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Abstract

Charles M. Kurtz (1855-1909)

Aspects and Issues of a Cosmopolitan Career

by

Arleen Pancza Graham

Adviser: Professor Katherine E. Manthorne

Charles M. Kurtz, the first director of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, spent most of his life executing his personal motto, *Amorem Arti Promovere*, "To Promote the Love of the Arts." During his lifetime he worked as a journalist, the editor and publisher of the National Academy of Design's *Academy Notes*, the administrator of several circulating exhibitions and the director of the Art Department of the regional Southern Exposition in Louisville and the Annual St. Louis Exposition. He also served as the Assistant Director of Fine Arts for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago and the St. Louis World's Fair of 1904, working only with the occasional assistant rather than a full complement of curators, registrars, secretaries and a public relations staff. Despite the fact that his name endures nearly a century after his death, no biography or thorough study of his life has ever been written, probably because his personal papers were long thought to have been lost.

Considered in its entirety, Kurtz's career raises many issues about the changing nature of the art world in America. Although generally perceived to be a champion of American art, there is considerable evidence that suggests that Charles M. Kurtz's private motivation was perhaps not quite so much patriotic as it was pragmatic, pecuniary and personal. After the death of his
daughter in 1991, his carefully guarded correspondence was bequeathed to the Smithsonian Institution's Archives of American Art. They reveal that his interest in American art was influenced by a number of factors, including revisions to the tariff laws, exposure to foreign art and new opportunities to present contemporary art to the American public. Likewise, his interest and ability to act as a private dealer for those artists—both European and American—with whom he had cultivated a relationship is also discussed. Consequently, Charles Kurtz's vision was much broader and less biased than is usually thought. This study is a consideration of the various aspects of his career and its implicit impact on the art world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It suggests that Charles M. Kurtz should not be remembered solely for his contributions for the promotion of American art, but rather for fostering an appreciation of art in America.
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INTRODUCTION

Charles M. Kurtz [Fig 1], the first director of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, issued numerous personal invitations to the dedication of the new art institution in 1905. His boyhood friend, James D. Spriggs, responded with the following note:

You are getting so famous you will need a biographer ... You have practically created a new profession, the promoting of art.¹

Indeed Kurtz had spent most of his life executing his personal motto, Amorem Arti Promovere --- "To Promote the Love of the Arts," in a most public way. However, no biography or thorough study of his life, particularly as it relates to the art world of his time, has ever been written.² Some contemporary scholars know him as a journalist whose columns on the art of his day appeared in several New York newspapers. Others associate his name with Academy Notes which Kurtz published for nine years on the

1. Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Microfilm #4818 (505), letter from James D. Spriggs to Charles M. Kurtz. Hereafter the material cited from this collection will be indicated by AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers with the microfilm reel number along with the frame number, if legible, in parenthesis.

2. Robert Presnar, director of the Lawrence County Historical Society in New Castle, Pennsylvania, is the author of The Kurtz Family of Lawrence County, a 1993 study of Charles M. Kurtz's family. It is based on the three linear feet of boxed material that the Historical Society received by bequest after the death of Charles' daughter, Isabella. Until that time, the Historical Society did not have any material relating to the family in its collection, since the family chose to discard any material in New Castle when the family homestead was demolished in 1963. The fifty pages of text and photographs in Mr. Presnar's book that are devoted to Charles M. Kurtz are an invaluable guide to his biography and his relationship with his immediate family in New Castle. The author wishes to express her gratitude to Mr. Presnar for his cordial assistance in answering reference questions in relation to this paper during a visit there in the summer of 2000 and with supplying some of the photographs used as illustrations.
occasion of the National Academy of Design's Annual Exhibition. Still others have come across his name as an early organizer of circulating exhibitions that brought art to the developing cities west and south of the major East coast metropolitan areas and later to national and international expositions. Through his work for the Southern Exposition in Louisville, the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 and the St. Louis World's Fair of 1904, he is remembered as one of this country's greatest champions of American art. Upon his premature death five years later, he was mourned internationally and remembered by William Kennedy, one of the Glasgow artists he helped to promote, as not only a museum director, but also a man who had "the energy and power to carry out public schemes for the good of the world."3

Today Kurtz's popular reputation has dimmed somewhat, but among those who study the late nineteenth century in America, his name endures. Considered in its entirety Kurtz's career raises many issues about the changing nature of the art world in America as it entered the twentieth century. Along with the seemingly undeniable contribution of his public promotion of American art, there is also considerable evidence that suggests that Charles M. Kurtz's private motivation was perhaps not quite so much patriotic as it was pragmatic, pecuniary and personal. Was he really convinced that America's artistic expression had truly come of age? Upon superficial consideration of his own words, it would seem so:

All this, probably springs from the idea that, as Americans, we owe it to our country and to ourselves to develop a certain nationalism in our affairs. It is a reaction, following a century of slavish copying of other nations.4


4. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4822 (599), fragment of lecture note on 1884 stationary.
Yet despite Kurtz's professed nationalism, there were other factors at work that made it politic and prudent for him to support American art. In examining his personal papers, which were long thought to have been lost in a 1918 fire, it becomes evident that Kurtz's devotion to all things American was not without reservations. His numerous letters are filled with derogatory comments about Americans from other walks of life, their habits and education, as well as with the occasional barb aimed at others in the American art world. There was rarely a favorable comment about other parts of the country outside of New York. Other letters paint a picture of a man who was a capitalist at heart—albeit an aesthetic one—who favored a career as an art dealer, but yielded to pressure from his parents to follow a more distinguished occupation. Despite their qualms, however, Kurtz quietly indulged in selling art throughout his life, often borrowing money from his father to do so and proudly reporting profitable sales. His published writings reveal an early and

5 Approximately forty-three linear feet of papers relating to Charles M. Kurtz, were bequeathed to the Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution in 1991 after the death of his youngest daughter, Isabella S. Kurtz (1901-1991). When visited by Robert F. Brown, then New England Regional director of the Archives of American Art on June 22, 1988, Miss Kurtz explained that after her father's death, she remained in Buffalo with her mother and sister. A fire in their home in 1918 scorched many of their belongings and she implied that her father's personal papers no longer existed. She did not allow Mr. Brown access to stored material to ascertain that for himself. Apparently she followed a pattern of limited availability and indecision with many professionals in the art world about the disposition of the estate for many years prior to her death, which may in part account for the scholarly neglect of Kurtz. Afterwards, the papers were released to the Archives of American Art by the executor of the estate, Dann Stevens, Esq. of Buffalo, New York. When transferred, the papers were indeed scorched in some places, as were some paintings, but for the most part, quite legible. Except for a small amount of material, some of which is duplicated elsewhere in the Archives, the papers have been microfilmed on twenty-three reels numbered 4804 through 4826 and constitute the most complete record of Kurtz's career. A finding aid to that material, compiled by the author while on the staff of the Archives of American Art, appears as an appendix to this dissertation. It is also available on the Archives' web site: http://www.AAA.SI.edu. The author wishes to thank Robert Brown, Dann Stevens and Robert Presnar for their cooperation and assistance.
continuing interest in the tariff and its effect on the importation of art into the United States—a concern that is echoed in his personal correspondence.

The tax on imported art was of critical importance to Kurtz beginning with his first important position as director of the Art Department for the Southern Exposition and continuing through his travels for several international expositions and in his final post as a museum director. In all of these appointments, he was continually introduced to and involved with foreign artists and their work. As his connoisseurship and professional reputation grew, so also did the opportunities to increase his bank account by acting as an agent for the sale of foreign paintings in this country. It was through his initiative, for example, that the Glasgow School of art was introduced to America. Many of the paintings that were exhibited in North America were reported sold, only to enter Kurtz's personal art collection. Built on speculation with financial help from his father, it was the initial repository for many of these paintings before being written about and exhibited throughout the country. Along with his mentor and friend, the wealthy museum director Halsey C. Ives (1847-1911), he acquired some of the more interesting works from circulating foreign exhibitions, with the hope of increasing their own reputations as connoisseurs and investing in an inventory for possible future sales. In today's art world, this practice might seem unethical, but in late nineteenth-century America, a nation of capitalists and robber barons, the notion of conflict of interest did not seem to carry the stigma that it does today.

Regardless of Kurtz's personal business practices, he proved himself a valuable contact for artists, both American and foreign. That he was held in high regard by foreign artists is evident from the inscription on his final portrait [Fig. 2]. Painted just four days before his death by the noted Spanish artist, Joaquin Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923),
whose work was to be exhibited under Kurtz’s direction in Buffalo, it is dedicated "A mi
amigo Kurtz" as well as signed.6

Charles Kurtz’s activities selling domestic as well as foreign art had ramifications
other than satisfying his early, furtive ambition to be an art dealer. It also supplemented
his salaries throughout his career despite the impact of tariff reform, a major issue during
those years. Kurtz, his wife and daughters were accustomed to genteel surroundings and
often required separate abodes due to his frequent travels which generated extra expense.
As he noted publicly in one of his newspaper columns, the rising duty on imported goods,
particularly that generated by the McKinley Tariff, had personal ramifications for him by
increasing his living expenses. It also served to focus attention on the more accessible
American art in the mid to late 1880s as it became more expensive to import art from
Europe.

It is for the promotion of American art that Charles Kurtz is usually remembered.
It could be argued that he was not the first to promote American art on a large scale.
Albert Bierstadt (1830-1902), for example, promoted his "Great Pictures" which critics
like James Jackson Jarves and Clarence Cook took note of, although objecting to the
means by which they were being popularized.7 But Kurtz was not an artist nor solely a
critic, and his more neutral, low key position and sociable nature afforded him the ability
to collaborate with a cross section of people in the art world of his day and employ a

6. The 1909 oil on canvas, Portrait of Charles M. Kurtz by Joaquin Sorolla is now
in the collection of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York. It was a bequest
of Isabella S. Kurtz, the sitter’s daughter (sometimes written as Isabel or Isabelle).

7. See Nancy K. Anderson’s and Linda S. Ferber's aptly titled catalogue for the
Brooklyn Museum exhibition, Albert Bierstadt, Art and Enterprise, pp. 29-31. Kurtz’s
letters state that Bierstadt sought him out to discuss possibly promoting the artist’s
pictures, although they apparently never came to an agreement.
variety of business practices simultaneously to promote a picture, artist or exhibition.

Today, his promotional techniques would more likely be considered under the businesslike headings of advertising, public relations and museum administration. His promotional campaigns included using his personal contacts in the New York art world to successfully organize and manage a “blockbuster” art exhibition. He then generated interest in it as it circulated throughout the country by using his skills as a journalist. Kurtz used carefully placed articles in the press to increase public awareness and create a better market for the art he was promoting not by effusive “puffery pieces” but rather by descriptive, expository essays followed by reports of sales from the expositions he managed, even if it meant subsidizing a specific artist or group personally in order to influence the public and sell pictures. These carefully orchestrated endeavors were the work of just one man, working with only the occasional assistant and without curators, registrars, writers, researchers or secretaries, thus making his accomplishments all the more impressive.

Despite his contribution to American art, Charles Kurtz’s vision was much broader, and his personal taste less biased than is usually thought, as evidenced by the exhibitions he organized during his four year tenure as director of the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo. Kurtz’s accommodation of the tariff revisions in order to bring European art to America is indicative of his personal, more cosmopolitan attitude toward art. His personal papers include musings on the nature of beauty, and it is clear from his letters that it was not limited to American art. Though he never had a commercial gallery or established a place of business of his own, he became one of the more influential entrepreneurial figures to gain prominence in the art world of the late nineteenth century. A consideration of his career and its implicit impact on the art world both past and present reveals that Charles Kurtz should not be remembered solely for his contributions to the
promotion of American art, but rather for fostering an appreciation of art in America. This study, based on his personal papers, is accompanied by a finding aid to the Charles M. Kurtz Papers at the Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution that was compiled by the author and published on-line by the Archives. Together, they constitute the restoration of a legacy that has long been denied him. 

8 One example of such an oversite occurs in the recent catalogue for an exhibition organized by the Albright-Knox Gallery, *Circa 1900*, (Buffalo, N.Y.: Albright-Knox Gallery, 2001). In it, Helen A Raye gives a very competent and comprehensive overview of the period as it relates to various art forms and particularly to art in Buffalo. In the section of her essay entitled, “But Is It Art: Photography Comes Into Focus,” she discusses the early recognition of the Photo-Pictorialists through an exhibition at the Albright Art Gallery in 1907, but she makes no mention of Charles M. Kurtz, who was responsible for scheduling the exhibition there. Likewise, Kurtz’s name does not appear anywhere in the essay.
CHAPTER 1

A Bright, Unusual Spirit

Charles McMeen Kurtz (1855-1909) began his career as a writer, so it is fitting that the first professional biographical sketch that one reads of him appeared not in an art publication but rather in a periodical entitled *The Journalist*. As such, it may be more objective and descriptive than would have been found in an art column of the day.

Here is Kurtz of the New York Press Club. He is a man who loves a good friend, a good story, a good picture and a good time. He is very sanctimonious looking, in front of a camera, but when argument has to be riveted with emphasis, there is a dense and sulphuric picturesqueness in his remarks that is without successful competition. He is descended, on his father's side, from a Lutheran minister, who came to this country from Darmstadt in 1722 and settled in Philadelphia. Mr. Kurtz's extremely pious demeanor is therefore, perhaps, an inherited gift—though it does seem a long way back to the parson-ancestor. On the other side of the house, he claims descent from Nicholas Wilder, who fought in the battle of Bosworth Field.1

---

1. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4816 (978), scrapbook, anonymous clipping, undated “Mr. Charles M. Kurtz” from *The Journalist*. Because Kurtz was a dutiful son and husband as well as a meticulous and organized record keeper, some of the material, especially printed matter or his writings, can also be found in other repositories, the principal one being the Lawrence County Historical Society in New Castle, Pennsylvania. Those papers are referred to as the Kurtz Family Papers, as the majority of the material relates to D.B. Kurtz. There is also a group of Charles M. Kurtz papers in the Getty Archives in San Marino, California. That collection consists mainly of letters to his parents from the early years of his career. They were found at the bottom of a box of medals and coins that belonged to Kurtz and were sold to a coin dealer at the auction of Isabella Kurtz's estate and subsequently sold to The Getty Archives. The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers of Halsey C. Ives, also in the Archives of American Art, also contain a number of Charles M. Kurtz letters. That collection is designated as such, no individual frame numbers were assigned when the material was microfilmed.
Kurtz himself emphasized his distinguished American lineage when he gave an account of his ancestry to his wife, Julia:

I find that from Grandfather Wilder's mother we are descended from Elder Faunce of the Mayflower and have a grandmother who was a Bartlett! . . . my great-grandfather fought in the battle of Bunker Hill. So you see I can belong to all the Revolutionary Societies if I want to, even the most “contracted” and exclusive of them!²

These two early accounts of Kurtz' heritage—one describing the public persona and emphasizing his European roots and personable nature, the other his personal account, focusing on his more privileged American ancestry--in many ways foreshadow the dichotomy that informed his career. Although publicly viewed as a champion of American art, and raised in thoroughly genteel American circumstances, the private Kurtz also appreciated European elegance and old master painting as well as the more progressive continental art.³

Born on the 20th of March, 1855 in New Castle in western Pennsylvania to a wealthy but parsimonious lawyer, Davis Brooks Kurtz⁴ (1826-1906) and his wife, the former Julia

2. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4816 (141), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 29, 1898.

3. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4823, The Star Scrapbook. Kurtz states in a letter to his parents that he has pasted all of his columns for the newspaper into his scrapbook. It is the most reliable record of which unsigned columns he wrote, so the AAA will be used as the source for the citation. His columns for The Star included a two part series, Great Artists, Little Known, Men Likely to Succeed the Barbizon Painters in Favor” [Sept. 8, 1889] and “Some of the Men to Be Looked Up to in the Future” [Sept. 15, 1889]. Included in his discussions were Augustin Theodore Ribot (“A Modern “Old Master”), Louis Lhermitte, and Fritz von Uhde. Kurtz also wrote several disparaging articles about the heavily promoted exhibition of Millet’s The Angelus [(see The Star, Nov. 19, 1889 and Louisville Commercial, Dec. 15, 1889 both in Kurtz scrapbook, AAA #4823 (533 & 541)] comparing it with the more dignified showing of Rembrandt’s The Gilder at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in the Sunday, Nov. 17, 1889 issue of The Star [AAA #4823 (532)].
Wilder, Charles, the first of five children, was brought up in a large, Victorian style house [Figs. 3 & 4] that was a landmark in the community. The elder Kurtz argued cases against the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Standard Oil Company and in doing so increased not only his professional reputation but also his bank account. At the time of his death in 1906, D.B. Kurtz was reported to have left an estate of one million dollars, yet it was only the year before that he absolved his fifty-year-old son, Charles, from his accumulated debt of five thousand dollars along with the accrued interest. Charles' relationship with his mother may best be described in a letter that he wrote to his intended bride, Julia Stephenson, [Fig. 5] of Harrodsburg, Kentucky, in 1884:

My mother, I think would rather not have me marry at all, ever, --but feeling on her part would never amount to 'opposition'. She simply feels that my wife would be more to me than she is: and that is the whole matter. Of course, as I was the oldest of her children, she always made more of a companion of me:...Now I think she is simply a bit jealous of you, my dear:--but she will get over all that."

Charles' relationship with his parents remained cordial, though characteristically formal, after his October 1, 1885 marriage to Julia Stephenson (1861-1931) [Fig. 5], a physician's daughter, whom he met while working at the Southern Exposition in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1883. While he returned home to New Castle to visit from time to time, she rarely

4. Davis Brooks Kurtz is the correct spelling according to Robert A. Presnar, who has written the family's definitive biography, *The Kurtz Family of Lawrence County*. The elder Kurtz's name also appears as Davis Brook Kurtz and more often written as D.B. Kurtz.

5. The other Kurtz siblings included Louis T. (1863-1903), an attorney; Edward L. (Fritz) (1869-1962), a professor of mining at Columbia University; Emily, (1860-ca. early 1940s), an artist; and Catherine, (Kit) (1875-1947), a musician. None of them, except Charles, had any children who lived to adulthood and his two surviving daughters never married.

6. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4805 (1392), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, December 22, 1884.
accompanied him and spent much of her married life living with her family in Harrodsburg, Kentucky while Charles travelled, suggesting that perhaps Mrs. D. B. Kurtz never did get over her initial bout of jealousy.

Charles Kurtz's interest in art began at an early age. According to one biographical sketch, he painted a set of scenery for the New Castle Opera House when he was fifteen years old, which also underscores his life-long interest in music. A year later he painted a thousand sign-boards for a local firm in his free time after school and on Saturdays. At Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pennsylvania, where he matriculated in 1872, he pursued a scientific program of study that included courses in Mathematics, Natural Sciences, English, Philosophy and Modern Languages, particularly French and German. The practical nature of the curriculum served him well in his future endeavors. He particularly enjoyed chemistry and experimented with the interaction of elements and the glass etching process that foreshadows his later interest in photography. It was during his college years that the young man became interested in art as a profession and began drawing illustrations of the college campus which were sold as souvenirs by local

7 **Pandora** (Washington, Pa.: Washington and Jefferson College, 1904). 12. **Pandora** was the title of the College yearbook.


10 Kurtz developed both a personal and professional interest in photography. He mounted an exhibition of photographs of the American Indian (now in the Library of Congress) by Edward S. Curtis and photographs by the Buffalo Photo-Pictorialists in 1907 and was in the midst of planning a major photography exhibition at the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York at the time of his death in 1909. For a further discussion of Kurtz's interest in the subject and glass plate window transparencies see Sandra L. Underwood "Catching the Light," *Archives of American Art Journal*, 32, no. 4 (1992): 25-29.
merchants. When he told his father, who was concerned that his son was not focused on a professional career, of his artistic activities, D.B. Kurtz responded by saying that "I will not feel justified to furnish you with the means to improve and cultivate your taste for drawing."Nevertheless, his son was not deterred and applied for admission to and was accepted by the National Academy of Design in New York during his senior year in college. After graduating from Washington and Jefferson College in the spring of 1876, Kurtz visited the Centennial Exhibition which had just opened on May 10th in Philadelphia. While it is tempting to regard this early visit as the beginning of Kurtz’s involvement with expositions, there is little more than passing references to it in his correspondence. However subtle its effect on Kurtz, the Centennial International Exhibition of 1876 set the stage for his future career. In the words of historian Robert W. Rydell.

"For the next forty years, America’s upper classes, confronted by growing class unrest, would redouble the efforts begun at Philadelphia to speak with the voice of authority, “enunciate doctrine.” and affirm their cultural hegemony through the medium of international expositions." For the young Charles Kurtz, New York was not only a place to hone his skills as a draughtsman. It also provided a place to launch a career in commercial art by creating illustrations, advertisements, title pages for books and monograms. It would also enable him to pursue his interests in music and writing. Kurtz began his formal study of art at the National Academy with Lemuel E. WilmARTH (1835-1918) [Fig.6] and William Morgan

11. Presnar, 55. Kurtz to Davis Brooks Kurtz, October 29, 1875, In collection of Lawrence County Historical Society the letters cited in Presnar’s book are identified by date. Other unpublished archival material from the Lawrence County Historical Society is cited by the assigned acquisition number.


13. Presnar, 56.
Charles Kurtz's original intention of becoming an artist himself was tempered by reality. Although he exhibited his oil painting, *Voices From the Past* [Fig. 8] in the 1878 Annual Exhibition at the National Academy of Design, his poem, "A Too High Ambition," expresses his frustration at not being able to express himself successfully in a visual format.

