155
- Early Christian art, 93
- Eastlake, Sir C., 158
- Eckersberg, Christoffer, 174 f.
- Eckström, Per, 172
- Eclectics, school of, 106
- Edelfelt, A., 174
- Egyptian painting, 92
- Elzheimer, Adam, 115 f., 127, 144
- Engelbrechtsen, C., 131
- Eugen, Prince, 172
- Exhibitions, origin of modern, 146
- Exner, Julius, 175
- Eyck, Hubert van, 124
- Eyck, Jan van, 124
- "Factory Forge," by Menzel, 123
- Fahlkrantz, K. J., 171
- Fayum, paintings from, 93
- "Feast of Cleopatra," by Tiepolo, 107
- Fedotov, Paul, 169
- "Fêtes Gallantes," 144 f.
- Feuerbach, Anselm, 118, 121
- Filippino Lippi, 98 f.
- Filippo Lippi, Fra, 98 f.
- Finnish painting, 174
- Flemish painting, 124 ff.; of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 124 ff.; of seventeenth century, 126 ff.; of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, 129 ff.; distinguished from Dutch painting, 125 f.
- Florence, 96
- Fortuny, Mariano, 109, 142
- Fosberg, Nils, 172
- Fourment, Helene, 127
- Fra Angelico, 98, 180
- Fra Filippo Lippi, 98 f.
- French painting, 143 ff.; of seventeenth century, 143 ff.; of eighteenth century, 144 ff.; of nineteenth century, 146 ff.
- Fujiwara period of Japanese painting, 178
- Fuller, George, 165
- Furioso, Il (Tintoretto), 105
- Gainsborough, Thomas, 155, 156
- Gallait, L., 120, 122 n., 130
- Gallén, A., 174
- Gan-ku, 182
- Gebhardt, E. von, 123
- Gegerfelt, V. van, 172
- Genelli, B., 119
- Genoa, cathedral of San Lorenzo, 95
- Genre picture by Botticelli, 99
- Géricault, Théodore, 147, 148
- German painting, 110 ff.; of fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, 110 ff.; of late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 112 ff.; of seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 115 ff.; of nineteenth century, 117 ff.; contrasted with Dutch and Flemish painting, 112; contrasted with Italian painting, 110, 115
- Gérôme, J. L., 150
- Ghent (Gent), altar piece of, 124
- Gifford, R. Sandford, 166
- Giorgione, 104
- Giotto, 91, 96
- Giovanni Alemannus, 100
- Giovanni da Fiesole, Fra, 98
- Goltzius, engravings by, 132
- Gothic period of Italian art, 95 ff.
- Goya y Lucientes, F. J. de, 141
- Graff, Anton, 116
- Gran, Daniel, 116
- Greek painting, 92
- Greuze, Jean B., 145
- Guardi, F., 107
- Gude, Hans, 173
- Guido di Piero, 98
- Guido Reni, 107
- Hagborg, A., 172
- Hals, Frans, the Elder, 134
- Hammershøy, V., 176
- Harding, Chester, 165
- Harrison, Thomas A., 168
- Heian period of Japanese painting, 178
- Hellquist, K. G., 172
- Herkomer, Hubert von, 161
- Heyerdahl, H., 173
- Hills, Laura C., 167
- Hiro-taka, 179
- Hobbema, M., 134
- Höckert (Hoeckert), J. F., 171
- Hogarth, Wm., 156
- Hoku-sai, 181
- Holbein, Hans, the Elder, 113
- Holbein, Hans, the Younger, 113; contrasted with Dürer, 114
- Homer, Winslow, 168
- Hooghe, Pieter de, 133
- How*, the, *vs.* the *what* in art, 119
- Hunt, William Holman, 159
- Hunt, William Morris, 165
- Impressionism defined, 147
- Ingres, J. D., 148
- Inness, George, 166 f.
- Intellectual quality of Italian painting, 95
- Isham, Samuel, 164
- "Isle of the Blessed," by Böcklin, 122
- Israels, Josef, 137
- Italian painting, 95 ff.; Gothic period, 95 ff.; Early Renaissance (Quattrocento), 98 ff.; High Renaissance (Cinquecento) 102 ff.; seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 105 ff.; nineteenth century, 108 f.; influence of, on Dutch painting, 131; compared with German painting, 115
- Ivanov, A., 169
- Japanese painting, 177 ff.
- Jerusalem, hymns on the heavenly, 98 n.
- Juanes, Juan de, 139
- Jō-setsu, 180
- Juel, Jens, 174
- Kakemonos, 177
- Kakusa Okakura, writer on Japanese art, 178
- Kamakura period of Japanese painting, 178
- Kana-oka, 179
- Kano school, 181
- Kauffmann, Angelica, 117
- Kaulbach, F. A. von, 123
- Kaulbach, Wilhelm von, 119 f.
- Kensett, John F., 166
- Kiprenski, O., 169
- Klinger, Max, 122
- Knaus, L., 120
- Kneller, Sir G., 156
- Krohg, Christian, 173
- Kronberg, Julius, 172
- Kröyer, Per S., 175
- Krüger, Nils, 172
- Kyhn, Peter, 175
- "La Belle Chocolatière," by Liotard, 145
- Lancret, N., 145
- Landseer, Sir Edwin, 158
- Larsson, Carl, 172
- "Last Supper," by da Vinci, 103
- Late Venetians, 107
- La Tour, M. Q. de, 145
- Lawrence, Sir Thomas, 157
- Le Brun, Charles, 143
- Lebrun, Mme. É. Vigée-, 150
- Leibl, W., 122
- Leighton, F., Lord, 160
- Lely, Sir Peter, 155
- Lemoine, F., 145
- Lenbach, Franz von, 123
- Leonardo da Vinci, 103
- Lessing, K. F., 120
- Le Sueur, E., 143
- Levitski, Dmitri, 169
- Leyden, Lucas van, 131
- Leys, Hendrik, 130
- L'hermitte, Léon, 153
- "Liber veritatis," by Claude Lorrain, 144
- Liberi, Pietro, 107
- Liebermann, Max, 123
- Lindholm, L. A., 171
- Liotard, Jean Étienne, 145
- Lippi, Filippino, 98 f.
- Lippi, Fra Filippo, 98 f.
- Lochner, Meister Stephan, 112
- Loo, Carle van, 145
- Lorrain, Claude, 144, 157
- Lo Spagnoletto (Ribera), 106, 139
- Louis XIV, era of, contrasted with that of Louis XV, 145
- Lundbye, J. Thomas, 175
- Lundgren, E., 171