I thought I would be an artist--
And many a day I passed
In the dim Academy cloisters
With many an antique cast
Whose outlines fairly mocked me
But whose stony charms would fade
In the breathing, blushing presence
Of many an earnest maid--
Who wrought in the gloomy alcoves
With crayon, charcoal and lead

---

14. Lemuel Everett Wilmarth was an American painter who trained at the Royal Academy, Munich and at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris. He was the director of the Brooklyn Academy of Design from 1868-70 and Professor in charge of schools of the National Academy of Design from 1870-90.

15. Du Bois Fenelon Hasbrouck (1860-1917) was an American landscape painter whose income was depleted by his constant dependence upon alcohol. Kurtz, believing he had marketable talent, became a kind of patron, especially during the 1880s, and commissioned and sold Hasbrouck's paintings.

16. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (615), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 15, 1886.
O'er many a graceful statue
Or splendidly modeled head
And these living charms would tempt e'en
My pencil to go astray—
Instead of the grace of the ancients
To picture the grace of today
But it did its great work so feebly
I threw it aside in despair
It could not put life in the features
Or light on the beautiful hair
And so I became discouraged
My crayons and pencils let fall
I could not put SOULS in my pictures
And that was the secret of it all!17

Kurtz's acknowledgement of his artistic limitations led to a return to New Castle that same year. It also launched his career as a journalist, when he accepted a temporary position with a local newspaper, the **Courant**, which had occasionally published his “New York Letters” between 1876 and 187818. Shortly thereafter, he edited and published The **Daily Reporter**, a small newspaper that covered the summertime revival meetings of the “National Camp Meeting For The Promotion of Holiness”. It is interesting to note that Kurtz’s motivation for concerning himself with these religious meetings was not his profound Christianity, but rather what he perceived to be the questionable aspects of the organization. He was particularly critical of the ministers who misrepresented religion for personal gain,19 a charge not unlike the criticism that Kurtz himself later received for selling paintings that were on exhibition for a commission. The **Daily Reporter** also published articles about politics and social issues but not art, giving credence to Kurtz’s

17 Presnar, 57. Kurtz frequently used all capital letters and underlining for emphasis in his writing. The transcriptions appear as they are in Kurtz’s original manuscripts.

18 AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823-2824. The scrapbooks in the collection contain the clippings of his early printed material.

19 Presnar, 58.
statement that he “threw away his palette and brushes and caught on with the new love.”

Of his earliest work as a journalist, Kurtz later wrote:

...In my overhauling of a box of papers, I came across two of my old “Camp Meeting papers” published in 1879... It seems right queer to me to read them over now. You may not think some of my “editorials” entirely orthodox,--still they were what I believed and to a certain extent believe now. One thing I can look back to with pride, and that is that my paper was thoroughly honest, according to my convictions, and it said exactly what I thought ...

Kurtz’s limited success with his newspaper, as well as his work as an editor during the winter months for the New Castle Guardian established his reputation as a journalist in western Pennsylvania, and three years after his 1876 graduation he was awarded an honorary Master’s Degree by his Alma Mater, Washington and Jefferson College. Later, in 1902, on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of Washington and Jefferson College, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred upon him “in recognition of distinguished ability and services as an art critic and writer.” The transition from a journalist for a local newspaper to a nationally recognized art critic and writer began with his return to New York in 1880 and a topic that would shape his career, the tariff on art, which will be considered in Chapter Five.


21. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, AAA #4806 (173), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, January 19, 1885.

22. Pandora, 15. As discussed in Chapter 9, Kurtz’s extensive use of the honorary appellation after this date caused controversy later in his career.
CHAPTER 2
A Newspaper Man

In 1880 Charles Kurtz returned to New York, determined to carve out a career in New York City, the place that would maintain a strong hold over him for the rest of his life. In writing about the City to his fiancee, Julia Stephenson, it becomes clear that for the ambitious Kurtz, New York was not only a fascinating place to live, but was also crucial to the success of his career:

There are so many congenial spirits here, and there is so much here that is interesting, beautiful and educational;—one can so much better keep abreast of the thought and action of the day;—he can grow so much more, so much faster, that I think I should rather live in New York in very moderate circumstances than be what is accounted rich in a smaller place. Besides I have an ambition to sometime be somebody;—a somebody not of a small place but of New York. I am ambitious in various ways, and I cannot help it, —though I know that the most comfortable, most placid, quiet, contented life is lived in a small place...I really envy the man who is philosopher enough to resolve to be happy and contented, at the sacrifice of racking ambition. I wish I could do it, but I cannot,—that is, I could do it, that is, I could not if I were obliged to give up all the various ambitions I have...And I have now more "ambition" than I have ever had before...I want to be wealthy, my darling, for your sake;1

An excerpt from an earlier letter2, written in rhyme in a lighter vein, while he was on the road, leaves no doubt that New York City, for him, also represented the epitome

1. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (69-70), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, January 3, 1885.

2. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (1115), Kurtz to “Sister Barchlow,” July 2, 1883. Charles Kurtz and his family used many nicknames for each other and in this case

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of American civilization. Like many others, Manhattan became his adopted home for most of his career. Kurtz’s pen produced articles for a variety of publications in New York. One of his earliest pieces appeared in the *New York Times*, on a subject that would inform much of his work in the next quarter century, the tariff. It was a timely topic, for Congress was then debating a proposal that would abolish the current ten per cent duty on foreign works of art that were imported to America. It was hoped that by so doing, the quality of American art would improve due to the increased competition from foreign artists. Kurtz’s piece, entitled “A Curious Protectionist,” argued that the best way to create a market for quality art in America was to impose a uniform tax rate which would not put valuable paintings at a price disadvantage and allow cheap inferior foreign art to enter more freely into the country, as the ten per cent tariff rate allowed.1 Kurtz’s stance on the tariff at this early stage in his career, differed markedly from art dealers in particular, who considered his idea somewhat unrealistic from a business person’s point of view. One Fifth Avenue dealer responded to him by writing, “If people have only reached the “trash” in their art development, let them buy trash. That is far better than buying nothing.”4

Although he seemed to have gotten off to an auspicious start, the twenty-four-year-old Kurtz became quickly frustrated with his new life in New York. Writing home to it is not clear to whom the letter was addressed. In it, he writes: “Oh, I long for the flesh pots of Gotham again. Why, did I leave civ’lization behind. A horrible havoc this makes with my brain: if I stay here much longer I’ll sure lose my mind. Four weeks, like a martyr, entombed alive, I’ve been in this village and still I survive: ‘Mirabile dictu’ I hear you repeat (and a native here asks if that’s something to eat). A week or ten days perhaps, longer I’ll stay, then pack up my pictures and hie me away . . . Then back to new York, and back to my pen, and back to the life of a human again . . .”


4. Presnar, 64.
his father on New York Press Club stationery later that month, Kurtz said:

I am utterly discouraged enough and tired and miserable enough to go home again; but—after all the hellishness I have been through, it seems as though things must take a turn soon. Besides it would be foolish to lose the advantages which I expect to derive from this club. ...Everybody tells me that my getting located is only a matter of time, but the big question that agitates me at present is “Won’t I starve to death or something before that “time” comes?"

In the Spring of 1881, Kurtz received what seemed to be the opportunity that he had been waiting for when he joined the staff of the *Truth* as a current events reporter. The publication had begun publication in 1879 and had as its masthead logo, “The Truth and Nothing But the Truth.” It was a daily morning newspaper of four pages, densely printed, with anonymously written articles on political topics that were written in a sensational style. The arts were not covered. Kurtz quickly became dissatisfied with his new position, not only because of his assignments but also because of the paper’s imposition of its particular point of view on his work. In May, he wrote to his father

...No matter how disagreeable a subject...if it needs an editorial I must write it, and write it too, according to the ‘ideas’ of the paper. The *Truth* office is a queer place, and they have some mighty funny ways of doing business over there."

Shortly thereafter, Kurtz resigned from the *Truth* and accepted a position writing about art for the *New York Daily Tribune*, founded by Horace Greeley, which had also employed the influential, mid-century critic, Clarence Cook. Perhaps mindful of Cook’s many negative reviews, Kurtz wrote in his private journal, “I am a critic, I have no opinion.” and he stayed on writing for the paper for the next three years, employing a descriptive, factual style rather than a vituperative one. His columns were often an account of his visits to artists’ studios and what they were working on, their seasonal comings and goings or interviews with them. Having stable employment left him free to

5. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (812), Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz January 22, 1880.

travel and to pursue other literary interests. It was also during the spring of 1881 that he
began planning his first trip abroad. His itinerary took him through England, Holland,
Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Italy and France where he visited both public and private
art collections. He also met Henry Blackburn, whose publications and success inspired
his own National Academy Notes, which Kurtz began to publish in 1881:

Last night we attended a lecture by Henry Blackburn of London, at the Academy.
Mr. Blackburn is the author of the Royal Academy Notes, Grosvenor Notes etc.,
published yearly in London, --after the style of which my own annual Art Notes
have been prepared. Mr. Blackburn, however, is the originator of the “Art Notes”
idea. I met him several times in London, three years ago, and lunched at his house
once. This morning I spent with him at his hotel...Last year he made about £3,000

7. The best record of his pieces (“Art Notes”) for the Tribune and The Star are his
own scrapbooks in the Archives of American Art, #4823. In one letter, dated August,
1889 (#4823, frame 233) Kurtz states, “I have kept everything I have done in my
scrapbook.” Kurtz’s income from Tribune writings from February 6–December 31, 1880
amounted to $797.45. By December of 1882, he reported to his parents that he was only
earning $4.35 per week and so resigned his position. Kurtz also had a serious interest in
musical theater and in 1882 he accepted a position with a new daily paper edited by John
C. Freund from January 1882 through September 1883, originally called Music and
Drama, A Review of the Stage, Art, Literature and Society. Kurtz, who had a strong
interest in musical theater and was writing his own “comic opera,” continued to go to the
Tribune office once a day for free lance assignments dealing with the visual arts.

Music and Drama, A Review of the Stage, Art, Literature and Society was a late
19th century publication that changed its name and format (from daily to weekly) several
times during the course of its run. It was also titled Music, A Review (Jan.–April, 1882),
Music and Drama, A Review (April, 1882–Sept. 1883), and Weekly Music and Drama, A
Review (Jan.–May, 1883). It is difficult to determine what Kurtz wrote for Music and
Drama since some of the clippings in Kurtz’ scrapbooks do not have a complete
identification as to the original place and/or date of publication. According to a New
York State Library World Catalog search, a complete edition of the publication is not
extant. Some issues (August 12, 1882–June 16, 1883) are available in the scrapbooks of
the Carl V. Lachmund Papers at the New York Public Library. Lachmund, a New York
writer on musical affairs, wrote for Music and Drama while he was visiting Germany in
these years.

8. AAA. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #1744, Kurtz Inventory Book, p. 157 for
chronology in Kurtz’ own hand. This information can also be found in other
contemporary published biographical sketches e.g. The Journalist, AAA, C.M.Kurtz
Papers, #4816, scrapbook.
out of his *Academy Notes*. When my book pays me $15,000 a year, I shall begin to look for "a house and lot" on a pleasant avenue.9

When he returned home, Kurtz realized that there was an ever increasing audience for art in the United States who wanted more than basic entries for each art work in an exhibition. In the *National Academy Notes*, he established a format that included descriptions of the principal pictures along with illustrations sketched by the artists themselves, and offered the catalogue for sale in cities outside of New York through well placed advertisements in art publications, Kurtz was able to stimulate interest in American art outside the radius of New York City as well as to inform visitors to the National Academy’s annual exhibition. The initial critical reception of *National Academy Notes* was favorable, as indicated by this excerpt from a review of the publication.

Mr. Charles M. Kurtz, one of the most efficient members of the reportorial staff of *The New York Tribune*, is the editor of the timely "American Academy Notes, 1881" containing illustrations of one hundred and twenty-two of the principal pictures in the fifty-sixth annual exhibition of the National Academy of Design. Mr. Kurtz has made an attractive and valuable catalogue, and modestly presents it "with a view of describing the pictures rather than of criticising them."10

Funded through a limited number of advertisements, the publication was valuable to Kurtz’s early career for establishing him in the New York art world rather than for the financial revenue it provided. *National Academy Notes* acquainted him with a large number of American artists and their work and he might have continued to publish it had his personal circumstances not changed.11


Upon his return home, Kurtz parlayed his travels into a column of "Art Notes" each week in the *Tribune*. He also accepted other freelance assignments, most notably the preparation of several descriptive *Illustrated Notes* handbooks published from 1881-82 for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. It was during the summer of 1882 that Kurtz began to understand the power of the press. In July, he accompanied his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Shubal Wilder, to the docks where they were to board ship. They were told that the state room which they had reserved was not available. In attempting to help with the problem, Charles said he was on the staff of the *Tribune*, whereupon the ship's representative left and then promptly returned with the key for the disputed room. In writing to his father about the incident, Kurtz commented, "I think they take care of the newspaper fellows--they don't like a racket." Just four years later, he was able to harness that power to help his friends, the artists DuBois F. Hasbrouck and William Morgan. In 1886, Hasbrouck thanked Kurtz for his favorable press.

The papers in which you gave me a nice send off came duly to hand. Also the one sent before in which you gave Inness a good notice. I thank you very much for all this "ink" and hope that I may be able in time to do as much for you.

---

12. *The Journalist*, 21 August, 1886, p. 18. The column is also found in AAA Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4816 (998), clippings scrapbook. Here it should be noted that the card catalogue of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Watson Library does not list Kurtz as the author of any of the Museum's catalogues. Between the years of 1881-90, there were general catalogues of loan exhibitions as well as of the museum's collection that were published each year which may have been compiled by Kurtz. In 1885, a three volume catalogue of the Cesnola Collection of Cypriote Antiquities (MMA fiche #148) was published. Kurtz became very well acquainted with Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832-1904), director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art from 1878 to 1904. Cesnola excavated the first known works of antique art from Cyprus in 1865. It is likely that references to work for the Museum in 1885 refers to the preparation of these catalogues for the Cesnola collection.


14. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, AAA #4807 (1122), Hasbrouck to Kurtz, October 19, 1886.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
William Morgan (1826-1900), Kurtz's former teacher at the National Academy of Design School, who was struggling financially, also realized the tremendous influence a favorable article could have upon sales. Just three days after Hasbrouck's note, Morgan wrote:

"...your telegram of tonight--offering $400 for the picture--proves that the "article" has been effective. What a power in the press for good or evil! I am overwhelmed by your giant efforts to boost me. If, after all the puffing I have in my time been favored with, I do not float into the most real success...I am very much indebted to you for your championship."

Although one might be tempted to read this as a kind of nepotism exercised on behalf of old friends and colleagues, Kurtz's endorsement of Morgan, an academic painter, and Hasbrouck, a landscape painter, seems to be in keeping with his personal taste in pictures. In 1883, he wrote an account of his visit to the Statue of Liberty Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition, which was on view at the National Academy of Design, and provided an insight into his reaction to the European paintings owned by American collectors at that time:

"The Bartholdi Reception was very interesting, but I did not care a great deal about the Loan Exhibition itself. The pictures are nearly all of the "impressionistic" order, and, in the main, are very unsatisfactory (to me)—though there are a few notable exceptions. There are two of those exquisite Corots, several fine Daubignys, two or three good, and one or two exceedingly bad pictures by Jean François Millet and so forth. The tapestries, embroideries, laces and bric-a-brac exhibited are very fine, but they are badly arranged and the interior of the Academy has a decided resemblance to a big bazar. [sic] As I walked from gallery to gallery, I could hardly help looking for a little jew to slip out somewhere and come to tell me how "cheap" everything was, and what "bargains" he could give me."

15. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, AAA #4807 (1124), Morgan to Kurtz, October 22, 1886.

16. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (1268) Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, December, 1883, p. 5. See also: Maureen C. O'Brien, In Support of Liberty: European Paintings at the 1883 Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition. The Pedestal Fund Exhibition opened on December 3, 1883 and remained on view four weeks. It was a benefit exhibition intended to raise funds for the base, designed by Richard Morris Hunt, on which Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi's Statue of Liberty would rest. During that time over..."
Kurtz's apparent disdain for French impressionist style paintings may have been overstated. Given the diversity of styles presented, there were few that could be called "impressionist" in the current sense of the term. His reaction may have been partially shaped by his realization that he could not afford to engage in buying and selling European pictures because he did not have the financial means, travel opportunities, or linguistic abilities to access them directly. In addition, the public, democratic venue in which he viewed the paintings undoubtedly colored his reaction. Barely two weeks later, he wrote an enthusiastic account of his attendance at an extravagant reception hosted by William H. Vanderbilt [Fig. 9], which included Millet's celebrated painting, *The Sower* (c. 1850, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) along with one hundred and sixty-eight other mostly nineteenth century, European paintings: [Fig. 9]¹⁸

Last Thursday I attended Mr. Vanderbilt's Art Reception...Mr. V entirely remodelled his galleries last summer, and although they seemed to have reached the acme of magnificence before, they are far handsomer now. Besides he has added many new pictures, including a Turner that is as fine as anything in the National Gallery in London: it is the most wonderful piece of coloring I have ever seen. The whole house was thrown open to the guests, who could wander from one room to another as they chose. There was a splendid lunch served in the immense dining room, an excellent orchestra played all evening in a little balcony between the Art Gallery and one side of the central court of the house, and everything was as "unreal" and fairy-tale like as it was possible to make it...there is

40,000 visitors viewed the 194 works of seventy modern European artists on loan from New York's private collections and dealers. Most of the works were French in homage to the gift of the *Statue of Liberty* by the French people and also in acknowledgement of the influence that French art had on American art of the nineteenth century.

17. Although paintings by Hilaire Germain Edgar Degas and Edouard Manet were prominently placed in the main gallery due to the personal interest in their work by William M. Chase, an organizer of the exhibition, they were the only two impressionists among the seventy artists whose work was on view. The majority of the 19th century French pictures that were exhibited would today be classified as Barbizon, and featured works chiefly by Jean-Baptists-Camille Corot. There were also examples of work by Romantic, Realist and Academic French painters. The Dutch Hague School was also well represented.

nothing, I think to compare with it in the world! I have been through nearly all of
the royal palaces in Europe, and they are really rather commonplace in comparison
to this. Everything is in the most exquisite taste; not Mr. Vanderbilt’s taste,
probably, but that of the man to whom he gave carte blanche to furnish him the
most magnificent palace in the world. His pictures—probably the finest collection
of modern paintings in existence—were all bought for him by the best connoisseur
probably in America, --Mr. S. P. Avery.19

Later in life, his reputation firmly established and his taste more inclined to favor
the “impressionistic order.” Kurtz too acknowledged what he had known since the mid-
1880s and his feud with the American Art Association—the power of the press and of an
art critic:

An art critic has power in proportion to the esteem in which his abilities are held by
the people and this power he should consider delegated to him to be used only in
the discharge of legitimate duty.20

Kurtz was very clear about differentiating between an art critic and a writer whose
topic is art. In undated notes entitled “Critics Criticised” (sic) Kurtz wrote:

Most of them have no system. They criticize the language and say nothing of the
idea, which is greater than the mere words. Because a writer uses excellent
language, full of bright thoughts, sparkling, effervescent wit, keen sarcasm,
exquisitely drawn figures and mellifluous adjectives—all published in the editorial
pages of an influential metropolitan journal—it should not be taken for granted that
he knows something about art, unless all this language covers some coherent art
idea which the writer is able to explain and does explain.21

19 AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (1295), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson.
December 25, 1883. Samuel Putnam Avery (1822-1904) will be discussed in relation to
Kurtz’s career in Chapter Four.

20. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, AAA #4822 (915), miscellaneous, undated writings
and lecture notes. From 1893-1909, Kurtz lectured frequently, particularly in St. Louis to
promote the various expositions he was associated with and later in Buffalo in his
capacity as museum director. His papers at the Archives of American Art include the text
and/or invitations for fifteen lectures and incomplete notes for several more. The topics
range from Early American Artists (1892-4) and Impressionism (1893-4) to The Glasgow
Painters (1901) Pan-Islamism (1907) and The Influence of the Fine Arts (undated).

21. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4822 (914). miscellaneous, undated notes
and writings.
He also made a distinction between pieces he wrote to support himself and those that he penned for artistic, promotional or other purposes. Writing to his fiancee, Julia Stephenson, in 1885, he said:

Yesterday afternoon I wrote some "garbage" for the *Courier-Journal* which you will see in today’s paper, signed "Veuve Cliquot"—You know I used that same signature somewhat two years ago.

What Kurtz meant by "garbage" is never explained, but may be deduced from the article that he refers to in his letter, which appeared in the *Courier Journal* of August 19, 1885, under the title "A Critical Discussion of Some of the Exposition Pictures." Writing under the pen name, Veuve Cliquot, he began the piece with a general review of the American art exhibited at the 1885 Louisville Exposition, noting that both older, established artists and younger men trained in foreign ateliers are represented. He believed that one of the first things to impress a visitor to the Exposition Art Gallery was the variety of subjects represented.

A few years ago the average exhibition of American pictures was little more than a collection of landscapes. Few of the painters essayed figure subjects, and fewer did them well. Eastman Johnson, J. G. Brown, Seymour J. Guy and perhaps three or four others comprised the whole group. There were few marine painters. De Haas was incomparably the leader among them, and, Quartley, Edward Moran and Bricher were about the only other representatives of that branch of art. There were some good portrait painters, and several of the landscape painters had achieved a certain amount of success in painting animals; the animal painters, strictly speaking, there were none. In the very early days there were artists in America whose work compared well with that done by their contemporaries abroad; but at the period of which I write, say ten or twelve years ago, American art—except in the single department of landscape painting—was away below par, as considered along with the art of the rest of the world.