- Madou, J. B., 130
 Makart, H., 120 f., 172
 Malbone, E. G., 165
 Manet, É., 153
 Mannerists, school of, 105
 Mantegna, 101, 180
 Marées, H. von, 122
 Margarethe of Austria, 126
 Maris, Jacob, 137 f.
 Maris, Willem, 137 f.
 Marr, Carl, 167
 Marstrand, V., 175
 Mary of Burgundy, 126
 Masaccio, T., 98, 108, 180
 Masa-nobu, 180, 181
 Mason, G. H., 160
 Mata-hei, Iwasa, 181
 Mauve, A., 137
 Meiji period of Japanese painting, 179
 Meissonier, E., 149 f.
 Meister Stephan, 112
 Meister Wilhelm, 110
 Memling, Hans, 125
 Mengs, A. R., 116 f.
 Menzel, A., 122
 Mesdag, H. W., 138
 Messina, Antonello da, 100
 Metsu, G., 133
 Michel, G., 149
 Michelangelo, 102 f., 101, 180
 Mieris, Frans van, the Elder, 136
 Mieris, Frans van, the Younger, 136
 Mieris, Willem van, 136
 Mignard, P., 143
 Millais, J. E., 159
 Millet, J. F., 152
 Monet, Claude, 104, 153
 Monticelli, A., 154
 Moore, Albert, 160
 Mor, Antonis, 126
 Moreau, G., 154
 Morelli, D., 108
 Mori-kuni, 181
 Mori-nobu, 181
 Morland, G., 158
 Moro. *See* Mor
 Moro-nobu, Hishi-gawa, 181
 Moto-mitsu, 180
 Moto-nobu, 181
 Munich school, 120 f.
 Munthe, Gerhard, 173
 Murano, Antonio da, 100
 Murillo, B. E., 141
 Musée nationale des arts, 146
 Mysterienspiele, 112
 Naturalists, school of, 106
 Nazarenes, 119
 Neuville, A. de, 149
 Nielsen, A., 173 f.
 "Nolime tangere," by Duccio, 96, 174; by Edelfelt, 174
 Nordström, K., 172
 Norwegian painting, 172 ff.
 Oil technique, 100, 103, 124
 Ô-kiu, 182
 Orchardson, W. Q., 161
 Orlovski, A., 169
 Oulless, W. W., 161
 Overbeck, F., 118, 119
 Pacheco, F., 140
 Padovanino, Il, 107
 Padua, Arena Chapel, 97
 Pallavicini collection, 99
 Palma il Vecchio, 104
 Parrhasios, 92
 Pater, J. B., 145
 Paulsen, J., 176
Paysage intime, 147
 Perov, V., 169
 Persian painting, 92
 Perugino, Pietro, 101, 102
 Pesne, A., 144
 Petersen, E., 173
 Pettie, J., 161
 Philip II of Spain, 139
 Philip IV of Spain, 140
 Phillip, John, 161
 Pieneman, J. W., 137
 Piero, Guido di, 98
 Piloty, K. von, 120
 Pisano, Andrea, 97
 Polygotous, 92
 Popular school of Japanese painting, 181
 Potter, Paulus, 133 f.
 Pourbus, Peeter, 126
 Poussin, N., 143 f., 157
 Poynter, Sir E., 160
 Preller, Friedrich, the Elder, 119
 Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, 158 ff.
 Protogenes, 92
 Prud'hon, P. P., 150
 Puvis de Chavannes, P., 153 f.
 Quattrocento, explanation of, 96 n.
 Raeburn, Sir H., 157
 Raffaëli, J. F., 153
 Raphael, 102 f.
 Regnault, H., 150
 Rembrandt, 132 f.
 Renaissance, early, in Italy, 98 ff.; high, in Italy, 102 ff.
 Reni, Guido, 107
 Répin (Répine). *See* Ryepin
 Restlessness in Botticelli, 99
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 155, 156, 168
 Ribalta, F. de, 139
 Ribera, G., 106, 139
 Ribot, Théodule, 151
 Richter, L., 118
 Rincon, A. del, 139
 Rivière, B., 160
 Robbia, Luca della, 125
 Roman painting, 93
 Romanticists, Flemish, 130; French, 147; German, 119
 Romney, George, 156
 Room, first painting of an actual, 125
 Roos, J. H., 116
 Rosa, Salvator, 106 f.
 Rosen, Georg von, 172
 Roslin, A., 171
 Rossetti, D. G., 159
 Rottmann, K., 119
 Rousseau, Théodore, 151
 Rubens, Peter (Pieter) Paul, 127 ff.; contrasted with Botticelli, 127; influence of, on Velásquez, 140
 Rugendas, G. P., 116
 Ruskin, John, 155, 161
 Russian painting, 169 f.
 Ruysdael, Jacob van, 135
 Ruysdael, Salomon van, 135
 Ryepin, Ilya, 169
 St. Bernard of Cluny, 98 n.
 St. Dominic, order of, 97
 St. Francis, church of, in Assisi, 97; order of, 97; pictures of life of, 97
 St. Stephen, funeral scene of, 98
 Salmson, Hugo, 172
 San Lorenzo, cathedral of, in Genoa, 95
 Sánchez Coello, A., 139
 San-sestu, 181
 Santa Croce, church of, in Florence, 97
 Sargent, John Singer, 151, 167 f.
 Scandinavian painting, 171 ff.
 Shadow, Wilhelm von, 120
 Schöngauer, M., 113
 Scorel, Jan, 131
 Secessionists, 118
 Segantini, Giovanni, 109
 Sesshiū, 180 f.
 Shchedrin, S., 170
 Shijō school, 182
 Shiū-bun, 180
 Siena, 96
 Signorelli, 101
 Silva, de. *See* Velásquez
 Sinding, Otto, 173
 Skovgård, J., 176 ff.
 Skovgård, P. K., 175
 Skredsvig, C., 173 f.
 Smibert, John, 162
 Snyders, Frans, 129
 Sonne, J. V., 175
 Sō-tatsu, 181
 Spanish painting, 139 ff.; of seventeenth century, 140 f.; of eighteenth century, 141 f.; of nineteenth century, 142
 "Sprawl of legs," derisive term applied to some pictures by Correggio, 104
 Stephan, Meister, 112
Stimmung in pictures, 157
 Stuart, G. Charles, 163
 Subject and technique, importance of, 117 f.
 Sully, Thomas, 165
 Swedish painting, 171 f.
 Syerov, V., 169
 Symbolism, danger of, in art, 93
 Tan-yu, 181
 Tarbell, Edmund, 167
 Teniers, David, the Younger, 129
 Terburg, Gerard, 134
 Thaulow, Fritz, 173
 Theodorich of Prague, 110
 Three dimensions, 101
 Tidemand, A., 173
 Tiepolo, G. B., 107
 Timanthes, 92
 Tintoretto, J., 105
 Titian, 102, 104
 Tokugawa period of Japanese painting, 179
 Tolstoy, Count F., 169
 Tosa school, 180, 181
 Tour, M. Q. de la, 145
 Toyotomi period of Japanese painting, 179
 Troyon, C., 152
 Trumbull, J., 164
 Turner, J. M. W., 157 f.
 Ukiyo-yé, 181
 Unusual conditions in paintings by Correggio, 104; by Rembrandt, 133
 Van Dyck, Sir Anthony, 128, 155