In landscape, however, American artists have always held good position, fairly even with their brethren abroad. ... The Art Gallery this year contains a wide range

22. The *Courier-Journal* is a Louisville, Kentucky newspaper for which Kurtz wrote pieces on the art exhibited and sold at the annual Southern Exposition to promote attendance.

23. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (892) Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, August 19, 1885. Kurtz used the pseudonym, "the widow Cliquot" several times during this period of his career.
of subjects and these subjects are treated from widely differing points of view, both in regard to interpretation and technique.24

At this point, Kurtz considered "subjects of a given class together, thus enabling one to discuss methods and institute comparisons the more readily and effectively." He began with landscapes, specifically "one of the most satisfactory landscapes in the gallery."

*Evening* by D. W. Tryon:

From a thoroughly artistic point of view, one of the most satisfactory landscapes in the gallery is No. 354—"Evening"—by D. W. Tryon. In this picture the artist has not sought to give us a literal transcription of everything in the landscape; instead he has striven to convey the spirit of the scene and in this he has succeeded most admirably. Stand off from the picture the proper distance, and note the fullness and richness of color, the glowing yet quiet and tender light in the sky in which the crescent moon has risen, the shining pool of real water in the foreground, the house peeping through the trees in the middle distance—adding something of human interest; observe the exquisite harmony in it all, the strength and at the same time the delicacy, both of the impression and expression. And then, if you have an artistic soul—but not otherwise—walk up close to this picture, and see how simply and directly the artist has rendered for us this splurge of color, no meretricious striving after effect. The artist has simply, on the spur of the moment, painted what he saw and with it the feeling that was in his soul. One who neither understands Nature nor Art will not like the technique in this picture. It is not a rendition of "prettiness" which anybody can understand; it is an expression of subtle beauty which appeals to the souls of those who look below the mere surface. It is a serious, honest, feeling piece of work.25

What makes this particular piece of "garbage" interesting is the notation, in Kurtz's hand, that appears alongside this section of his column in his scrapbook:

"Afterward I bought this." As in the case of his earlier writings which he used to promote his artist friends, William Morgan and F. DuBois Hasbrouck, Kurtz clearly recognized the value of using the press and some well placed articles to help publicize paintings. In this case, the "garbage," like the "puffery pieces" of earlier generations, clearly enhanced the value of and esteem for a painting that Kurtz himself purchased. Just three months later, he wrote to his father about the Tryon stating that he had in his possession "the best


25. Ibid.
landscape painted, thus far, in America.”

It does not seem to have remained in his possession for any length of time, for his inventory books listing works included in his collection at various points in time make no mention of it. Kurtz had effectively harnessed the power of the press both to promote the love of art and to sell his paintings. Throughout the rest of his career, he made a distinction between the “garbage” he wrote merely out of financial need or for promotional purposes and those that he wrote for readers seriously interested in art. One example of the latter was a poem that he had published in *The Journalist Souvenir*, a book commemorating the third anniversary of that weekly magazine which was the organ for the New York Press Club:

To A Lady Student of Art

Hail all to Art—man’s best interpretation
Of language God through Nature doth express;
Success attend, and sweetly sound the voices
Which speak to Art’s beloved Priestesses.

May your interpretations all be pure,
And earnest as your nature and the mind
That guides your brush to give your thought expression
Then Art through you new nobleness shall find.

And when your life has reached its culmination
And mists of death sweep thick before your eyes,
May sunshine from life’s pictures pierce the darkness,
And light your home eternal in the skies.

For in the end e’en God shall view the pictures
Our lives have formed each individual day,
And by the justice of His solemn judgment,
Eternally they’ll point each artist’s way.


27. Charles M. Kurtz, “To A Lady Student of Art,” *The Journalist Souvenir*, New York, 1887, p. 43. Although there is no dedication, it is likely that the poem was inspired by Kurtz’s sister, Emily (1860-1947), who came to New York to study art in 1883, initially with William Morgan, and in 1889 continued her studies in Paris. She was estranged from her family after 1906 when she brought suit to settle her father’s estate so that she could receive her inheritance and live in the bohemian life style to which she had become accustomed.
Although Kurtz enjoyed the ambiance of the New York Press Club where he was a member and frequently retreated there after a day spent visiting artists' studios or attending auctions to write, he placed journalists below authors in the hierarchy of the literary world. Throughout his life, Kurtz wrote various types of literature, including short stories and poems for both children and adults, although he had little success in having them published. His regard for literature is evidenced by a letter he wrote about his election to the Fellowcraft Club in 1889:

I have been elected to membership in the Fellowship Club [sic], and I think it will prove to be very advantageous in extending my acquaintance among the most desirable literary people. Richard Watson Gilder, Editor of the Century Magazine, is President, and most of the most prominent literary men in the city are members. The "Press Club" is a journalists club but the Fellowcraft is rather an author's club. It has a very pretty house in Twenty-Eighth Street near Broadway.

Kurtz's personal literary aspirations rested primarily on the hope of publishing two libretti for comic operas, a reflection of his long standing interest in music and literature. Entitled The Aldermen of Man-hat-tan (copyright 1889) and The Cannibals (1891), they were social and political satires. In his search for a composer, he even contacted the famed Englishman, Arthur Sullivan (1842-1900), but he never did find a musician interested in scoring his work nor did he find an impresario willing to stage them. This was partly due to the fact that they ill timed. His 1889 New York City inspired opus,

28. The Fellowcraft Club was organized in March of 1888. According to its constitution, it was formed to "promote social intercourse among journalists, artists and men of letters." The number of resident members was limited to three hundred. By 1890, its resident members included wealthy figures such as Nicholas Biddle, Harrison G. Fiske, the publisher, Richard Watson Gilder, Robert Underwood Johnson, Jonathan Sturges, Charles A. Watrous and Kurtz's close friend Chauncey C. Starkweather, an independently wealthy journalist. Among the non-resident members was the artist, Rufus F. Zogbaum of Highland Falls, New York.

29. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4809 (1516), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 14, 1889. See also: Fellowcraft Club of the City of New York, Constitution, By-laws, House Rules, Officers and Members (New York: The Fellowcraft Club), 1890.
which required a certain knowledge of local politics to appreciate, was completed as the
taste for European things in America was on the rise. As the historian Robert H. Wiebe
has noted, after 1877 America was transformed from a land of “island communities” to a
nation where organized, cosmopolitan interests held sway. Kurtz himself was an example
of what Wiebe described as the “new middle class”—confident, sophisticated and
educated—that had sought “to remake the world upon their private models.”30 However,
he chose to write about indigenous, domestic issues that only a New Yorker could
appreciate. Despite their cosmopolitan format, the topics rendered his work passe.

I heard last night from my opera. M’Caull will not take it. Stevens said he
thought it was very bright, witty etc., but that they did not dare attempt anything
of a “local” nature, and moreover that there was a prejudice against anything
American that was perhaps thoroughly unreasonable, but that they had to
recognize.31

Kurtz resigned from the Tribune on December 23rd, 1882, to write for the new
daily paper, Music and Drama, and to develop an idea for his own weekly paper. Kurtz
titled his nascent publication, American Art News, and intended to publish it every
Wednesday. As is evident from the notations on Kurtz’s proposed layout for the first
issue planned for February 5, 1883, it would have featured an article on and etching by
an artist who was a National Academician32. However Kurtz’s project was put aside in

30. Robert H. Wiebe as quoted in Richard L. McCormick, “Public Life in
Industrial America,” The New American History (Philadelphia: Temple University Press,
1990): 94.

31. Here he refers to John A. McCaull, impresario of the McCaull Opera
Company which traveled across America. Col. McCaull, as he was known, was born in
Kentucky and had served as a Confederate officer before becoming a lawyer in Baltimore.
During the 1880’s, McCaull became known as “the father of comic opera in America.”
Kurtz claimed, McCaull said his comic opera was the “best he had seen by an American.”
See also Presnar, 73.

32. The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, San
Marino, California Special Collections, Charles M. Kurtz Papers. A mock up of the first
page of the inaugural issue in Kurtz’s hand indicates his intentions. However the project
never materialized.
favor of another, more lucrative post, that of general manager for the American Art Union.

Kurtz explained the premise for the relatively short lived organization in an article in the *Tribune* in 1883:

The new society of artists--*The American Art Union*--at the head of which is Mr. Daniel Huntington, embodies an excellent idea. It can hardly fail to bring the people of this country to a better realization of the merits of American painters. The managers of the Union intend to hold exhibitions in various cities, East and West, to display the works of the members of the society. In this way, the artists can offer their pictures to the public for admiration or sale without the intervention of middlemen, and without showing the commercial spirit which is so disagreeable to their taste. Whether or not the financial results prove to be all the managers hope, the Union will undoubtedly be the means of increasing the general art culture of this country.33

D.B. Kurtz apparently agreed with his son's decision to accept the position and responded favorably to it:

The Union (is) apparently acting very fairly and (is) giving you a reasonable salary--Do hope the enterprise will prove a success, and that you may have a permanent connection with it. This gives you an opportunity to develop your taste and talent for art literature.34

Like the earlier institution of the same name,35 the new American Art Union had an auspicious beginning, but it was one that was relatively short-lived. The organization depended upon subscribers, who also received a season ticket to view permanent exhibitions at the gallery; an annual etching; the illustrated monthly magazine, *The Art Union*; and a vote as to the manner of disposal of purchased works of art.36 Charles Kurtz


34. Presnar, 63.


36. See *The Art Union* magazine, 1, no. 1 (January, 1884) for a thorough description of the organization's mission statement and member benefits.
described its physical space in a letter shortly after the New York gallery, located at 44 East 14th Street, opened:

Our Art Union formally opened its galleries with a reception which was attended by many pleasant people. We have a couple of very pretty galleries, and some fairly good pictures. At night the gallery is lighted with electric light, and is very pleasant and attractive indeed.37

His responsibilities as editor of the magazine began in 1884 and occasionally allowed him to express his opinions about current issues, such as the tariff, and introduce themes that he would return to again in future publications.38 In the Art Union, there also appears the first public acknowledgement of the ill health that plagued Kurtz throughout his adult life. In the double issue, published for October-November, 1884, is the following notice. "Owing to the illness of the editor... it was impossible to get out our October number on time."39 Charles Kurtz had been subject to severe, increasingly debilitating attacks caused by a kidney disease since his college days. As he grew older, the attacks increased in frequency and resulted not only in his having one kidney surgically removed in 1899, but also in his dependence upon strong, narcotic drugs in the decade that preceded his death in 1909.40

As general manager of the American Art Union, Kurtz edited the magazine, put in long hours at the Art Union's Galleries, and arranged for travelling exhibitions. He

37. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 1299-1300), letter, p. 11.

38. The Art Union I, no 2 (February, 1884) includes his signed piece "Art Criticism" (p.44), an unsigned article on the previously mentioned publisher, "A Talk By Henry Blackburn" (p.46) and “Frauds in Art” (p.38) which is the precise title of a series of articles Kurtz wrote while writing for The Star, [see AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (486 & 497) for articles from Sunday, 25 Aug. and 1 Sept., 1889].


40. See AAA, Kurtz Papers, #4816 (953) poem by Charles M. Kurtz, "To My Departed Kidney", October 27, 1899. There are also numerous references to his health and the medication he used to obtain relief in his correspondence.
shipped the pictures, supervised the hanging of the exhibition and prepared the catalogue. He also arranged for sales of the paintings from the exhibitions. As the first issue of the magazine notes,

One of the objects of the American Art Union was that the society should be the medium between several exhibition associations. Movements have been started in a number of cities recently to establish permanent Art Galleries: Cleveland, Detroit, Nashville, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Milwaukee. The Louisville, Ky. Public Gallery, established through the American Art Union, is doing well.  

His first effort for the Art Union was successful and it was reported that by May of 1884, of the one hundred and thirty-five pictures originally shown in the New York City exhibition, thirty-nine were sold totaling $16,475.  

The large collection of paintings exhibited in Buffalo, New York and Louisville, gained Kurtz valuable experience as an arts administrator. The Art Union magazine reported that the Southern Exposition in Louisville was visited by one million people. The following year, he also acted as temporary editor for the Art Union magazine. However it was not long before it was apparent that the survival of the organization was as questionable as Charles’ hopes for a successful career in New York. His father, ever hopeful that Charles would return home and pursue a professional career--


42. *Art Union*, II, no. 5 (May, 1884): 113.

43. *The Art Union*, I, no. 1 (January, 1884): 23. The magazine reported that one of the objects of the organization was that the society should be the medium between regional exhibition associations interested in establishing permanent collections and artists. Louisville purchased fifteen pictures as the nucleus of a public art gallery from the Southern Exposition and it was reported that “The Louisville Kentucky Public Gallery, established through the American Art Union is doing well.” (p.24).

preferably in his own law firm—planted the seeds of doubt about continuing in his present position.

It does seem however to me, from all appearances, that the prospect for any lucrative employment or business in New York in the near future is not very flattering. The Art Union Magazine’s success, or the want of it rather, will not warrant the expectation of its surviving the current year, even if it should continue that long. Should its publication be discontinued, even though the Art Union itself should survive, is there any probability of an engagement with that association in any capacity, that should be very remunerative. Outside of that there is nothing in reporting for the press—basic experience in the former would scarcely warrant its repetition. and while the latter might be self sustaining, it would not assure much beyond that. Of course I would fain hope far better things for you, but of such there is uncertainty, if ever a reasonable probability. This is not intended for your discouragement but rather—as you express a preference to spend the winter in New York to induce you to look the prospect squarely in the face that you may fully anticipate its difficulties, and the better prepare yourself to meet them…By the way, you failed to mention whether you have succeeded in collecting any of their arrears for your services.45

Charles was indeed successful in collecting the salary due him, but not before his resignation from that post at the close of 1884. His departure proved ominous both for the institution and for himself. The artist, J. Jay Barber (1840-after 1905), voiced his concern to Kurtz in an 1885 letter:

Is the American Art Union a collapsed institution? It kind of looks so to me, for if they do nothing this year they can’t expect to do any more next year. I may be mistaken not knowing all the circumstances and hope I am. …I don’t like the idea of your having given up the editorship of that magazine. The new man may be a good one but I know his predecessor was and would rather keep him.46

Although it took until July of 1886 for the Art Union to settle its indebtedness to Kurtz,47 he had long since moved on to another position with the American Art

45. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers. #4805 (768-773). D.B. Kurtz to Charles M Kurtz, October 23, 1884.
46. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (1069), J. Jay Barber to Kurtz, September 9, 1885.
Association, which proved to be the most contentious of his career. Kurtz had been approached by Thomas E. Kirby, a founder of the newly formed enterprise, in January of 1884 about the possibility of Kurtz taking charge of their galleries:

This morning I received a note from Mr. Kirby, of the American Art Association—which has recently fitted up new art galleries in this city at an expense of nearly fifty thousand dollars—inviting me to call upon him “on a matter of business.” I went as a matter of course, and Mr. Kirby told me that the Association wished to talk with me concerning the possibility of my taking charge of their galleries and general art business. After the great “Prize Exhibition” which is to be held in March, the Association proposes to exhibit its pictures in half a dozen of the principal cities of the country—for say a month at a time—and it would like to arrange that I take charge of and go around with these out-of-town exhibitions, attending to the packing and shipment, the supervision of the hanging, the preparation of the catalogues, arrangement of sales and so forth.

I asked Mr. Kirby what proposition the Association had to make me. He replied that he did not know: that I must think the matter over and inform them what salary I should expect for my services...Now in case the Art Union does not continue, my acceptance of this position involves several considerations:

Considering the possibility of my going into the art business myself, after awhile, it might be very advantageous for me to accept such a position for a year or two. I would undoubtedly make a great many acquaintances, and I should endeavor to make some friends in the various cities we should visit, and all this would be advantageous for future dealings. Every good picture-buyer whose acquaintance I can make or whose friendship I can gain, may be one of the stepping stones to better fortunes after a while.

On the other hand, it might be disadvantageous to give up the publication of my Academy book; ...However, I think the Association business might possibly pay better, at present.48

However it took nearly a year for an arrangement to be agreed upon. Kurtz seemed to have a premonition of the uneasy relationship he was to have with the

47. AAA C.M.Kurtz Papers, #4807 (561), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 6, 1886 Kurtz writes that he called upon the artist, Enoch Wood Perry, who was the Secretary of the Art Union. Perry paid him in full the old Art Union indebtedness—$61.84.

48. AAA Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4807 (561) Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 6, 1886. Kurtz writes that he called upon the artist, Enoch Wood Perry, who was the Secretary of the Art Union. Perry paid him in full the old Art Union indebtedness in the amount of $61.84.
American Art Association's founders, Thomas E. Kirby and James F. Sutton from the beginning of his dealings with them. Writing to Julia Stephenson later that year, Kurtz acknowledged that his arrangement with the two men was motivated more by his personal financial situation rather than by any firm conviction about the worth of their endeavor to promote American art:

I visited the Art Association again this morning and had a long talk with Messers Sutton and Kirby. They were unwilling to make a contract for a year, or to guarantee me any salary for a shorter period, until we had "tried each other" for awhile. They offered me the management of the "Sketch Exhibition" which opens tomorrow, with five per cent commission on all sales, (whether I make them or not), and also to allow me to do outside work--writing, buying and selling pictures and so forth--on my own account. The exhibition which opens tomorrow will close about February 1st. When it closes, the Association and I will both know whether we feel like continuing business together:--and then, if we continue, I will have a guaranteed salary.

I would not have made this provisional arrangement, but, at present, I have nothing else to do between now and the time for beginning work on my "Academy Notes."

Kurtz had apparently hoped that he would be appointed Manager of the National Academy Exhibitions, a recently vacated position that he had applied for but did not

49. Gerald D. Bolas, "The Early Years of the American Art Association, 1879-1900" (Ph.D. dissertation, The City University of New York, 1998). The American Art Association was founded in 1883 by Thomas E. Kirby (1846-1924), James F. Sutton (1842/3-1915), son-in-law of the department store owner, R.H. Macy and R. Austin Robertson (1830-1891). The purpose of the organization was "the encouragement and promotion of American art" through its gallery, the Prize Fund Exhibitions and increasingly through its auctions. Kirby was an antiques dealer and auctioneer who remained a principal in the firm until 1923, when he and his son sold the American Art Association. It was managed by Hiram Parke and Otto Bernet from 1922 until 1937 when they formed Parke-Bernet Galleries which later merged with the British auction house, Sotheby & Co. in 1964. Sutton, an importer, acquired much of the work to be exhibited and collections to be sold. Robertson, who had a residence in Japan, was a collector and buyer of oriental art.

50. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4805 (1329), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, December 16, 1884.
receive. He then accepted the offer from Sutton to manage the third annual exhibition of the American Art Association from December 17, 1884 to February 1, 1885.

1885 was a transitional year for Kurtz in both his personal and professional life. During that year, Kurtz wrote catalogues for the sale of the George I. Seney Collection, an important event in the New York art world. Seney (1826-1893), a prominent Brooklyn financier who was President of the Metropolitan National Bank, collected modern paintings, both European and American. He frequently lent them for exhibition to the Brooklyn Institute of Art and the Southern Exposition at Louisville, Kentucky, where Kurtz, who managed the annual Art Department exhibition there, had become acquainted with some of the pictures from the collection. Due to a downturn in business however, Seney was forced to sell his collection at auction in March of 1885, and it became a social as well as an artistic event of some importance. Kurtz, now employed by the American Art Association which was to handle the sale, wrote his fiancee about his latest writing assignment.

I am to have my labors increased by the preparation of a catalogue for the Seney collection of pictures, which is to be sold by the Art Association next month, after

---

51 AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4805 (1082). Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, November 25, 1884. “The position pays--in percentages--about $2,000 for the six weeks of the Spring Exhibition and generally $700 to $1,000 for the four weeks of the Fall Exhibition.”

52 See Bolas, *The Early Years of the American Art Association, 1879-1900*, for a thorough discussion of the organization and Kurtz’s affiliation with it.

53 In 1883, when Kurtz was employed by the American Art Union, he exhibited a large collection of Art Union paintings in Louisville, Kentucky where they became part of the Southern Exposition’s first great art display (see Chp.3). His adept management of the exhibition impressed the organizers of the Louisville Exposition. However rather than pursue the Louisville position, Kurtz applied for and hoped to be selected as the director of the Art Department of the New Orleans World’s Fair in September of 1884, however he was not appointed. Following that disappointment, he accepted the offer to become the Director of the Southern Exposition’s Art Department in Louisville, and directed that annual exhibition until 1886.
being exhibited two weeks in the galleries. The collection is one of the very finest in the country. You doubtless remember that quite a number of Mr. Seney’s pictures were at Louisville the memorable summer I first met my Julia—The “Helping Hand” was one of them, and if you look over the catalogue, you can doubtless recall many of the others. Still, at Louisville there were only about 30 of Mr. Seney’s pictures, while his whole collection will number I suppose in the neighborhood of two hundred. I am to go over to Mr. Seney’s house in Brooklyn, on Tuesday morning, to begin the work of cataloguing the pictures. The Association aims to get up the handsomest catalogue—unillustrated, of course— that has ever been published in this country. No expense is to be spared in paper, press work, etc. Mr. Seney’s pictures cost him over $800,000; they were held by the Bank as security for $350,000. I do not know how they will be apt to sell, but they will no doubt bring fair prices, though hardly very near what they cost as many of them were purchased at very extravagant prices. I would very much enjoy the work of preparing the catalogue if I hadn’t quite so much of that kind of work on hand just now.

Several days later he continued this account of his experience:

Today I have been over to Mr. Seney’s late home in Brooklyn. It is a magnificent house, on the ‘Heights’ at the top of the hill from the Wall Street ferry. From there is a splendid view of New York, the Jersey hills beyond, the East River and Brooklyn bridge. Governor’s Island, Bedloe’s Island and Staten Island—with their forts etc.—and all the Bay, full of almost every species of steam and sailing craft. The interior of the house is decorated and furnished with apparently little thought for the expense thereof. It is all done in most exquisite taste, too. It must have been very hard for the Seneys to give up such a home, still they may possibly get back again;---the house itself has not been sold. I went over this morning with Mr. Seney, Mr. Kirby and Mr. Sutton and we made a sort of inventory of the pictures. There were 250 which are to be sold and they constitute by far the finest collection ever offered at public sale in America. ...This evening, I came down there to arrange the pictures as I desire them to be hung tomorrow, for the reception Thursday evening. Our little catalogue list will be out tomorrow...

Kurtz’s assessment of the actual profit realized, relative to the expense, was indeed

54. The Helping Hand by Émile Rénouf, won a medal at the 1880 Salon in Paris and was considered the artist’s first great success. It depicts an old fisherman and his little grand-daughter, who is trying to help row the boat. Purchased by George I. Seney in 1881, it was sold in the April 2, 1885 sale of George I. Seney’s collection (catalogue #264). It was purchased by and is now in the collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

55. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (274), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, February 7, 1885.

56. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4806, Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, February 10, 1885.
accurate. Although the sale was pronounced a success, it probably fell well short of Seney’s initial expenditure. By the time the three day auction was concluded, two-hundred and eighty five pictures were sold for a total of $406,910. Preceded by a two week preview exhibition that visitors paid to see, press reports that found their way into London and Paris papers, and a lively debate over the authenticity of some of the European pictures, the sale provided Kurtz with a sound model for the management of future exhibitions. As Kirby himself noted, “it was the first time...that management was a feature....From this time on the interest in art increased.” Kurtz, however, not only noted the professionalism of the event, but also the prices paid for the American pictures, which, untainted by charges of forgery and dubious authenticity, exceeded expectations and brought in more money than Seney originally paid for them. For a young man who harbored hopes of becoming a dealer but had limited financial means or opportunity for foreign travel, the Seney sale must have been a revelation, for as Kurtz himself said:

The particularly gratifying thing in the sale was that nearly all the American pictures brought more than Mr. Seney paid for them—and his losses were on his foreign pictures almost entirely. The publication of this fact will have a very good influence. I think on American Art.

57. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (532), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, April 2, 1885.

"The Seney exhibition was a great success. The receipts from the sale of admission tickets averaged $1,000 a day and 6,000 catalogues...were sold. There have been two nights of the sale already and 200 of the pictures have brought nearly $200,000. Tonight will be the third night’s sale, and the most important of the pictures will be sold tonight."

58. as quoted in Bolas, 261.


60. AAA Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806, Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, March 31, 1885 also quoted in Bolas, 261.
Although Kurtz’s employment with the Art Association came to a bitter end the following year, apparently over money owed him and credit not given to him, his dealings with George Seney continued. Less than one year after this sale, Kurtz himself was attempting to sell Seney, who went on to acquire two more picture collections, a painting by the Scandinavian artist, Emil Carlsen:

"Mr. Semple and I have an appointment to meet Mr. Seney on Tuesday morning. Then I shall try and get the latter up to Carlsen’s studio, and if I succeed, I think I can likely sell him the picture and make something myself in addition. Father could not spare me the money to buy it just now with convenience, so I have given up buying it myself—though I feel that if I could do so, and hold it for a time—exhibiting it meanwhile—I could easily double my money on it."  

Kurtz was enjoying some degree of success in his professional life, which enabled him to bear witness to some of the more noteworthy events of his day. The following excerpt from one of his letters not only serves as an historical record but also mirrors the visual images of his time, such as Edward P. Moran’s (1829-1901) *Statue of Liberty Enlightening the World* of 1886 [Fig. 11]:

I received your letter just as I was setting out to go down the Bay, on the occasion of the reception of the Bartholdi Statue of Liberty. It was a beautiful morning, and

---

61. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807, Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 6, 1886. Kurtz wrote: “The $200 he (Sutton) stole from me isn’t a circumstance to the losses he has actually sustained through my efforts.” See also Presnar, p. 66: In a letter to his father, dated April 11, 1886, now in the Kurtz Collection at the Lawrence County Historical Society, Charles stated that Thomas E. Kirby was “a vulgar little beast” who had taken credit for work done by Kurtz in the past. Kurtz attempted to vindicate his losses through a series of snide comments about the Art Association and its activities that he was able to have published particularly in the Louisville, Kentucky newspapers concerning the worth of the Prize Fund Exhibition pictures.

62. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (626), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 17, 1886. There is no record of Kurtz ever owning a painting for any length of time by the Danish born artist, Emil Carlsen (1853-1932) in his papers. He apparently continued to have an interest in the artist’s work throughout his career. As director of the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York, Kurtz included a Carlsen *Still Life* in the Second Annual Exhibition of Paintings by American Arts (1907). William Semple was a collector and a director of the Southern Exposition in Louisville.
as I rode down to the battery on the elevated road, to take the steamer, I most sincerely wished that you might have been with me.

It was a delightful trip down the Bay to Gravesend, where we came up with the \textit{Isere} which brought the statue. Quite a number of vessels were there before us, among others the French war vessel, \textit{La Flore}, with cannon peeping from her portholes, and the American ships, Powhatan, Omaha, Alliance, and Despatch [sic]. The boats formed in procession—about one hundred vessels in line and an almost countless number of tugs, yachts and all kinds of small craft—and we moved towards the city at about eleven o'clock. The day was \textit{perfect} and the procession presented a fine appearance. Every boat was decorated with flags and streamers—wherever there was room for them—and from the flags of all nations the French and American colors were preeminent, of course. Nearly every boat, too, had music aboard, and between the strains of the \textit{Marseillaise}, \textit{Hail Columbia}, and so forth, and the booming of the cannon from all the forts along the Narrows and from the numerous French and American War vessels there was quite a racket.

Many of the boats were so crowded that their decklines were almost even with the water, and it is almost a miracle that there were no accidents. Our own boat was not uncomfortably full—it was one of “The World” boats and those aboard were there by invitation.—I did not go down to Bedlow’s Island nor remain downtown to see the procession there.\textsuperscript{63}

Kurtz’s professional, public persona was a stark contrast to his personal situation, which left him somewhat frustrated. Writing to his fiancee less than two months before their wedding, Kurtz’s early optimism about a career in New York seemed to falter.

I am afraid that I have led you to expect more than I can give you;—that I have allowed you to be deceived in me:—to think that you are about to marry a man of more account than your poor, miserable “Carl” is. Sometimes I hope so much to be “somebody” in this world, that I allow myself to believe I sometime may do something worthy. But somehow I drift along and my ambition seems to drift along with me, and there is no fruit— and, I sometimes think there is little promise...I think I may be able to do something better. I shall try very hard, and I shall ask your encouragement. ...But here perhaps may lie disappointment for you. I shall have to work very hard. In the city, surrounded by thousands of opportunities for enjoying existence to its full, we must deny ourselves, we must live very much for each other alone, and there may be days and days all alike for us, even in New York.\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{63}. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers \#4806 (650), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, June 21, 1885.

\textsuperscript{64}. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, \#4806 (817), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, Aug. 3, 1885.
Despite his lack of optimism about their quality of life, Julia Stephenson married Charles Kurtz on October first, 1885, in Harrodsburg, Kentucky. His involvement in many aspects of the wedding—from designing intertwined initial pins as gifts for the attendants to checking the guest list respondents—were all done from a distance and anticipated his peripatetic lifestyle which the young couple would endure for most of their twenty-three year marriage.

Although he was devoted to his wife, art and business always came first for Charles Kurtz. Just weeks after their marriage, they lost some of their personal possessions while he was en route with an Art Association exhibition. Kurtz, always a meticulous record keeper, sent a list of ruined or missing items to Julia, explaining that their trunks had been broken open and that a number of items were stolen.

My coins are gone. Dairies and memo books gone and nearly everything not destroyed seems to be ruined. Our “Brenner” picture is smashed. I fear other pictures may be broken or missing. It pains me to break this news to you in this abrupt way. I would go to you this moment if I could, but I must stay here and go over the pictures and check them off to the car men. I must know the worst about the pictures first, and must get them off the pier, as they are here at the Art Association’s risk and would be their loss in case of fire. I am “broken up” over this thing and sympathize with you.65

It was this sense of duty and obligation, often at the expense of his personal life that helped establish Kurtz’s reputation as a competent administrator. To ease his conscience, Kurtz was a faithful and articulate correspondent throughout his marriage. His accounts of the places he visited, the people he met, the current events that

65. AAA Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (1277-81), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, dated only 1885. Kurtz here refers to a painting by the German born artist, Carl Christian Brenner (1838-1888), who settled in Louisville, Kentucky. It was probably “Winter Sunset” (1885) which was mentioned along with other wedding presents in newspaper accounts of their marriage. This painting appears in the Kurtz Inventory Book [AAA 4821 (273)] and remained in the family’s possession until the death of his daughter, Isabel.
surrounded him and the art that occupied him provided his wife, as well as those who read his papers, a glimpse into a world that she, due to familial obligations, was, more often than not, unable to enjoy.
CHAPTER 3
To Promote the Love of Art. Executive Abilities and Critical Knowledge

Charles Kurtz honed his administrative skills during the 1880s by managing regional and travelling art exhibitions, beginning with his activities for the American Art Union in 1883. That year, the organization appointed him general manager for its exhibition at the Art Gallery at the Southern Exposition in Louisville, Kentucky [Fig. 12]. Chartered by the legislature of the state of Kentucky on October 30, 1882, it was visited annually by half a million people from all parts of the country and was intended, like other similar regional expositions, as a post Civil War celebration of reconstruction displaying local products and national achievements. The Louisville Exposition offered an art exhibition of work produced primarily by New York based artists, musical attractions by the distinguished conductor, Walter Damrosch, and a general exhibition of natural and manufactured products. For the three months each year that it was open, visitors were able to not only partake in cultural experiences but inform themselves about the latest industrial innovations.

In 1883, the first year of the Exposition, the picture collection was principally a loan collection gathered by the American Art Union from the collections of noted private collectors such as the New Yorkers George Seney, August Belmont, Henry G. Marquand.

1. AAA. Charles M. Kurtz Papers. #4805 (671) & 4804 (1222). In thee letters Kurtz mentions his application for the position of Director of Fine Arts for the New Orleans Exposition. He was selected for the post.
and Samuel P. Avery among others. Almost every noted foreign artist was represented along with fine examples of American artists. It was a significant exhibition in the history of art in America, because for the first time, an important collection of both foreign and American pictures was shown in the South. Many of them would otherwise only have been accessible through a personal acquaintance with the owner. The exhibition of these pictures initiated a desire on the part of prominent citizens of Louisville to establish a public art gallery, which would not only serve as a local attraction but also as an educational institution. To that end, a subscription fund was established in which ten thousand dollars was collected for the purchase of paintings. The pictures were to be purchased from the Exposition and installed at the newly established Art Gallery of the Kentucky Polytechnic Society.² By 1884, it was agreed to limit purchases for the collection to works by American artists, ostensibly to give viewers the opportunity to become acquainted with the work of native artists, but more probably because the new higher tariff rates on imported art made American pictures more accessible and affordable. The pictures were all carefully selected, and it was announced that the 1884 art collection was the very finest collection of works by American artists ever exhibited.³ The 1885 Southern Exposition included the pictures from the recently initiated Prize Fund Exhibition and were under the auspices of the American Art Association.

The person responsible for coordinating both of these exhibitions of American Art was Charles M. Kurtz, for when he resigned from the Art Union in 1884 and began his affiliation with the American Art Association, he did so without interrupting his

² AAA, Kurtz Papers, #4820, Journal of The Southern Exposition, October, 1885. According to Dr. David B. Dearinger, Curator of the National Academy of Design, the collection of the Kentucky Polytechnic Society is now owned by the Public Library of Louisville, Kentucky.

³ Ibid.
association with the Southern Exposition. His success with the first exhibition placed him in a favorable position with the Board of Directors to request another appointment. The summer of 1885 was the third season that Kurtz held the position of Director of the Art Gallery. His financial arrangements with the Art Association during this period were less than satisfactory to him and depended solely on commissions from the sale of pictures purchased directly from the Exposition exhibition. However the high quality of the pictures in the 1885 show convinced him that the financial rewards would be worth his while. At that point, Kurtz had pieced together a career with several components rather than one main focus. He explained his it in a letter to a college fraternity brother, then an attorney in St. Louis, where he expected to soon be ensconced as it was the next venue for the Prize Fund Exhibition. His description of his peripatetic activities at that time foreshadows the format that his professional life would take.

You see I am at Louisville. I am here in charge of the Art Department of the Southern Exposition—a position I have held for the past two summers, and a very pleasant one. This summer, after we wind up here, I expect to take the picture show to St. Louis, ... My winters I spend in New York, where I have a business connection with the American Art Association. In the Spring of each year I get out my *Academy Notes* and I do some miscellaneous newspaper work at odd times. Last year I edited the *Art Union* but I gave it up in December, as there was no money in it to speak of.

4. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (201). Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, Jan. 22, 1885. Kurtz explained his current employment situation in this letter. "I have no arrangement with the Art Association except that I receive five per cent commission on the sales of pictures here. However, I should like to keep up my arrangement even on that basis for the Prize exhibition, because I think that exhibition will probably pay pretty well. Still, if I can, I should very much prefer getting a regular salary and letting this rather unsatisfactory percentage business go."

5. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (852). Kurtz to John A. Keys, August 7, 1885.
In 1885, the Art Association introduced the concept of a Prize Fund Exhibition. It was an innovation that would have an impact upon the Southern Exposition art exhibition, and also on Charles Kurtz’s life style since it acquainted Americans throughout the country with contemporary American art. A year and a half before, the American Art Association, in conjunction with a number of wealthy patrons from around the country, established a cash prize of $2,500 each to be awarded in the spring in New York by a committee elected from the subscribers. Each artist who received a prize was required to give his picture to the Prize Fund committee, which would distribute the winning pictures to art institutions located in the respective cities from which came the largest subscriptions. Before the pictures were distributed however, they were publicly exhibited in each city to which one of the prize pictures would be assigned. Because of the generous award, there was great competition among the artists. Six hundred paintings were submitted, but only one hundred and seventy were selected for the Prize Fund Collection, which was considered by a number of publications the best exhibition of American painting ever viewed by the public. One critic described the exhibition as having the potential to be to America what the Paris Salon was to France:

Those who have the most lively hope for the future of American look upon this movement [The Prize Fund Exhibition] as the beginning of an institution which its outcome, it is sufficient for the present to know that it is a movement worthy of encouragement and enthusiasm. Most of the pictures in the collection are for sale,


7. In 1885, the first four prizes were awarded to Crepuscule (Twilight), given to the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts; Henry Mosler for The Last Sacrament, given to the Kentucky Polytechnic Society, Louisville; Frank Myers Boggs for A Rough Day, Harbor of Honfleur, given to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; and R. Swain Gifford for Near the Coast, given to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
and art can only be encouraged permanently by the financial success of its products. There are few people even among those well versed in art matters, who are fully aware of the scope and power of the growing school of American art and the rank it is rapidly making among the older schools of Europe.

Louisville, which had a large number of subscribers, exhibited the Prize Fund Exhibition at the Southern Exposition. However, the size of the exhibition space required additional art to fill it, so Charles Kurtz, acting as agent for the Exposition, was given the task of selecting additional pictures. Like a modern day dealer, he was able to use the contacts he had made in New York from his Academy Notes and his newspaper work to borrow another two hundred and fifty pictures to supplement the Prize Fund Collection. His services were invaluable to the Exposition directors, and for his efforts, he was invited to return as Director of the Art Gallery the following year.

When Kurtz arrived in St. Louis in November of 1885, he submitted promotional articles, the forerunner of the modern press release, about the prize Fund Exhibition to the St. Louis papers, including Joseph Pulitzer’s St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Republican and the Globe Democrat to increase interest in the show. However the critic for the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Sunday, November 22, 1885, was considerably more favorable in its review of the exhibition and claimed that Eastern art dealers “have erected a false prejudice in favor of every class of painting imported from Europe ... as against everything—no matter how meritorious—that may have been produced in America, or by American artists temporarily sojourning abroad.” But it also noted that, “In some respects the dealers ... have been justified.”


9. Of the 250 pictures, 200 were oils and 50 were watercolors. In size they were generally smaller than the prize Fund pictures.

10. Presnar, 65. The author quotes from a letter in Kurtz Family Papers, Lawrence County Historical Society from Charles M. Kurtz to Davis Brooks Kurtz, November 29, 1885. In it Kurtz outlines his plans to publicize the exhibition. The St. Louis Globe Democrat, Sunday, November 22, 1885, was considerably more favorable in its review of the exhibition and claimed that Eastern art dealers “have erected a false prejudice in favor of every class of painting imported from Europe ... as against everything—no matter how meritorious—that may have been produced in America, or by American artists temporarily sojourning abroad.” But it also noted that, “In some respects the dealers ... have been justified.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Louis Post-Dispatch was less than convinced by the advance press about the exhibition and the quality of American art in general. A less than enthusiastic review appeared in the paper on November 19, 1885; in evaluating the exhibition, it set the tone for the appreciation of American paintings in that city:

This will be called a fine exhibition on first acquaintance by many who have a certain pride in the ability of American artists. But if this acquaintance is developed, the conviction must at least be forced upon them that, as a whole, it betrays a want of thought and a barrenness of ideas deplorable in the extreme. This is the first requirement of a picture— that it shall express an idea, it is not only the public’s right, but its duty to demand it. Few, very few, of the pictures answer this demand, and the public must certainly hesitate to accept the collection as affording a clue to the mental status of our national painters. ... One is struck too, by the cleverness displayed on every side; a cleverness that dazzles us and toys with us. But it is that cleverness which is the very curse of everything that is American. It is the disease of American art, of American industry and of American everything which can possibly have a superficiality. The art here is a self-conscious art, and it winks at you in a coaxing way, or lays hold of you to compel your notice or shouts at you, even though you turn your back: “See how I am painted.” You cannot escape it ... Masters say the sure sign of a novice is to show how well he can paint and how much. Thus, the conviction is forced upon us that American art is insincere. ... too many of them evidence a shallow, tawdry attempt at supposed technical skill which seeks to hide itself beneath a tricky front ....

The review then focused on each of the four Prize Fund pictures, and in three of the four, found nothing of such merit in them to warrant the distinction placed on them. R. Swain Gifford’s (1840-1905) Near the Coast [Fig. 13, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York] was “disappointing in the extreme” due to its false shadows and unnatural tones as well as “that old theatrical effect of black against white.” Frank M. Boggs’ (1855-1926) Off Honfleur [Fig. 14, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston] was referred to as being “hardly worthy of notice, the scheme being an old threadbare one, long ago discarded by the progressive artists of the day.” Perhaps due to its overtly Catholic subject

11. AAA, Kurtz Papers, #4808 scrapbook, “American Art, A Review of the Pictures on Exhibition at the Art Museum, The Drift and Tendency of National Art as Seen in These Representative Pictures--The Four Prize Pictures--Their Merits and Demerits--The Results,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch, November 19, 1885.
matter. Henry Mosler’s (1841-1920) The Last Sacrament [Fig. 15] was clearly the least appreciated. It was said to be:

an excellent expression of a certain kind of cheap clap trap; the stock in trade of a class of American painters. A gray wall against a gray sky and the priest trick. It might as well have been the fisher girl trick or the gleaner trick or any other trick that would admit the gray wall and gray sky. Mr. Mosler is not capable of appreciating the pathos of his subject by reason of his being an American. ... Mosler has given only a hackneyed expression of a hackneyed subject with scarcely anything to claim more than a passing glance.\textsuperscript{12}

Alexander Harrison’s (1853-1930) Le Crépuscule, [Fig. 16] the picture awarded to St. Louis, was regarded as “immeasurably the best of the lot” due to the fact that the artist had “studied his motif well, understood the physical laws that surround and control it, and employed a “delicate and poetical tone.”\textsuperscript{13}

This devastating review had, not surprisingly, an impact on attendance at the exhibition. The Saturday edition of the paper printed another notice about the Prize Fund exhibition with the acknowledgement that “The exhibition of American paintings at the Museum of Fine Arts has not drawn well as yet.” The Charles Sprague Pearce picture included in the exhibition, Return from the Pasture, and typical of his pictures of French peasants, prompted charges of “false and dishonest” painting since he used professional models, and it was cited as an example of what was wrong with the exhibition:

We should look on the American art future with considerable misgiving if this class of work is encouraged. There are subjects in our midst as noble and pathetic as any Millet or Breton ever painted, and it is the mission of our American artists to find them. This criticism is intended not so much a condemnation of the picture as of the spirit which failed to conceive it justly.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} AAA. Kurtz Papers, #4808, scrapbook, “The American Paintings Now on Exhibition at the Art Museum,” \textit{St. Louis Post-Dispatch}, November 21, 1885.
\end{itemize}
In an attempt to bolster the number of visitors, a later piece that appeared in the 
*St. Louis Post-Dispatch* attributed the poor attendance to the waning winter daylight 
and an announcement was made that the Museum of Fine Arts would initiate evening 
hours so that "the public who could not devote a few hours of the day to an inspection of 
the pictures will have the pleasure of seeing them in the evening."  