- Van Marcke, Émile, 152
 Vargas, Luis de, 139
 Vasari, G., 94, 95, **106**
 Vase paintings, 92
 Velásquez, Diego de Silva y,
 140; proper spelling, 140n.
 Venetsianov, A., 169
 Vereshchagin, V., 169f.
 Verhagen, P. J., 129
 Vermehren, F., 175
 Vernet, Horace, 149
 Veronese, P., 105
 Vien, J. M., 148
 Vigée-Lebrun, Mme. É., 150
 Vinci, Leonardo da, **103**, 114,
 180
 Vouet, Simon, 143
 Wall paintings, 93
 Wanderjahre of German art-
 ists, 111
 Watteau, A., 144f.
 Watts, G. F., 160
 Wentzel, G., 174
 Werenskiold, E., 173
 Werner, A. von, 123
 West, Benjamin, 163
 Weyden, Rogier van der, **125**
 Whistler, J. McN., 91, **168**
 Wilhelm, Meister, 110
 Wilkie, David, 158
 Wilson, Richard, 157
 Winckelmann, J. J., 116
 Woodbury, Charles H., 168
 Wordsworth, remark of, con-
 cerning Sir Joshua Rey-
 nolds, 168
 Wouverman, P., 135
 Wurmser, N., 110
 Wyant, A. II., 166
 Yamato school, 180
 Zeuxis, 92
 Zorn, A., 172



Hist. of Art

40

- 1337 — Giotto
- 1440 — J. Van Eyck
- 1540 — { 1520 Raphael }
 { 1564 Michelangelo }
- 1640 — Rubens. 1st? } 1585
 } 1565
- 1740 — { 1721 Watteau }
 { 1764 Hogarth 1st }
- 1837 — Constable.

Suggested by Table I

1337
 1440
 1520
 1564
 1640
 1721
 1764
 1837

MEMCO LIBRARY 21
 .21W.
 FRESNO 15.
 N. S. CORR.

CRYSTAL
BOOK JACKET COVERS

IS DURAFOLD

PAVE 5