Writing under his pseudonym, "Veuve Cliquot," Kurtz published a piece entitled "The American Art Of 
Today" in which he not only says that the show is remarkable for its comprehensive 
nature, but also for its defining the quintessential nature of American art. Kurtz, who 
divided the pictures in the exhibition into three groups, suggested that one third is 
representative of the "older men, whose reputations are the result of years of 
conscientious effort that has been recognized by the people."; a second group is 
comprised of "younger men, educated abroad whose work shows the relationship of our 
art to that of foreign nations"; while the final third are artists who "have grown up 
amongst us, who have not received the advantage of a foreign education, but who have 
diligently studied from nature...and who, perhaps, paint what are, at present, our most 
characteristically "American" pictures."  

Kurtz’s semantics imply that for him, the future 
of American art could be found in the latter two groups: one benefiting from foreign 
training, which Kurtz saw as an advantage; the other dependent on what James Thomas 
Flexner has called "that wilder image" of American scenery. At this point in his career, 
Kurtz’s pragmatic nature promoted those characteristically "American" pictures like the 
landscape paintings of his friend, Dubois F. Hasbrouck, while his genteel upbringing 
personally preferred paintings that reflected cosmopolitan training and experience.  

15. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Southern Exposition scrapbook, #4824, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, December 5, 1885.

The unsigned clipping from The Evening Post [Louisville] is probably by Charles Kurtz as he saved all of his own writings. In “Trouble In Art Circles,” August 8, 1884, Kurtz defends Italian art: “A representative of The Post visited the Art Gallery and examined certain large Italian pictures characterized as ‘ridiculous’ and calculated to mar the beauty of the collection if given space on the walls. Upon a careful inspection he found the pictures alluded to in the article ranking among the most pleasing and meritorious in the whole collection. The names of the painters of these pictures should be to any one in the slightest degree acquainted with the modern school of Italy, an ample guarantee of their merit and a thorough vindication of the choice of the committee without further particulars. Two of these paintings so unsparring condemned are large Italian landscapes by the celebrated Andreas Marco of Florence and portray in that artist’s happiest manner the Italian scenery and skies for which he is justly renowned in his native land. Nearly all of this artist’s pictures find their way to England, where he is highly appreciated by all genuine connoisseurs in the fine arts. Two other of the pictures are figures pieces and mates by Cavallier G. Castagnole, a member of and professor in the Academy of Fine Arts in Florence, and an artist who is so highly esteemed in that city that his productions are invariably sold before leaving the easel. Another of these ‘ridiculous’ pictures is by Zingoin, and a most charmingly realistic work of art. This picture ... having been commended as one of the finest of the display of that season, wherein were to be seen the choicest contemport works of Italian art. These pictures were not offered for exhibition the reporter learned, but were loaned at the express solicitation of the President of the Exposition and on that of the Art Committee, who had previously examined them ... and who ... requested the use of them for the Art Gallery. it seems quite curious, and not altogether in good taste, under the circumstances, that these particular pictures should have been singled out from amongst the contributions for a merciless assault, when others, the use of which is paid for by the company, in every respect their inferiors, either receive unstinted praise, or, at least, are suffered to pass by unchallenged. A dealer, too, hand in glove with association artists, with his personal friendships for this one and his personal enmity for that, and with an indefinite interest for all, would naturally prefer to keep foreign art productions in the background, knowing full well as he does, that the contiguity of even a good copy of some of the pieces of the old masters would seriously interfere with, if not prove fatal, to the sale of many a picture which it is expected will be returned to its owner in the shape of its full equivalent in a draft or post office order, seller’s commissions alone deducted. None of the pictures criticised and alluded to in this article are, we are informed, for sale, and need therefore excite the invidious comparisons of no one.”

Andreas Marko (1824-1895) painted genre scenes as well as landscape paintings. He was born in Vienna of Hungarian descent and received his earliest training from his father, Karoly Marko. For many years, he lived in Florence and a professor in the
While Kurtz was occupied with exhibition work, his bride, Julia, with her husband’s encouragement, took art classes at the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, which had been established by Professor Halsey C. Ives (1847-1911). He was a displaced New Yorker, who had been an instructor at Washington University in St. Louis before becoming instrumental in the establishment of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts. In 1881, Ives was appointed director of the Museum of Fine Arts and held a dual appointment as director of both institutions by that time. Although the precise circumstances of their initial meeting cannot be documented, it is likely that it dates from these early days in St. Louis. Ives was only eight years older than Kurtz; nevertheless, he became a kind of mentor and father figure to the thirty-year old, and the two began a lifelong professional friendship. That friendship, which sometimes superseded his relationship with his wife and his family, left Ives devastated at Kurtz’s premature death.

The Prize Fund Exhibition, a disappointment in St. Louis, moved on to Boston in February of 1886, delayed by winter transportation problems. Once again, Kurtz provided the particulars about the exhibition in articles in the Boston newspapers. The Boston Transcript published a piece on the Prize Fund Exhibition in its “Art Notes” column that drew heavily from the information provided by Kurtz. It carefully circumvented any truly negative critical commentary and noted that “The exhibition strikes one as creditably strong, particularly in landscapes and marines, for the genre is spare and poor and the

Gabrielle Castagnola (1828-1883) was born in Geneva, and also lived most of his professional life in Florence. He was a painter of historical and genre scenes. Aurelio Zingoni (1853-1922) was a native Florentine. He studied at the Academy of Fine Arts of Florence. Although he was primarily a genre painter, he was also recognized for his religious picture, *Glorification of the Madonna*, which he exhibited in the Alinari competition of 1900.
flower studies very few.” Harrison’s *Crépuscule* was judged “the noblest of the prize
works,” and Kurtz’s catalogue for the exhibition was praised for being “complete and
nicely arranged.”\(^{18}\)

In contrast, the *Boston Journal* cast a more critical eye on the exhibition. In a
more succinct review, it abbreviated the origins of the exhibition and went on to analyze
the contents. It noted that three of the four winners of the prizes resided in Paris—“a thing
that may be considered to show that American art has not yet established itself upon
ground of its own.” Yet it tempered even that comment:

“The most rabid patriot cannot justly condemn the selection that has been made ... in only one case has the subject been distinctly foreign—Mr. Mosler’s picture, which shows a priest and his two boy attendants ... Both Mr. Harrison’s and Mr. Bogg’s pictures are effects of natural scenery, which does not depend upon
nationality for its interest; and even Mr. Mosler’s work has that deep human
interest which is of the same quality in America as in France. Consequently, these
prize winners show more of their native character than might be expected and
when one sees that Mr. Gifford’s purely American work has gained the third
award, one may well feel that the patriotic spirit which is supposed to burn in the
breast of every observer of the collection may be permitted to glow as warmly as
possible.”\(^{19}\)

The review concluded with an encouraging assessment that indicated that Kurtz’s efforts
had succeeded in winning support for American art.

On the whole, the exhibition is of satisfactory strength, and if it does not show
American art making a great stride anywhere, indicates that it is at least holding its
own, and apparently advancing somewhat.\(^{20}\)

When Kurtz returned to New York in the March of 1886, he was assigned to the
preparation of three catalogues that the American Art Association would publish in

\(^{18}\) AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 9371-2), scrapbook, “Art Notes, The
Prize Fund Exhibition,” *Boston Transcript*, February 19, 1886.

\(^{19}\) AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (371) scrapbook, “The Fine Arts, The
17, 1886.

\(^{20}\) Ibid.
conjunction with upcoming auctions\textsuperscript{21} for the Beriah Wall and John A. Brown private collections and the estate of W. H. Aspinwall. He also began preparation of his own material for \textit{National Academy Notes}. However, Kurtz's position as manager of the American Art Gallery had been taken over by Arthur Eliott, a young man who was hired at half of Kurtz's salary to sit at the desk in the American Art Association Gallery to facilitate sales. He also found that Thomas E. Kirby had taken credit for work done by Kurtz in the past, including the authorship of the Seney catalogue, and Kurtz believed that Kirby had plagiarized some of his biographical notes about the artists for use in another, unspecified catalogue. Many of the artists who had works in the Prize Fund exhibition were unhappy because their paintings, some damaged in transit and not fully reimbursed by insurance, were kept two months beyond the original return date and prevented from being available for sale. In addition, Kurtz's travel expenses were also brought into question.\textsuperscript{22} Outraged by this turn of events, Kurtz severed his relationship with the Art Association, claiming that money was owed him\textsuperscript{23}. The Art Association responded by

\textsuperscript{21} See AAA, Miscellaneous American Art Auction Catalogues, \#N141 (576-624) and \# N141 (707-726). The catalogues were for the auction of 262 European and America "Modern Master" paintings from the collection of Beriah Wall and John A. Brown of Providence, Rhode Island. They were auctioned at Chickering Hall in New York from March 30th through April 1st. The third catalogue was for the Aspinwall Gallery's collection of old and modern masters, an estate auction held at Ortgies' Galleries in New York on April 6th, 1886.

\textsuperscript{22} AAA, \#4807, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Kurtz to James Sutton, April 30, 1886. Also found in AAA, Kurtz Papers, \#4823, clippings scrapbook. "President of the American Art Association Disputes $200 Withheld From Salary" In other correspondence with his wife, Kurtz suggests that the Art Association held him partially responsible for some of the damage to paintings in transit to Boston as he oversaw the loading and shipping. The catalogue in which Kurtz's work was used but not credited is not specifically named.

\textsuperscript{23} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, \#4806 (1356), October 31, 1885. Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz. In it he reports that in a final report to the Art Association, he enclosed a check for $1,374.76 as proceeds from the 1885 Southern Exposition, but retained his last
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accusing Kurtz of forging documents and threatened him with incarceration in the New York city prison known as “The Tombs.” Kurtz railed about his predicament, vowing to seek his own revenge:

The Art Association will lose by this performance. The artists are indignant at the way things are going now. --But I shall see that Sutton and Kirby are punished for this and all their other villainy, if I live long enough. They haven't yet begun to experience what I have in store for them!  

The bitter feud between Kurtz and Kirby did eventually spill over into Kurtz’s newspaper columns, and the sniping continued for several years afterwards with both sides seeking allies who could help discredit the other. In Kurtz’s case, he enlisted the help of quarter’s salary Kurtz believed that this amount was much more than the Art Association expected to receive. The dispute about finances seemed to have centered around travel expenses incurred later, rather than his salary or commissions. There is some evidence to suggest that the less than complimentary reviews in St. Louis were not only disappointing but also resulted in fewer sales than expected and to make up for the loss of anticipated income, Kurtz’s expense account was brought into question.

24. Bolas, 258. Bolas relates how the American Art Association was accused of promoting pictures in the Seney sale catalogue that were possibly not genuine or did not have the appropriate provenance by William J. Stillman, the critic for the Evening Post, and was thereby attempting to perpetuate the legitimacy of dubious works. The Association filed a lawsuit in response to the charges. It may be that the latter accusation against Kurtz was an attempt to further extricate the Association from questionable business practices.

25. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (735), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, August 10, 1886.

26. Kurtz Family Papers, Lawrence County Historical Society, #1993.39.426.A. Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, September 8, 1889, p. 9. In this letter, Kurtz relates how Sutton called at the office of The Star and complained to his editor that Kurtz was “persecuting him.” Kurtz also admitted to planning a scheme in which he would hire the painter D. F. Hasbrouck to copy Millet’s highly prized and priced painting, The Angelus, which the Art Association was circulating, and exhibit it in a rival venue on Broadway for ten cent admission, considerably less than the fifty cents the Art Association was charging. He hoped to force Sutton to buy the copy in order to eliminate the competition. The scheme was never realized; nevertheless, Kurtz, acting as the representative of The Star, was denied admission to press view of The Angelus. In another piece of correspondence, Lawrence County Historical Society #1993.39.441C letter from C.M. Kurtz to D.B.
Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832-1904), the archaeologist who was the Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art from 1878 to 1904. An account of a visit to General di Cesnola’s country house in Mt. Kisco, New York in 1889 outlined plans to disparage Sutton and Kirby in print:

It is right funny, but Sutton and Kirby both have country places near Mt. Kisco. Both were born up there in the neighborhood. The General tells me Sutton’s place is superb. He has several hundred acres. has servants in livery, a dozen horses and all that sort of thing. The General doesn’t like them: says they are not honest etc. He seemed to appreciate hearing a few particulars regarding my experience with them and my efforts in their behalf. When a Mr. Holcombe (who lives at the Windsor hotel here but is now in Europe) returns, General di Cesnola will let me know it and will give me a letter to him. Holcombe has lived a good deal in China and Japan—can speak the languages etc.—and knows of some of Sutton’s transactions there. Cesnola thinks he can give me—and would be quite willing to give me—material for several “able articles.”

How do you like my Sunday “touch” about hearing that bells would be rung behind the “Angelus?” Doesn’t that even up the lie about our hiring bald-headed old men to “Cry” in front of the “Christ Before Pilate” picture?

Sutton had himself “interviewed” in The Tribune the other day, in which he snivelled about being abused in certain newspapers by people who had a spite against him. I think I shall comment a little upon his “baby talk” in next Sunday’s Star. His appeal for “sympathy” is really comical.27

Charles Kurtz was not the only one to take issue with the Art Association; as the directors of the Southern Exposition’s Art Department were also dissatisfied with the terms of the contract. Perhaps as a response to the fact that the picture they were awarded in 1885 received the most criticism in the press, the directors were reluctant to subscribe to and be forced to accept one of that year’s Prize Fund pictures. They wanted an assurance that if they did not like the Prize Fund picture awarded them, the American

Kurtz, November 28, 1889. Charles relates how his antigonism towards the Art Association resulted in a directive from the editor-in-chief to “discontinue making any reference whatever to the Art Association in future” despite the fact that the editor liked Kurtz’s articles. Kurtz suspected that Sutton went directly to the owner of The Star, C. P. Huntington, and “secured intervention in the matter.”

27. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4810 (198), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, August 5, 1889.
Art Association would buy it back at the subscription price. The artists also objected to the terms under which their work was exhibited and the requirement to commit a work to remain in the exhibition for the duration of the tour. Throughout the spring of 1886, William Semple and the other directors debated the wisdom of acting without the cooperation of the Art Association for the coming year’s Exposition. Even though the directors knew Kurtz’s extensive connections with artists in New York from his publication of *Academy Notes* and columns on artists’ activities in *The Tribune*, they were still somewhat apprehensive about his ability to mount a major exhibition should they break with the Art Association and sought assurance from Kurtz that he could handle the job by himself:

... As matters seem to stand it would now look as if we shall have to rely upon getting most of our pictures from the artists direct, and you should keep picking the strings in that direction until we get a little further light here and can act intelligently ... Sutton and his group have certainly acted in very bad faith with the artists but the latter have the upper hand of them.

Sutton asked for the Exposition’s proxy to represent it in the selection of the prize pictures and Maj. Wright sent it to him. We would of course have preferred to have you act as our representative but as the picture will certainly be turned over to Sutton and the $2,000 in money claimed in lieu of it, we thought it best to let Sutton take the responsibility of the selection of it, this you must regard as strictly confidential. The Exposition don’t want the picture and will take the money instead as provided in the agreement, but it must not be known now. I haven’t any faith in the Art Association crowd and if we can’t have the assurance that they will be able to comply with their agreement to furnish us with pictures in accordance with their contract, I shall oppose the payment of any money to them for the prize picture. So far as we are informed there are so far but two subscribers for prizes--the Corcoran Gallery and ourselves ...

As I understand it, the artists simply ask a pledge that their pictures shall be kept fully insured in transit and while in the Gallery here and to be returned to them in as good order as when delivered to us but that no charge will be made for the loan of them. Am I right? In case of a “break” between the Exposition and the Art Association, do you think you can get enough pictures from the artists and

28. William Semple was a businessman from Louisville, Kentucky, who made his fortune in railway supplies and metals. He was the chairman of the Art Committee for the Southern Exposition. Semple became a valued personal friend of Kurtz and came to New York to visit him and also to buy paintings from him.
Although Kurtz was confident, the directors prevailed upon William Semple to wire Kurtz in New York with one final query: “Should we break with Sutton are you absolutely certain that you can secure pictures enough elsewhere to fill gallery. Answer quick.” The Art Association countered by making one last attempt to convince the Exposition directors to engage its services rather than entrust their exhibition to Charles Kurtz. Sutton’s negotiations included a threat to obstruct loans:

Mr. Sutton was here yesterday. . . . The result was that he made a proposition very similar to the original one to furnish the Exposition with a collection of pictures to be equal in number and quality to that of last year—he says it will be better. He stipulates however that we are to subscribe $2,000 and take the picture awarded us. Whether the Board of Directors will accept the proposition is an open question—I think it is somewhat doubtful and you may yet have to secure a collection outside of the Art Association and from the artists direct so don’t let go any of your strings. . . . Sutton said repeatedly that he could block the way of our getting pictures from the artists if we tried it on our own account thro’ you. We don’t scare worth a cent but he may give you some trouble.

Knowing that he had the support of the directors of the Southern Exposition, and the confidence of many of the artists, Kurtz rose to the challenge. He proposed to fill the Exposition’s Gallery with pictures he could personally secure loans for himself. He immediately contacted George Seney, who had recouped his fortune and managed to secure the loan of forty of his pictures including one which had been promised to the Art Association’s for the Prize Fund exhibition. His ability to convince simultaneously the

29. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (283), Semple to Kurtz, April 29, 1886.

30. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz papers #4807 (292), telegram, Semple to Kurtz, May 5, 1886.

31. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (300-303), Semple to Kurtz, May 14, 1886.

32. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (708), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 30, 1886. Seney’s painting The Gossips by Carl Marr had been promised to the Art Association, as it was considered one of the best works in the Prize Fund exhibition. It
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Southern Exposition directors, important lenders such as the Buffalo Academy of Fine Arts, and the seventeen artists whose pictures were in that year’s Prize Fund show that a creditable exhibition could be mounted in 1886 without the cooperation of the American Art Association. This was an impressive accomplishment for a young man of only thirty-one years, indicating his rising status in the art world. Some insight into the difficulties he encountered and how he gained the confidence of the artists can be gleaned from the draft of a letter Kurtz wrote to the artist Henry R. Poore (1859-1940) who had studied and exhibited at the National Academy of Design:

Although I have not only your blank consigning to me your picture, Close of a City Day, for exhibition at Louisville but also your order to the American Art Association to deliver the picture to Mr. Wilmont I have reason to fear that I may have trouble in obtaining the picture. Mr. Sutton, I am told, has boasted that he would thwart my attempts to obtain any picture now in the Prize Fund exhibition.

When we demand the surrender of the picture, he will probably write to you and threaten you with the disfavor of the Association in case you persist in fulfilling your agreement with me. I have no fear that Mr. Sutton will be able to “bulldoze” you and you need have no fear that the Art Association may be able to injure you in any way; -- the Association is not now in a position in which it would be wise for it to attempt anything maliciously aggressive.

I only want to advise you that if you will support me in this matter, you may rest assured that henceforth I shall esteem it my especial interest and pleasure to do whatever I can for your advantages.

You shall not be involved in any expense in this matter, I only want your “moral support” in case I must resort to legal means to obtain the picture you have committed to my care for exhibition in Louisville.

If I obtain your picture, I shall exert myself to the utmost to secure your satisfaction in having it in our exhibition.33

Implicit in the letter is the promise to publicize and, he hoped, sell the painting. Once the painting was released to his care, Kurtz kept his word and did succeed in having

should also be noted that the works included in the 1886 exhibition were not all by American artists.

33. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4820 (1038-40), draft, Kurtz to Poore, August 3, 1886.
the painting mentioned in a *Courier-Journal* piece on the Exposition art gallery later that month, which also noted that *Close of a City Day* had been given a prominent position in the gallery.\(^34\) It was this kind of integrity that helped Charles Kurtz develop his reputation in the coming years. The local press celebrated Kurtz as “The Accomplished Gentleman Who Has Charge of the Exposition Gallery” and said that “Every lover of art as it is presented through the medium of pictures should know something of Mr. Charles M. Kurtz.” It described him as an “artist and a connoisseur but also a newspaper man of ability, experience and fame” who “enjoys a personal acquaintance with almost every artist of any repute in America.”\(^35\)

Fears concerning the quality of the Louisville collection were alleviated when Kurtz used his experience in journalism to place an article in the *Courier-Journal* in which he carefully explained the circumstances that led the Exposition directors to break with the Art Association because of its peculiar business methods. He also took the opportunity to continue his vendetta against the Art Association by pointing out that the organization was a business and not an association of artists. As such, it had violated tariff regulations by bringing in a group of pictures duty free from Paris, ostensibly for educational purposes and not to be sold. Kurtz’s printed exposé, appearing well outside of New York, inflicted little damage:

> An admission fee was charged, however and certain pictures were sold, which doubtless paid a duty, though they were introduced into the market first free of duty. But the average picture dealers, undisguised as an association, cannot do business in this way, as the Government is not blind in their respective cases.\(^36\)


\(^35\) AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4823 (381), scrapbook, “Art Director Kurtz.” *Courier-Journal*, September 5, 1886.
At the 1886 Southern Exposition, Kurtz introduced an innovation that was
designed to increase the number of visitors to the Exposition. Ballots were distributed one
evening so that a popular vote on the ten most favored paintings could be taken. The
*Courier Journal* thought it to be an interesting and useful exercise.

The Louisville idea is a very good one in short, and wherever pictures are exhibited
to popular gatherings, as at expositions and public art galleries, it might be
introduced with the result of arousing a more general interest in fine paintings than
could in any other way be created.37

Given the large number of people that the Exposition attracted--one newspaper
report estimated that 25,000 visited on the final day--this popular vote was a strong
indication of the taste of the American public in 1886, the year in which French
impressionism was introduced to New Yorkers. It also gave astute art professionals like
Kurtz, some notion of what kind of paintings would be most likely to sell, as well as some
idea of how effective his promotional efforts had been. Of the ten paintings, nine were of
genre subjects done in a realistic style. Some, like Carl Marr's (1859-1936) *The Gossips*
[Collection: Gayle S. Rose],38 were highly publicized due to the Prize Fund exhibition and
its ownership by George Seney; while others, such as Thomas Waterman Wood's (1823-

36. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (380-81), scrapbook, “Facts In Fine
Arts, The Failure of the American Art Association to Keep Faith With the Exposition,”
*Courier-Journal* August 22, 1886.

37. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823, scrapbook, “Art Criticism in
Kentucky,” *Courier Journal*, September 27, 1886.

women in native costume talking, was painted in Munich in 1884, and originally in the
collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. It was sold at auction (Park-Bernet
Galleries, N.Y.) in 1956 and was acquired by William H. and Frances W. Haussner for
their Baltimore restaurant, which displayed their collection of 19th century European
academic art. Old Masters and sculpture and American art. After the restaurant was
closed, major works from the collection, including *The Gossips* were sold at Sotheby's.
New York, on November 2, 1999 to Gayle S. Rose of Memphis, Tennessee.
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1903) *Putting On Airs*, had previously been featured in Kurtz’s *National Academy Notes*. Only one, William Trost Richards’ (1833-1905) *Restless and Illimitable Sea*, was a scene of nature, the subject matter that Kurtz believed was particularly well done by American artists.39

Kurtz also used his new found status to place two lengthy articles in the *Courier-Journal* promoting his personal protege, DuBois F. Hasbrouck,40 and another about his former teacher, William Morgan. By the end of the Exposition, he was able to report that two Hasbroucks and three Morgans were sold. The latter’s *Blowing Bubbles* brought eight hundred dollars, the highest price of any painting in the exhibition. Kurtz also announced that he would establish an art school that would offer instruction in drawing and painting. It would be staffed by the painter of that highly priced work, his New York friend and former teacher, William Morgan, provided a sufficient number of pupils were willing to enroll.41 By the close of the Exposition, he was able to report to his parents


41 AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823, scrapbook, “An Art School in Louisville,” *Courier-Journal*, October 12, 1886. Although Kurtz had a “School of Fine Arts” prospectus printed and distributed, he did not succeed in interesting the thirty people that would be required for the initial thirteen week quarter and did not proceed with the venture.
that his efforts, except for the art school, had been successful both personally and professionally.

We did splendidly with the pictures this year. I sold two Hasbroucks,—one for $100 and one for $125,—two Morgans (of my own) at $60 each; ... Sold 33 pictures in all, for nearly $6,000. Minneapolis people have written me for my "terms" for next year. Think this Exposition may reorganize for next year, too. In latter event, will probably come here again. Bierstadt writes for me to call upon him as soon as I get back to New York: possibly the London enterprise. S.P. Avery (the art dealer) also wants me to call upon him. I do not know what all may not be in store for me.42

By the end of October, Kurtz knew that his efforts had been successful and would reap benefits. The Chicago Tribune reported that of the various regional expositions then open, Louisville had the most interesting art exhibition, though it was the smallest.43 In St. Louis, Missouri, once again a venue for the Prize Fund exhibition, the newspapers confirmed what the Louisville, Kentucky Exposition directors had sensed.

A copy of the St. Louis Exposition art catalogue just received shows how wise was the Southern Exposition Directory in tenaciously refusing to release the Art Association from the "safety clause" in the contract, requiring a collection equaling

42. The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Kurtz to D.B.Kurtz, October 28, 1886. See also: AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 scrapbook, "Exposition Art Gallery, Something About William Morgan and His Pictures," October 17, 1886. It is interesting to note that prices Kurtz reported to his father were $25 less than what was reported in the newspaper. Although Kurtz mentions Bierstadt several times in his correspondence, it does not appear that he ever collaborated with him in the exhibition of the artist's pictures.

43. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (396), scrapbook, untitled clipping from Courier-Journal, October 28, 1886. In the article, a quotation from a personal letter to Kurtz is reprinted that compares the Exposition's art exhibition to others: "Mr. C.M.Palmer, General Manager of the Minneapolis Exposition wrote Charles M. Kurtz a letter saying 'After visiting all the Expositions, I am of the opinion that you have the most uniformly excellent collection of pictures, of its size, which has been on exhibit in this country this summer.' The other Expositions referred to were Milwaukee, which had 388 pictures lent by amateurs of that city; Minneapolis, which was termed "extensive" with 42 paintings by Albert Bierstadt, 20 by William Bradford and one Titian on view; Cincinnati, whose exhibition was described as "mediocre;" St. Louis, where the Art Association exhibited 463 paintings and the Prize Fund Exhibition; all of which outnumbered Louisville, which it said showed only 145 paintings. In fact, according to the Southern Exposition handbook, "nearly four hundred pictures were secured."
in number and merit that of last year and it also shows how the St. Louis people have suffered from not having had some such clause. The collection of pictures sent to St. Louis by the Art Association (or at least as many of the pictures sent by the Association as were hung and catalogued) do not equal them in average merit.44

Kurtz left confident that he would return the following year, although the Exposition still owed him three hundred dollars. It was a debt that may be viewed as an omen, for despite the success of the Art Gallery, the Exposition was experiencing financial difficulties that put its future in doubt for 1887. A $148,000 debt forced the directors to file for bankruptcy:

It remains to be seen whether or not the public of this city will put the enterprise in the way of continuing ... With two exceptions all the employees of the company were paid. Major J.M. Wright and the Director of the Art Gallery, Mr. Charles M. Kurtz. These are the two unfortunates and certainly no person has served the company more faithfully or more effectively.45

Major Wright resigned, and acting on the advice of his friend and confident, William Semple, Kurtz declined the directorship of the Art Gallery the following year after returning to New York to pursue more promising opportunities. Although subsequent Expositions were held in Louisville, Charles Kurtz did not return to manage the Art Gallery. He did, however return to Louisville to exhibit pictures as his career followed another direction. Nevertheless, 1886 was a pivotal year in Kurtz’s career. It marked his transition from a journalist who recorded the news of the art world and an employee of established art businesses, to a valued consultant and entrepreneur who was able to manage and market art on a national scale. By combining his interests in art and writing, he had learned how to effectively “promote the love of art” and profit from it as well.

44. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823, scrapbook clipping.
45. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (396), scrapbook, unidentified clipping, “Sensational Finale, The Glory of the Closing Hours of the Exposition Succeeded by Bankruptcy, The Big Show Fails For About $148,000.”
As he prepared to leave Louisville at the close of the Southern Exposition, Charles Kurtz received a letter from Samuel Putnam Avery (1822-1904), the distinguished art dealer, that charted Kurtz’s course for the next three years. Kurtz’s critical success with the Southern Exposition along with his very public feud with the Art Association and subsequent successful sales of paintings, largely from the studios of New York artists, had increased his visibility in the New York art world. So it was not surprising that Kurtz, who had became acquainted with Avery during the former’s tenure at the American Art Association, would be contacted by the prominent New York art dealer. Earlier in his career, Avery, like Kurtz, had favored American art and had organized the American exhibition at the 1867 Universal Exposition in Paris. However, his gallery on Fifth Avenue and Fourteenth Street depended on the sales of contemporary European art for the bulk of its profits. His familiarity with the European as well as the American art market is apparent in this letter in which he proposed that Kurtz manage the exhibition of an important painting by a contemporary European artist.

October 30, 1886

Dear Mr. Kurtz:

Sedelmeyer is here with Munkácsy’s Christ Before Pilate—had nearly arranged with American Art Association but a sudden disagreement upset all. He expects to get large gallery of Academy—but also has engaged another place. He wants a
person to act as secretary—to issue the invitations, write advertisements, answer letters, etc. I recommended you ... of course I cannot tell what compensation you may ask or what he will give, but if you are reasonable, (and he is not a niggard) I think you can fill the bill—the picture will bring you before the public here, and if you prove useful to Mr. S. he will no doubt be only too glad to have you continue with the picture in other cities. If you think it worth hastening on for—send me a dispatch at once on getting this, saying when you will arrive here ... glad you made the sales you did—33 sounds well.

Hastily yours,

S.P. Avery

Avery's enthusiasm was well founded. Charles Sedelmeyer (1837-1925), a German by birth, was a wealthy Parisian-based art dealer with galleries on the Rue de la Rochefoucauld as well as in Vienna, Dresden and Berlin. During the course of his career, he acted as agents for more American and European art collectors than any other dealer in Paris and became quite wealthy in the process. Sedelmeyer had signed an exclusive contract with one of Europe’s most celebrated realist artists, Mihály Munkácsy (1844-1900) [Fig. 18] Although Munkácsy had taken a Hungarian name in 1863 after the town from which he came, the artist’s family name was Lieb. For his part in the revolution of 1848, Munkácsy’s father was imprisoned and died there the following year, which may have provided the inspiration for his early success, The Last Days of the Condemned Man, [Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest] which received a medal at the Paris Salon of 1870. The painting reflected the rise of Hungarian history painting, whose “purpose was

1. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1161), Avery to Kurtz, October 30, 1886.


“He was not a Magyar, but was of Jewish descent, his family belonging to the class of German Jews from which come the land agents of the Hungarian landed proprietors.”

4. After the 1848-49 War of Independence, the Hapsburgs denied the existence of an independent state of Hungary
not just stereotyped historiography ... in the choice of subjects it sought to suggest the great tragedy of the nation. Its main feature was an allegorical presentation of its themes, analogous only to the art of Delacroix and Daumier."\textsuperscript{5} Initially, the young artist trained with the portrait painter, Elek Szamosy (1826-1888) in Gyula, Hungary, before moving to Munich where he studied with Franz (or Frantz) Adam (1815-1886), a battle painter. The early emphasis on facial expression and figures served Munkácsy well in his mature work, which often included multiple, individualized figures showing a range of emotions. Success had enabled him to move to Paris, where he lived in grand style after his 1874 marriage to Cécilie Papier De Marches, the wealthy widow of a Luxembourg landowner. By one account, the artist's lavish lifestyle masked a marriage that was less than happy, as was his political situation. Munkácsy was resented by the French since he did not become a citizen, while his Hungarian compatriots begrudged him his success in a foreign country.\textsuperscript{6}

Munkácsy was first introduced to Americans at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, where his painting, \textit{The Last Day of the Condemned Man} [Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest] was on view.\textsuperscript{7} It was followed in 1879 by a public exhibition at New York's Lenox Library of \textit{Milton Dictating Paradise Lost} [New York Public Library], which had won a medal at the 1878 Paris Salon. During the time that it was on view, it attracted much attention and it continued to remain on view at the New York Public Library for

\textsuperscript{5} Lajos Végvári, \textit{Munkácsy} (Budapest: Corvina, 1961), p.5.


\textsuperscript{7} \textit{The Last Day of the Condemned Man} (Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest) was a painting that Munkácsy had long wanted to paint. It was finally commissioned by the Philadelphia collector, W.P. Wilstach and painted in Düsseldorf.
much of the twentieth century. Munkácsy’s fame was such that even American artists who went abroad to study sought out the artist. John Robinson Tait (1834-1909), a landscape painter from Baltimore, studied in Düsseldorf and Munich from 1859 to 1871. It was in Munich that he met and became friendly with Munkácsy, despite the fact that the Hungarian artist, besides his native language, spoke only French and broken German, a fact that undoubtedly kept him at length from most of the American students. In 1879, Tait, who also spoke German, wrote a biographical profile of him for *Lippincott’s* magazine. Another American expatriate artist who came in contact with the Hungarian artists was William T. Dannat (1853-1929), who studied with Munkácsy in Paris in 1879. His work from that period shows some direct influence in its choice of subjects from everyday life and the use of dark tonalities and dramatic expression, as in his 1884 painting, *Spanish Quartette* [Metropolitan Museum of Art]. While some American artists, like Dannat, had the opportunity to study with Munkácsy, others, like Henry George Keller (1870-1949), a painter and etcher who had studied in Düsseldorf, imitated the older artist’s technique by copying his work. Keller’s 1894 painting, *Head of Mozart* [Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Ohio] is a replication of a portion of Munkácsy’s painting in the collection of the Detroit Institute of Art, *The Last Days of Mozart*, which was given to the museum by General Russell A. Alger after the artist’s American visit.

The acclaim that Munkácsy’s work received in America created a demand for his paintings among collectors. In a brochure written to accompany the exhibition of


Munkácsy’s “moral show” pictures, the assertion was made that “It was chiefly to this country that he owed his financial success.”

George I. Seney’s collection, when auctioned in 1885, included three of Munkácsy’s paintings. Two of them had been discussed at great length by the respected American critic, Mariana Griswold van Rensselaer (1851-1934), a contemporary of the Hungarian artist, who had lived abroad herself and so understood and appreciated Munkácsy’s stature in Europe. It was her words that Kurtz quoted in his entry for the artist in the George I. Seney auction catalogue in 1885 to convey a sense of his fame:

No painter of a more vigorous, intense, and truly artistic personality has been born into the world in recent years than the Hungarian, Munkácsy. I may indeed call him the very strongest of all living painters. It is hard to say what is the more impressive in his work, his masterly technique of a sort quite peculiar to himself—or the splendidly artistic temperament it reveals. ... And Munkácsy is an original master—one who cannot be said to owe his qualities to the example of any predecessor.

The appeal of working with both an artist and a dealer of international reputation was greatly appealing to an ambitious young man like Charles Kurtz. There were many precedents for paying admission to the exhibition of a single work of European as well as


11. The three Munkácsy paintings were The Night Rovers, In the Studio (A portrait of the artist and his wife) and Landscape.


American art.14 Kurtz responded enthusiastically to Charles Sedelmeyer's proposition to manage the American exhibition of Munkácsy epic work, *Christ Before Pilate* [Fig. 19] of 1881. Inspired by Tintoretto's passion pictures, *Christ Before Pilate* and the *Crucifixion* [Scuola de S. Rocco, Venice], it was, like many of the artist's paintings, a large canvas15 and it was the one with which the artist reached the pinnacle of his fame. This was due primarily to the inclusion of forty realistic looking figures expressing a wide range of emotions appropriate to the biblical scene, described in John:18, 19 and Luke:23 in which Christ is condemned to death. Due to its wide circulation throughout Europe,16 it, along with its companion piece, *Christ on Calvary* [Fig. 20] of 1884, had brought Munkácsy to the attention of American art connoisseurs such as Avery and Kurtz as well as recognition from American art collectors who began to purchase his paintings after Charles Sedelmeyer began to cultivate wealthy American collectors in 1877.17 In addition, 

14. The convention of circulating, single works of art for exhibition had been established by the mid-19th century. Examples by American artists include Benjamin West's *Christ Healing the Sick*, John Trumbull's *The Declaration of Independence*, Frederic Edwin Church's *The Heart of the Andes*. Likewise, the tour of Albert Bierstadt's western epics such as *Storm in the Rocky Mountains*, was supplemented by profits from the sale of prints published in 1869.

15. The painting measured almost fourteen feet high and twenty-one feet wide.

16. In addition to European capitals including Paris, Vienna, Budapest, Berlin, Stockholm, Amsterdam and Brussels, the painting was exhibited in London and twenty other towns in Great Britain.

17. Americans who owned paintings by Munkácsy include the New York collectors A. T. Stewart (*Visit to the Baby*), William K. Vanderbilt (*The Two Families*), Catharine Lorillard Wolfe (*The Pawnbroker's Shop*) and George I. Seney, who owned three works by 1885, as well as William Astor, Jay Gould, August Belmont, and John Fiske, Samuel Hawk, Erwin Davis and Robert Lenox Kennedy. Chicago collectors Potter Palmer (two paintings) and P. C. Hanford owned work by Munkácsy as did John Wanamaker of Philadelphia (*Three Ladies In A Park* (1886)) and an undated *Portrait of Miss Wanamaker* (the collector's daughter). Edward Strahan's *Art Treasures of America*, published in six volumes between 1879 and 1882 lists 17 works by Munkácsy in American collections. Including those mentioned, other collections in which Munkácsy was
it offered Kurtz the opportunity to get the better of the Art Association yet again. Writing from New York to his wife, who was staying with her family in Harrodsburg, Kentucky, after giving birth to their first daughter in September, Kurtz explained the situation.

... I went to see Mr. Avery, who told me Mr. Sedelmeyer of Paris wanted to see me about taking partial management of Munkácsy’s great picture “Christ Before Pilate” in this country.

The American Art Association expected to have charge of the exhibition of this picture, but undertook to “juggle” with Mr. Sedelmeyer in making the contract, so Mr. Sedelmeyer turned his back on them. The Art Association had been so sure of having this exhibition, that Sutton had a great lot of printing done, handbooks prepared etc., and had announced the exhibition “to be held at the American Art Galleries” through all the papers in the country, nearly so he will be out considerably. I think it will about break his heart when he learns of my arrangement with Mr. Sedelmeyer ...

I arranged to take charge of his show, especially caring for the Press Department for a salary of $75 a week. I am to do the work for a month (at that price) and “if we get along harmoniously” as we are both inclined to think we will— I shall probably engage with him for the whole year. The exhibition will be held at the 23rd St. Tabernacle in this city ... which was once a church. The picture--28 feet long if I remember rightly—will occupy the whole proscenium front! It is the greatest painting of the century--was visited by millions of people in Europe.

The exhibition will be held here for 3 or 4 months and then the picture will go to Boston and other cities ...

Kurtz’s experience working within the New York press and the contacts gained through profession organizations to which he belonged, such as The Press Club, proved invaluable to him. The World, The Tribune and The New York Times all covered the arrival of the artist, who had come to New York for the American debut of his picture with lengthy represented were Mrs. W. P. Wiltach, A. J. Antelo and Henry C. Gibson of Philadelphia, H. B. Hurlbut of Cleveland and William T. Walters of Baltimore. American museums which now own Munkácsy paintings include the Art Institute of Chicago, the Detroit Institute of Arts (which was the recipient of R. A. Algar’s purchase of Mozart’s Last Days in May of 1887), the Metropolitan Musem of Art, New York, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the Walters Collection in Baltimore and the Worcester Museum, Massachusetts.

18. The actual dimensions are 13’ 6” high and 20’8” wide.

19. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1191), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 5, 1886.
articles. Each article described in great detail how Munkácsy’s boat was met by a reception committee headed by Charles Sedelmeyer, who had received a permit from the Secretary of the Treasury to board the vessel and personally escort the artist from his ship while it was still in quarantine in Sandy Hook, New Jersey. Another boat chartered by Sedelmeyer awaited to take the artist to New York City. On board was a group of prominent men, including the dealer, Roland Knoedler; Sedelmeyer’s son-in-law and business associate, Eugène Fischhof, and the Secretary of the Reception Committee.

Charles M. Kurtz.

The initial enthusiasm about the arrival of the artist and the exhibition of his painting was tempered by the critical reception of the picture. The New York Times review carefully described the ambiance in which the picture was exhibited, regarded it as a masterly composition but not one without problems, and suggested in what might be considered an anti-semitic tone, that money was “getting next to godliness.”

The Tabernacle is a happy mixture of the mundane and the spectacular: its seven branched candlesticks are full of symbolism and its stage is a capital one for private theatricals. Hung with sad colored draperies and provided with a row of upper lights, the scene contained for its single star actor the large view of the judgment hall of Pontius Pilate with that ambitious prince on his throne. Jewish counselors seated about him, the accuser of Christ gesticulating indignantly, Christ himself standing with bound hands in the centre, a Roman legionary keeping the crowd back with the butt of his spear, an excited Jew before him, raising his arms and opening his mouth in violent denunciation and a mass of angry, curious, argumentative, and indifferent persons blocking all the background. Through the door one sees a bit of wall, a tower, and sky of a beautiful rich green color. The judgment hall is not architecturally elaborate or archaeologically exact; nondescript capitals enliven the small pillars on the left; nondescript decorations take away the look of bareness from the wall against which the throne of Pilate is placed; the notables present are not oppressively correct in dress, nor is it likely that at such a scene in such a place, a refined young woman would have been present, unveiled with her child, as Munkácsy has represented the group in the second plane against


21. Although the author of the review is not identified, it was probably Charles De Kay (1848-1935), who wrote on art for the newspaper from 1876 to 1894.
the wall. The colors are arranged agreeably, Pilate is in a white robe. Christ in a yellowish white, thus giving the highest broad lights to the two chief actors. The accuser is a Rembrandtish Israelite in a gold tunic; the seated counselor on the right of the canvas, with back turned; has a beautiful greenish blue plush cloak. The carpet before the throne is painted with that charm of brushwork we have seen in Munkacsy's earlier work, but it has either been kept low purposely or has faded. A man of the accusing party in a reddish robe, full face, is a handsome figure, and the soldier, with his massive bare arms and weighty spear, takes the attention from the first. Of heads and full figures there are at least 30 in the composition, and the general effect is decidedly interesting. But all it is, save where colors are touched on, may be anything but news to those who have examined the etchings of this picture.

The picture itself, indeed, when the impression it makes is compared with that of the finer class of its reproduction, is distinctly disappointing. We are used to expect from Munkacsy a richness, air unctuousness of touch... He used to make one think of Leibl and Gabriel Max... Of that there is little in Christ Before Pilate. ... There is no meanness about the painting; all is done with energy and intelligence, sometimes with so much energy that Munkacsy forgets a shadow when a shadow is due, such as one that ought to fall across the robe of Christ from the level spear of the soldier. But there is not so much richness here and delight in painting for its own sake as one expects. What gives most pleasure is the composition...

Then it may be that in the hope of dollars the spectacular business surrounding the picture does it injustice. It is certain that the gas makes the painting unsightly through reflections from the varnish when seen from some points of the auditorium. If a painting has any subtlety at all the glare of gas is sure to quench it, and even strong colors may suffer from the lack of cool daylight. But it is necessary to treat a star picture as a star actor is managed—surround it with all kinds of drawbacks in the shape of push, exaggeration, crude puffery, calcium lights...

Does anyone dare to murmur in the hall of the god of the Phoenicians on Twenty-third Street, west of Sixth-Avenue, namely the Tabernacle that if the figure before Pilate represents Christ as he really looked, it may be better to become a Buddhist at once? Is one within hearing of Sidonian Sedelmeyer that anyone is hardy enough to suggest that "the religious racket is being worked for all it is worth?" While the great Michael de or von Munkacsy has condescended to quit Sardanaia to reap a golden harvest on barbarous shores, is it the time to hint that the Jews have crucified Jesus afresh, made a ferocious dynaster of him, given him the expression of a person escaped from a madhouse, and then dragged the picture from country to country as remorse, with as much vulgarity and greed of self as the mountebank drags a monster from fair to fair.

This may be though, but must not be expressed. In the first place, it might depreciate other paintings by de or von Munkacs--or plain Munkacsy, just as you choose--and these are largely owned in America. Think of Messrs. Vanderbilt, Belmont, and Walters: think, or think, before you breathe the breath of doubt on that illustrious man's work, of the depreciation that might occur to investments, capital, and money earned by the honest sweat of these and other millionaires who own works by Munkacsy. And then have some feeling for the new come
millionaire who owns Munkacsy himself; for, in the second place, it will not do, because in America is the poor fellow's last hope. No European Government has been as willing to pay half the price asked for it, but the United States, which is the chosen home of Humbug, and has the proud distinction of having given birth to the greatest of humbug-monger, may still be counted upon to buy something not without merit, so long as its chief attractions are size and costliness.\footnote{22} 

The reviews concluded with a comparison to the English Pre-Raphaelite painter, Holman Hunt, that somewhat mitigated the harshness of the comments.

It goes down much easier than Holman Hunt's colored carving in relief which represented Christ in the carpenter's shop. If it does not in the remotest degree suggest any ideal that Christians can form of Jesus Christ, it can be heartily admired and applauded for the powerful character of nearly every feature in it and for its masterly composition.\footnote{23}

This criticism was reinforced by that of Clarence Cook (1828-1900), the venerable former \textit{Tribune} critic and editor of \textit{The Studio}, a journal of the fine arts. In the December, 1886 issue, he lambasted the exhibition as much for its promotional tactics as for the artist's abilities while praising the American press for its efforts to see through them.

It is certainly a sign of healthy independence on European judgment--so far, at least, as that judgment has been really formulated in the public prints--that an immediate check has been given in our newspapers to the attempted repetition in this country of the well laid schemes of advertising humbuggery that have been apparently so successful in countries old enough to know better.

In view of a great deal that is discouraging in the condition of art in this country, it is encouraging to feel assured that, when the agent of this latest travelling show shall leave our shores, he will not be able to print an American chapter, companion to the one published by Mr. Sedelmeyer in his book, and facetiously entitled "Opinions of the Press."\footnote{24} We shall not find the leading American newspapers, like those of nearly every country in Europe, uniting--in terms that would be gross

\footnote{22} "Christ Before Pilate, Munkacsy's Picture As A Star," \textit{The New York Times}, November 18, 1886, p. 5.

\footnote{23} Ibid. Here it appears that the writer is mistaken. The painting \textit{Christ in the Carpenter's Shop} (1849-50),[The Tate Gallery, London] is by the Pre-Raphaelite artist, John Everett Millais. Holman Hunt's painting of the youthful Christ is \textit{The Finding of the Savior in the Temple} (1854-60) [The City Art Gallery, Birmingham].

\footnote{24} Here Cook refers to the small book published in Paris in 1879 by Charles Sedelmeyer, \textit{Opinions of the Continental Press on Michael Munkacsy and His Latest Picture}. "Milton Dictating Paradise Lost to His Daughters." Written for promotional purposes, it was a compilation of favorable critical reviews about the painting.
flattery applied to the works of the acknowledged greatest masters in the art of painting—in praise of a work, which, outside of a certain amount of brush-power and clever stage-effect, has nothing that can entitle it to serious consideration. ... Who would believe that in this wide-awake common-sense time of ours, such a dish of ridiculous and nauseating buncombe could be seriously offered to the public in the confident belief that it would be swallowed, not merely without a wry face, but with child-like gratitude.25

The negative critical reviews were countered by a series of well placed interviews26 and accounts of social events planned in Munkácsy’s honor.27 Although the artist spoke no English, he was feted at a number of social functions planned in his honor during the month and a half that he spent in America. Among the activities, which were not limited to the New York environs, was a trip to Niagara Falls, and another to Baltimore on his visit to Washington, D.C. There, a series of entertainments closed with an event so grand that it was recalled in the artist’s obituary some fourteen years later—a dinner hosted by the Secretary of the Navy, William C. Whitney and his wife followed by a visit to President Grover Cleveland. One of the New York City events included a dinner held at Delmonico’s shortly after his arrival to which a number of distinguished personages were invited. They included the artists, Albert Bierstadt,28 a painter of epic travelling pictures.


26. Charles M. Kurtz, “Interview With Munkácsy,” Pomeroy’s Democrat, March 3, 1887. Extant copies of this publication have not been located.

27. See John Maass, “Munkácsy In America, New Light on Christ Before Pilate,” Művészettörténeti értesítő, Vol. 37, no. 1-2, Budapest, 1988. This account of the origins of the Munkácsy paintings and the artist’s visit to America is the most complete account published to date. Maass suggests that it was Sedelmeyer who suggested painting a scene from the life of Christ as the artist’s next major work. (However Maass’ source is the promotional publication, M. von Munkácsy, which Sedelmeyer himself published in 1914, long after the artist’s death.) He believes Sedelmeyer was inspired by a scene in Chapter 5 of Anna Karenina by Leo Tolstoy and notes the presence of Russian writers and artists in the Parisian circle of Munkácsy. Maass also identifies a number of other notable sources for the Christ Before Pilate.

and Daniel Huntington, the President of the National Academy of Design, and the Hungarian born publisher of *The New York World*, Joseph Pulitzer. Pulitzer commissioned him to paint a portrait of his wife, one of three painted with some reluctance during his stay at Sedelmeyer’s urging. Among the speeches was one given by the noted abolitionist, the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher (1813-1887), whose words were later quoted in the promotional material that accompanied the *Christ Before Pilate* exhibition: “The artist has seized life by its very highest elements, and speaks to us through his canvas in our deepest moods and our most pious aspirations.”

Although Kurtz had spent about twenty hours a day working prior to the opening of the exhibition, and admitted to his family that he was “almost crazy from overwork and anxiety” with “too much to do and too little time to do it in,” he apparently did not feel exploited nor was he disturbed by the negative criticism. Rather, he felt fortunate to have become associated with Sedelmeyer and Fischhof. He particularly liked Eugène Fischhof.

Albert Bierstadt also hosted a small farewell dinner at Delmonico’s on December 31, 1886. Bierstadt loaned Munkácsy his studio during his visit. Like Munkácsy, Bierstadt also studied art in Düsseldorf, which may account for the comradery between the two men.

29. Ibid. The three portraits painted while the artist was in New York were: Mrs. Joseph Pulitzer (destroyed in a 1900 fire at the Pulitzer’s New York house, Dr. James McCosh, a Presbyterian minister and President of Princeton (University Club, New York) and Henry G. Marquand, a financier and the distinguished President of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (unlocated). See also, Lajos Végvári, *Munkácsy*, (Budapest: Corvina, 1961) p.15. It was at Sedelmeyer’s urging that the artist undertook commissioned portrait painting in America. He also completed a seated *Portrait of Miss Wanamaker* (undated) for the John Wanamaker collection. The portrait was probably painted in 1887, when John Wanamaker visited Munkácsy at his Château Colpach in Luxembourg. Sedelmeyer also encouraged Munkácsy to paint 17th century costume-pieces and some writers attribute his decline to his capitulation to Sedelmeyer’s demands.

30. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4825, (610); “Christ Before Pilate,” promotional flyer for St. Paul exhibition.
who was only two years older than he and was entertaining the possibility of establishing a permanent branch of the Sedelmeyer Galleries in America. Sensing a possible opportunity to make a living solely from buying and selling art in his favorite place of residence, Kurtz, who had been selling primarily American pictures for the past few years whenever possible, remarked, "What a great thing it would be if I could work into some such enterprise!" That unguarded statement provides further indication of what Kurtz's preferred career path would have been. Had the Sedelmeyer enterprise materialized, Kurtz would undoubtedly have been launched on a career as an international art dealer based in New York. It also suggests that Kurtz was not only open to but, given the opportunity, in fact may have preferred dealing in European art. However, a permanent American branch of Sedelmeyer's gallery was not established, so Kurtz's association with the European dealer remained on a free lance basis.

*Christ Before Pilate* began its run in New York on November 17, 1886, with a private view for the press and the clergy followed by a reception for "society" the following day. Artists, too, were interested in having an early view of the celebrated picture. Elliott Daingerfield (1859-1932), who arrived in New York in the 1880s and became a student of George Inness, was interested in seeing the work of this realist painter despite the differences in their styles. Writing to Kurtz, he said:

> I have failed to receive an invitation to the private view of Munkasy's [sic] *Christ Before Pilate*. You will understand an artist's desire to see this work, which is my

31. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1243), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 16, 1886.

32. Charles Sedelmeyer continued to bring European art to America, however, and rented space in established galleries. As late as 1898, Charles Kurtz was still associated with him, writing the introduction for *A Collection of Paintings Representing Leading Masters of the Early English and Modern European Schools, Especially Selected from The Sedelmeyer Galleries, Paris, on Exhibition at The Ongies Galleries*. Although presented as an exhibition, the paintings were sold at auction in New York on April 14, 1898.
Although it was the visits by the socialites that provided the cachet, it was the complimentary tickets to the press and the "preachers," who, it was hoped, would urge their congregations to visit "the moral show" that would be crucial for attracting the general public to visit the exhibition. Citing the words of the Reverend Dr. T. De Witt Talmage (1832-1902), the promotional literature that was distributed to publicize the exhibition said that the painting was "wonderful as a work of art, and worth a thousand sermons as a moral lesson." Inviting the local clergy to a private view was a public relations strategy that Kurtz invoked many times as the painting made its way through the heartland of America. After engaging a well placed hall for exhibiting the painting, sending announcements about the show to the local press, and supervising the installation of the painting, Kurtz invariably wrote out a number of complimentary admission cards and sent them to the local ministers and Sunday schools.

That plan had worked so well in New York, that at the close of its opening day, Kurtz was able to report that there were 1,600 paid admissions at fifty cents each to the exhibition which grossed eight hundred dollars for the venture. It was not without competition either. As a cyclorama, the *Battle of Vicksburg*, which was advertised as the "grandest representation of this famous assault of General Grant" was on view concurrently on 55th Street and Seventh Avenue, with admission priced at one half of that.

33. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (4), Dailerfield to Kurtz, undated.

34. Dr. Talmage had co-authored a popular book that served to annotate the bible by providing a narrative history of the events recorded in it and illustrating them with engravings.

35. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1263). Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 20, 1886.
for Munkácsy's painting. For Kurtz, the success of the exhibition was not only measured in dollars; it also afforded him the opportunity to thwart the Art Association and extract another measure of revenge.

The "Moral Show" is doing splendidly. It is bringing from $500 to $750 a day straight along, so far, and I trust it may "keep it up." The Art Ass'n is sick over this thing. Kirby told Rehn he understood I had something to do with turning Mr. Sedelmeyer against the Art Association. He spoke of me as "that damned Kurtz." Could I ask better revenge on those cattle than to have them think they have lost this through me? I am going to have the Custom House get after the Ass'n some of these days, too. Forman of the Met Museum told me of some of their tricks with the Custom House, and I am going to have the matter investigated and written up.37

One month later, Kurtz was able to report that the show remained a financial success with receipts of nearly six hundred dollars per day. In addition to the admission receipts, Sedelmeyer was also doing a brisk business selling pictures as this excerpt from a letter that Kurtz wrote to his father attests:38

Since coming here, Mr. Sedelmeyer has sold about $65,000 worth of pictures too!—One bought by Morris K. Jessup and presented by him to the Metropolitan Museum (Columbus Before Ferdinand and Isabella by Brozik) was sold for $20,000. Jay Gould bought another for $15,000—a Munkácsy, The Grandfather's Birthday, a superb work. I met Jay Gould during the transaction but Eugene Fischhof sold him the picture. ... I am making the acquaintance of new "picture buyers" here every day, and feel that my connection with this business will be of the greatest advantage to me for the future.39

36. Advertisements, The New York Times, December 4, 1886, p. 7. In a conversation with the author, Dr. Kevin Avery of the Metropolitan Museum of Art identified the two artists who depicted the Battle of Vicksburg as Joseph Bertrand and Lucien Sergent. The exhibition at the New York Coliseum was sponsored by the Columbia Panorama Company.

37. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1289), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 24, 1886.

38. Sedelmeyer mounted a concurrent exhibition at the Tabernacle from December 1888-13, 1886, "Some Selected Paintings by M. De Munkacsy, Vacslav Brozik and Tito Lessi." The paintings mentioned above were in addition to the twenty on view in this exhibition.

Kurtz's continued efforts to publicize the exhibition through well placed articles in publications with which he had an affiliation were well received by Sedelmeyer, who had also mounted another exhibition of paintings by artists from the same circle so as to increase his sales in America. One such press piece that Kurtz authored appeared in *The Journalist*, a professional publication that was the organ for the New York Press Club. The journal reached writers who were in turn capable of generating more publicity, usually in art publications. Another event designed to promote the exhibition as well as to attract new clients for Sedelmeyer was a reception for a select group of two hundred "millionaires" which an ebullient Kurtz, confident of his own success, described to his father:

> Although it is said that it is hard to argue with success, the management of the picture's exhibition was not without its critics. Just two days after the exhibition opened, *The New York Times* compared Sedelmeyer, although not by name, to the American showman, P.T. Barnum, "the most eminent deviser of attractive advertisements that show business has ever seen."

> But it is also true that European showmen have bettered his instruction, and that among them is now to be found the most complete mastery of the art of piquing

---

40. See for example AAA, #4808 (107), Sedelmeyer to Kurtz, March 18, 1887. In this letter, Sedelmeyer remarks, "I regret that the *World* has not published your article about my sailing."

41. Kurtz, "An Interview With Munkácsy," *Pomeroy's Democrat*. This newspaper was the official organ of the Greenback Labor Party and was published by Mark Mills Pomeroy (1833-1896) a newspaper man and prominent citizen of La Crosse, Wisconsin who had previously published in Chicago before coming to New York.

42. The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, Special Collections, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, December 18, 1886.

43. In response to the public's enthusiastic reception of the picture, the artist created twenty-four known studies in oil of figures in the painting, replications and variations of *Christ Before Pilate* in addition to the prints that were sold by other dealers such as M. Knoedler.
the public curiosity. There is no form of the puff direct, the puff oblique, or the puff collusive which is not entirely familiar to them.

Of late the venue of this talent has been changed from the show business proper to the domain of art. Here it does not seem to be altogether in place. The burlesque actress and even the prima donna are not supposed to be above profiting by the arts of the puffer or even above conniving at them. The manager is the inventor of the arts by which the interest of the public is aroused and stimulated, but his client must be prepared to do her part toward making those arts successful. There is no great harm in this perhaps. It is only when a literary man or an artist is concerned that the want of dignity and delicacy becomes apparent in his submission to the schemes of his manager...

When the showman finds a plastic subject whose desire to make money is stronger than his desire to maintain his own dignity and the dignity of his calling he is naturally pleased with the opportunity to exhibit him in a striking attitude adapted to excite notice and comment. It is a peculiarity of the showman's mind that he cannot distinguish between fame and notoriety and, if his victim be passive, the showman does his best to merge into mere notoriety whatever reputation the victim may have previously acquired.

Foreign artists seem to succumb to the showman's wiles with little resistance and several foreign artists have left this country within a few years considerably richer than they came into it by reason mainly of their tractability.

The circumstances of the transaction are not recorded, but it was probably through the publicity generated by efforts such as these that Munkácsy's painting found its way into the collection of the Philadelphia department store magnate, John Wanamaker (1838-1922), in February of 1887. Although he has been described as "America's most influential merchant," Wanamaker was, despite his business acumen and wealth, "a


45. In a conversation with the author (June, 2000), William Zulker, archivist of the Pennsylvania Historical Society and author of a biography of John Wanamaker, said that he is not aware of any correspondence between Wanamaker and Kurtz that would further document their relationship.

devout Presbyterian, torn between evangelical religion and commerce.ˮ As the culminating event for the 1876 Centennial Exhibition, he hosted a religious revival meeting on property he owned on Market Street in an abandoned Pennsylvania Freight Station. His legacy included the building of a variety of Christian institutions such as Bible schools, churches and missions that he hoped would integrate Christianity into a society that he believed was fast becoming too materialistic. It has been suggested that Wanamaker's religious activities were an attempt to sanctify his business and rationalize the abundance with which he had been blessed. 48 Wanamaker, as the commercial heir to A.T. Stewart, the New York merchant who died in 1876, looked to Stewart as a mercantile paradigm to emulate 49 That paradigm included an outstanding art collection, which, coincidentally, was being prepared for auction by the American Art Association precisely at the time that Munkácsy's great picture was being exhibited.

Wanamaker was joined in his business endeavors by Robert Ogden (1836-1913), his partner and later superintendent of Wanamaker's New York store in the 1890s. Ogden, like Wanamaker, was also Presbyterian, but not as orthodox in his views. Nevertheless, upon his death, Wanamaker told his son, Rodman (1863-1928), that “we shall not have his like again, he was a miracle of goodness.” 50 Ogden's contribution to the business was his aptitude for management and public relations along with a firm belief in the power of pictorial advertising. In a speech given to the Sphinx Club, the country's first advertising association, for example, Ogden explained that “hot pictures” that

47. Ibid. p.32.

48. Ibid. p. 212.

49. Wanamaker bought Stewart’s “Marble Palace” on Broadway and Astor Place in New York and later connected it to his own building.

50. Leach, p.51.
commanded the attention of the average viewer were desirable in advertising. He also saw it as his mission to bring beauty to ordinary people. "Get rid of the precious notion that 'art is for art's sake'. art belongs to commerce; it must be connected with 'practical things'." Given Ogden's ideas about the ability of certain images to attract people, and that art should be connected to commerce through its practicality, along with Wanamaker's evangelical nature, the appeal of owning an epic religious painting like *Christ Before Pilate*, becomes clear. It had convincingly commanded the attention of New Yorkers and generated press notices and profits while conveying a moral message, qualities which would be transferred to the painting's new owner. The *New York Times* reported that the decision to purchase it was sudden. Civic pride, which entered into some of Wanamaker's art purchases, could not have been the primary motive in this acquisition, since the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts had previously arranged with Sedelmeyer to exhibit the picture. The purchase price was higher than had "ever been paid before for a modern painting." Later publicity material reported that the price had been "over $100,000." but Wanamaker was an astute enough businessperson to realize that the gross receipts from the New York exhibition alone almost equaled his purchase price.

51. Ibid. p. 52

52. AAA, John Wanamaker Papers, #3918, Art Collection inventories (786-1110). Wanamaker's private art collection included about two hundred and twelve paintings by 1908. It was displayed in either his Walnut Street town house or his country estate, Lindenhurst and was primarily composed of European paintings, particularly but not exclusively from the Italian Renaissance, Dutch Baroque and English Rococo periods. The store collection, displayed in its Philadelphia building, was offered for sale. There were few American works in either collection, and those that were included were by Pennsylvania artists. Thomas Hovenden's *Bringing Home the Bride*, hung in the Linen Department of the store, was the most prominent example. Other works by Pennsylvania artists in Wanamaker's personal collection had religious themes, as, for example, Benjamin West's *Christ Blessing Little Children* and Henry O. Tanner's *Christ and His Mother Studying Scripture*.

Moreover, if he continued to circulate the painting to venues around the country, the admission fees would eventually offset the cost of the picture and the related expenses, while the attendant publicity would effectively advertise his establishment and accomplish Ogden's self-proclaimed mission to intertwine art, religion and commerce. The circulation of the painting, along with Wanamaker's establishment of the Munkácsy Gallery in the Philadelphia generated skepticism, as evidenced by this review which appeared in a cultural journal of the period:

The use of art for advertising merchandise shows enterprise, whatever we may think of it from an aesthetic point of view. On turning over the pages of almost any of our leading magazines we see cuts of fine pictures devoted to the interest of soap, or perfumery, or plasters for rheumatism. It degrades the picture by the law of association of ideas, reducing the artist to the level of the artisan. ... But the desire for gain knows no conscience in dealing with art any more than it does in the presence of want.

A new feature in trade has recently been introduced by Mr. Wanamaker, of Philadelphia, in establishing a room of art in connection with his immense retail store, for the delight of his patrons, --including among his collection the great painting of Munkacsy, “Christ Before Pilate.” Whether this new way of advertising (for such it will be regarded, whatever the intention) will be to stimulate other great merchants to open art rooms, as they have already opened reception rooms, --and what will be the effect upon the art world, remains to be seen. Some will protest against this obtrusion of trade into departments foreign and superior to itself, as naturally tending to reduce them in fact, or by association, to its own level. But when the tide rolls in, it is useless to try to stay it by a shout or a growl. Besides, if a man of Mr. Wanamaker's high standing wishes to give the poor and rich, high and low, a chance to see one of the most remarkable pictures of our time, who should object?54

Correspondence between Kurtz and Ogden suggests that Wanamaker was sensitive to such criticism of commercializing the painting. By August of 1887, Kurtz was instructed not to use Wanamaker business envelopes for mailing press releases to newspapers, for he [Wanamaker] did “not want to connect the picture with our business.”

Although the New York Times reported that the painting had become the property

of John Wanamaker on February 9, 1887, Kurtz wrote to his father that the actual transfer did not occur until later in the month, and his association with the painting's exhibition would continue for the time being. Much like museum marketing techniques of today, Kurtz outlined plans to sell prints of the painting along with copies of other works by the artist, and then turned his attention to financial matters, always of concern to him.

On the 22nd of February the business was formally transferred to John Wanamaker, and it has been running for his account ever since—though that fact has not been made public. I am principally in charge of the show, assisted by James Grant, a Scotch Presbyterian who is one of the deacons in Wanamaker's store when he is at home. ... Alas! I'm afraid I am "out of the frying pan into the fire." I fear there is a little too much Presbyterianism about the new combination to agree with my blood.

At the last, Sedelmeyer and Fischhof acted very pleasantly. They paid me the $200 of which I wrote you, and gave me a splendid big etching of the "Christ Before Pilate." Sedelmeyer also told me he would like to have me act as his representative here until his return, for which he would pay me $60 a month in addition to my Wanamaker salary, ... Next winter he will probably bring over his other big picture by Munkacsy, the "Christ on Calvary," and endeavor to repeat the performances of this winter. Counting the profits from this exhibition before the sale of the picture, the amount received for it, and the amount received from the sale of pictures in the Private Gallery, and the total will boot up nearly $300,000 which the good Mr. Sedelmeyer will take home to Paris with him...

When Wanamaker came here, he told me he proposed to keep all the former employees for the present at the same salaries and wages formerly received from Sedelmeyer. He said he would not make a permanent arrangement with me or anybody until he got acquainted with us all, but he would like me to continue through March if I would. I told him I would. I said nothing about salary, because I was rather afraid he would pretend to believe I was receiving a $50 salary, and I wanted to show him how "necessary" I was to the exhibition before getting too independent. Before he went away though, he asked me if I could give him any references. The damned—"Philadelphian!"—I was very strongly tempted to ask him if he could give me references, but again my poverty sat upon me and I referred him to the President, officers and members of the National Academy of Design, the President, Trustees and Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, ditto of the Southern Exposition, to The Tribune and various other institutions he may have heard of in Philadelphia.


56. In a photograph now owned by the Lawrence County Historical Society of an interior view of the music room in the D.B. Kurtz house, [Fig.4] a framed reproduction of the Christ On Calvary can be seen hanging over the mantel. In correspondence with his father, Charles Kurtz mentions sending the prints home for safekeeping.
I had a long talk with Wanamaker and formed a pretty complete mental diagnosis of him. He is oppressed by a superabundance of religion and benevolence but I am told his employees are the poorest paid of their species.

I had a practical demonstration of his liberality today, in the shape of a check for $100 and a letter stating that it was for my past half month's salary, which he understood from Mr Sedelmeyer was $200 a month.

This damned good snivelling exhorter deliberately attempts to skin me out of two or three days salary every month, by paying me by the month instead of by the week. There is a vast difference to me between a month of four weeks and a month of 30 or 31 days.

In my present position I am not disposed to break with this ass, but I shall state the condition of affairs to him very plainly. I will not insist upon having $75 a week, but I will make a struggle for $50 a week. Wanamaker asked me in his letter not to let old Grant know what I was being paid—So I suppose poor old Grant gets about $30—The "show" is making now from $300 to $400 a day, net profit! 57

The advice given by D.B. Kurtz to his son in response to his letter was pragmatic, and undoubtedly mindful of his son's constant indebtedness to him. 58 He reminded Charles that his independence was not worth the meager financial returns and physical toll on himself that he received from his publication of Academy Notes.

If I were you I would try and pursue Mr. Sedelmeyer for the future advantages he might be to you. As for the magnanimous Christian philanthropist, Wanamaker. I am afraid he is too narrow a pattern for you to ever get a full coat out of—but if you can induce him to be of use to you, use him to the best advantage, but think if it would be well to let him know at the first opportunity that your salary is by the week and not the month. 59

57. The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, Special Collections, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, March 3, 1887. In addition to the etchings of Christ Before Pilate, color reproductions printed in and imported from Paris of Munkácsy's Visit to Baby from the A.T. Stewart collection and Two Families from the Vanderbilt collection were also being offered for sale as a pair for $50.

58. See for example, AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (1050), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, October 5, 1886. Charles Kurtz borrowed money regularly from his father to meet his family's expenses and/or to buy pictures. As the Southern Exposition closed and just before his association with Sedelmeyer, he owed his father $1,000 plus $30 interest.

59. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4808 (85), D.B. Kurtz to Kurtz, March 7, 1887.
Cognizant of his father's advice and somewhat dissatisfied with his employment by Wanamaker, Charles Kurtz kept up his association with Sedelmeyer, who had returned to Paris after the sale of the painting, disappointed that Wanamaker seemed to have abandoned the idea of purchasing old master paintings. Kurtz kept Sedelmeyer informed about art matters in New York knowing that before he left, the dealer had once again engaged the Tabernacle and intended to arrange for the exhibition of the companion painting to *Christ Before Pilate*, a crucifixion scene called *Christ on Calvary* the following winter. The scheme again involved Kurtz, and would follow the same format as that for *Christ Before Pilate*. In the meantime, Kurtz also acted as Wanamaker's agent, and by the end of March, 1887, had received carte blanche to "buy anything that seems cheap enough" at New York auction sales. However as the critic for the *New York Times* noted, although Wanamaker had become "The Latest Picture Maniac" by 1887, he had turned his back on American art.

He is exchanging good 2 per cent. property, situate on the giddiest whirls of Philadelphia's thoroughfares, for the baubles concocted with a few square yards of duck and some patent colors by certain slaves of the Phoenicians of Paris--slaves who are glad to secure a fraction of the illicit gains of their promoters. For the latter we should feel only withering disdain; but as to their hapless victim, we

60. See *A Guide to the Pictures of the Wanamaker Store* (Philadelphia: J. Wanamaker, n.d.). By 1900, the store collection included one hundred and five works of art. They were mostly nineteenth century European paintings that had been exhibited at the Paris Salons and whose subject matter was usually a genre or a landscape scene. A few history paintings were notable exceptions (e.g. *Napoleon's Farewell to France* by Eugène Guillon; *Bonaparte Landing in Egypt* by Antoine Guillon; *Baptism of Fire* by Jules Monge, a scene from a Zouaves battle in Algeria; *The Martyrdom of St. Catherine* by C. F. Phillippeau and *Columbus at Salamanca* by the American Frank M. Du Mond and a study of *The Battle of Gettysburg* by Peter Frederick Rothermel, a Pennsylvania born painter). The only other paintings by American artists included Thomas Hovenden's *Bringing Home the Bride* and George W. King's *A Colorado Canon* [sic].

61. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4808 (107), Sedelmeyer to Kurtz, March 18, 1887.

62. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4808 (115) telegram, Wanamaker to Kurtz, March 29, 1887.
should temper justice with mercy.63

As the Christ Before Pilate exhibition prepared to end its run at the Tabernacle in May, Kurtz was sent by Wanamaker and Ogden to Boston to scout possible locations for a summer exhibition there. Although Ogden, who was Kurtz's primary correspondent, was polite in his directives, he clearly regarded Kurtz as an underling who was merely hired to handle another aspect of the Wanamaker business empire. By this time, the department store magnate's art emporium included the public collection which was exhibited throughout the Philadelphia store on Juniper Street and in its “Munkácsy Gallery” in the ninth floor annex, as well as a private art collection, the contents of which were split between the Wanamaker country estate, Lindenhurst, and the family's Philadelphia townhouse on Walnut Street. After John Wanamaker's death in 1922, his son, Rodman (1863-1928), continued to expand the art on view in the store to include a group of paintings chosen from the annual Paris Salons. After his demise, the gallery was closed and the store collection was sold at auction by Sotheby's in 1930.64


64. AAA. John Wanamaker Papers, #3918 (1110). Sotheby's undated sale catalogue for Wanamaker Gallery. After Rodman Wanamaker's death in 1928, Sotheby's surveyed the contents of the store's gallery and prepared a list of items to be auctioned. Included in it were objects on display in the store (e.g. Munkácsy's palette) and several paintings relating to the artist that were on view in the Munkácsy Gallery such as the Austrian, Hans Temple's (1857-1931) picture of Munkácsy in His Studio Painting a Version of Christ Before Pilate (1887). Because the London auction house merged twice afterwards with American firms, the older records are not all accessible, and the precise sale date for the auction of the store's gallery's contents cannot be determined. American furniture and art from Rodman Wanamaker's estate were auctioned by Sotheby's on March 13, 1935, the only date that Sotheby's records for a Wanamaker sale near the store gallery's closing.
Christ on Calvary, the companion picture to Christ Before Pilate, was purchased by Wanamaker in April of 1888 for $175,000,\textsuperscript{65} and billed as "Munkacsy's last great picture."\textsuperscript{66} Although its fame was never as great as its predecessor nor its tour as successful \textsuperscript{67} Nevertheless, store promotional material stated that "after Mr. Wanamaker had acquired the two pictures, he counted them among his most treasured possessions."\textsuperscript{68} Its exhibition undoubtedly benefited from the resonance of Christ Before Pilate, and at least one writer continued to pay homage to it in poetic verse in August of 1888.

Munkacsy's Christ

One great idealist against the world!
   How firm he stands, between the Jewish mob
And Roman pedant law! As if there whirled
   No human thought within, no human throb
Convulsed that poor, frail form, where time has wrought
   Its work in fretting line and changing hue;
But though the body thus, that soul all fraught
   With Truth has given the great obedience due
To its own law. What matter then the shame,
   The hissing and the scorn, the Roman ban?
Right still is Right; the Law of Truth the same;
   Salvation in obedience still for man.
As he stands firm before a world alone,
   So sits the Law of Truth, God, on his throne.\textsuperscript{69}

---

\textsuperscript{65} Maass, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{66} Munkácsy completed the trilogy with Ecce Homo [Fig.21], completed in 1896. It is regarded as the last painting of his career, since he was not able to paint during the last four years of his life.

\textsuperscript{67} Maass suggests that the picture's fame was not as great as Christ Before Pilate because the crucifixion scene was a more familiar subject in art and invited less favorable comparison with the Old Masters.

\textsuperscript{68} AAA, John Wanamaker Papers, #3918 (722).

Like *Christ Before Pilate*, *Christ On Calvary*, a slightly larger picture, \(^{70}\) opened its tour at the Twenty-Third Street Tabernacle in New York in 1888. It was exhibited in venues familiar to Kurtz, like Louisville and Pittsburgh, as well as throughout the South. One reason for the lessened enthusiasm may have been the subject itself, which was more familiar and perceived by the critics as being less original in composition. In addition, this time, the artist remained in Europe, which did not create as many public relations opportunities, although a compilation of press and related printed material was once again made available in book form.\(^{71}\)

Once again, Sedelmeyer mounted a related exhibition that allowed the dealer to maximize his profits.\(^{72}\) Kurtz urged Wanamaker and Ogden to send the paintings on tour to South America or back to Paris for exhibition in the International Exposition during the summer of 1889. The paintings continued to be publicly exhibited until 1891, when

---

\(^{70}\) *Christ on Calvary* measured fourteen feet, two inches in vertical width by twenty-three feet, 4 inches in length, as opposed to *Christ Before Pilate* which was thirteen feet, six inches in width by twenty feet, eight inches in length.

\(^{71}\) Charles Sedelmeyer published *Christ on Calvary by M. de Munkacsy*, in New York in 1887. It contained 109 pages of illustrations, opinions of the English, German and Austrian press, an English sermon on the subject and a scholarly study of the painting.

\(^{72}\) AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4825 (85), *Some Paintings by Munkacsy and Others on Exhibition and For Sale*. This checklist, printed by Emory H. Barton, 17 Race Street, Cincinnati, notes that the paintings were “mostly collected by Mrs. Charles Sedelmeyer, Paris and Mr. Charles Kurtz, who for the past eight years has edited the illustrated handbook of the Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design and will be sold at moderate prices.” Of the 31 paintings offered, only two were by Munkácsy, *Meditation* ($6,000) and *The Sleeping Model* ($3,500), nine were by Kurtz’s protege, Dubois F. Hasbrouck, and seven others were by the American artists Jervis McEntee, Walter Gay, Irving R. Wiles, Eugene Poole, LeGrand Johnston, A. L. Morgan and Ralph A. Blakelock. Prices for the American pictures ranged from a low of forty dollars for the Morgan to a high of six hundred dollars for the Gay, with the other priced between one and two hundred dollars.
Wanamaker, who had never been entirely comfortable with the scheme, announced that
"They will not be exhibited for private profit in this country any more at present."
However, they were included in a major public exhibition at least once more. It was
only after John Wanamaker's death in 1922 that his son, Rodman, began exhibiting the
paintings once again in the Grand Court of the Philadelphia store each Easter season,
where postcards of the paintings were also available for purchase.

When Munkácsy died in May of 1900 in a Bonn insane asylum, the *New York*
*Times* reflected on the course of his career and lamented his association with Charles
Sedelmeyer.

It was unfortunate that his great skill was shorn of its best achievement by an
arrangement into which he entered with a Paris dealer who had galleries in
Dresden, Vienna and Berlin, to furnish paintings for exhibition. To this was due
the enormous canvasses [sic] all too hasty execution of his later work.

For Charles Kurtz, however, the association proved much more beneficial. During the
years in which he was associated with Sedelmeyer on the exhibition circuit, Kurtz
became familiar with the regional characteristics of the United States and its people.

Of Buffalo lately I've changed my impression (with experience ideas *should* make
progression) and now I assert, with all due conviction, and without any fear of a
flat contradiction, that of all the slow places, --Philadelphia aside--and of all the
dead places, which long since have died, this town is the slowest and deadest. It's
one that should stretch out its fingers and "take in the bun". Indeed, I assure you. I
find it quite slow, even while I am running my "great moral show!"

The people are pleasant, and talk about art with a knowledge omnipotent--so one
would think, whose knowledge of pictures was not gained apart from the cheap
country grog--shops where bad people drink. Their knowledge of Art, as the
knowledge of swine about wearing clean shirts, --I can only define.

73. The paintings were exhibited again publicly in Chicago, in 1893 at the World's
Columbian Exposition, where Charles Kurtz was the Assistant Chief of the Art
Department.

The remarks that I hear would be oftentimes funny, were I not so anxious to rake in the money of the people who make them, but who never try to learn how essential it is they should buy.75

Kurtz also gained valuable experience in what today would be termed advertising and public relations, a relatively new area, being explored by Robert Ogden on behalf of Wanamaker's department store. In his promotional techniques, Sedelmeyer, like Ogden, was also "anticipating some publicity methods of the American film industry including the 'personal appearance tour' of the star,"76 a technique that Kurtz later adopted in his promotion of the Glasgow School, substituting himself as the official representative for the artists.77

Despite the fact that the modest salary and low profile that Kurtz was forced to endure may not have pleased him at the time, it afforded him the opportunity to practice progressive advertising and marketing techniques effectively without publicly incurring the wrath of critics, as had Charles Sedelmeyer. In addition, promotional techniques (such as private viewing days for select groups such as well-to-do socialites, the clergy, the press, and children), brochures placed with railroad agents, concurrent exhibitions related to the main focal point, and carefully placed newspaper articles that "piqued" the public's interest were effectively applied to other large exhibitions that Kurtz managed himself.

75. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (1113), Kurtz to "Sister Barchlow," July 2, 1888.
76. Maass, p. 40.
77. Maass also observes that the epic narrative and historical paintings of the 19th century were prototypes for the wide screen Hollywood biblical epics like The Robe (1953), and Barabbas (1962) which have scenes similar to Christ Before Pilate. In addition, he notes that several of the Hollywood epics based on ancient Roman and biblical themes had Hungarians (Mihály Kertész, Endre Marton and Miklós Rózssa), associated with their production (Ben Hur, Cleopatra, The Egyptian, Noah's Ark, Quo Vadis).
later in his career. The "moral show," despite its high-minded subject matter, was not an entirely moral or aesthetic experience from either a critical or business point of view. For Wanamaker, the circulation of the Munkácsy paintings became an effective way to advertise by furthering an awareness of his namesake business in a subtle manner. Much like corporate sponsorship of art exhibitions today, the circulation of these major religious paintings for the benefit of the general public who would otherwise not be able to view, much less purchase such important paintings, no doubt assuaged Wanamaker's conscience as it increased his personal fortune as well as his reputation as a philanthropist. Likewise, as Kurtz traveled the country on behalf of genteel but enterprising businessmen, he further developed his own nascent attitudes about the commercial aspects of art and Americans in general. As evidenced by the letter quoted above, Kurtz came to realize that the business of art had little to do with aesthetics or morality. The problem with which he grappled was how to interest the public in spending money on art. The tours of the Munkácsy paintings, despite their high-minded subject matter, taught Kurtz much about the business of bringing art—whether American or European—to the people profitably.
CHAPTER 5

A Blow At Beauty: The Tariff Issue

Until 1816, the tariff, a tax on imported goods that was originally intended primarily to raise revenue as well as to protect and encourage American manufacturing, was extremely low. It only became a national issue after 1816, when the first truly protective tariff aimed at promoting American goods at the expense of imported products was enacted.¹ In 1861, during the Civil War, to create additional funds for the federal government, the tax rose to ten per cent on foreign works of art and imported goods, and it remained at that stable level until 1883, when an increase from ten to thirty per cent was established.

In May of 1884, a modification to the tariff on art was proposed. The plan was to levy a tax of ten per cent where none existed upon the work of American expatriate artists and reduce the duty on foreign art from thirty to ten per cent on works of art imported for the use of art schools and art institutions. It would also reduce the tariff upon paintings produced by foreign artists and imported by dealers and wealthy individuals from thirty to ten per cent. This became a major point of contention.² During the Congressional debate,

¹ The first general tariff was passed in 1789. Administration of tariffs is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury.


The primary objection to placing art on the free list was that it was viewed as a luxury. “It goes to adorn the “parlors of the wealthy; and you ought not to take off the taxation they pay when the House positively refused the other day to reduce the taxation ... on woolen goods and on boots and shoes and on farming implements and on all the
a petition from over four hundred American artists was introduced, stating their view on

the matter:

To the Congress of the United States:
The undersigned respectfully ask the retention of the law of March 3, 1883, wherein all oil paintings and watercolors, for art educational purposes, no matter who the artist, are admitted free of duty, and also admitting free of duty paintings and watercolors the result of the labor of American artists residing abroad, and laying duty only upon such works produced by foreign artists imported into this country and sold for profit and individual use, and taxed as are other articles of luxury which compete in trade circles.3

Several speakers on the issue noted that a duty on imported art was an affront to those countries--principally France, Italy and Germany--whose schools had educated American artists and whose exhibitions had recognized them. Opponents also argued that an import duty demeaned American artists because it implied that the United States government thought that American art was “inferior” and needed the protection of a tax on imported art.4

Congressman Frank H. Hurd of Ohio countered the suggestion to reduce the rate of duty by proposing Bill #7651 that would have abolished the duty on works of art that were the product of both foreign and American artists residing abroad because in his view, “art should be free.” In his address to Congress, he reminded the legislators that under the tariff of 1846, which was endorsed by the Democratic Party and regarded as a model of what a revenue tariff should be, all foreign works of art were admitted into America free of duty.

implements with which our people toil to make their daily subsistence. You refused to take 20 per cent off that taxation; and yet you are ready to reduce the taxation on a magnificent painting from 30 per cent down to 10 per cent...on magnificent paintings which are imported to adorn the parlors of a Gould or a Vanderbilt...the House was asked to put them on the free list because the tax was burdensome...”

3. Ibid., p.4297.

4. Ibid.
in my judgment there ought to be no duties at all on works of art. ...Art is an educator. It refines, elevates, civilizes. It develops and perfects the tastes of a people. It is at once the evidence and the cause of culture. Every work of art which America receives adds to its store of educational equipment and increases the possibilities of artistic growth. It does not come as other articles, to disappear in the wants of daily consumption, but to delight and improve the public taste for a blow at beauty. It is as though you would draw a curtain over the sun. It is sitting in the darkness when at your own bidding the glory of the light may come.

Remove these restrictions upon foreign art, that the intelligent, ingenuous youth of America, of this and succeeding generations, may have easy personal converse with the splendid works of the world's divine genius.5

Hurd's proposal along with a reduction in the tariff was defeated by the House with a vote of 52 in favor and 179 against and 92 not voting. Although the duty remained at thirty per cent, the issues that the debate raised reverberated and remained points of contention for the next quarter of a century.

The tariff remained a subject of heated debate in Congress6 as well as the press7. By

5. Ibid. p. 4297.

6. Congressional hearings that dealt with the tariff include:
49th Congress, “Exempting From Taxation All Property Held By Trustees of Corcoran Gallery of Art,”, 1885-86.
49th-1 Congress, “Exempting From Taxation Property Held By Trustees of Corcoran Gallery of Art in District of Columbia,” 1885-86.
1885, the Art Committee of New York's Union League Club, which had not one artist on it, circulated a letter advocating the removal of all duties on importations of foreign art. The Art Union, which had changed its format from a monthly to a quarterly magazine, reprinted the text of the brochure. By that time, the magazine, acting as an unofficial organ for American artists, clearly stated the artists' position and again directly addressed the tariff issue in its pages:

The artists generally favor a duty of $50 on every oil painting...the present duty of 30% on imported works of art cannot be considered high, when the duties on all other importations average at least 50%...As for works kept out from a $50 duty--let them stay out.

The Republicans interpreted their success in the election of 1888 as a majority vote against the low tariff introduced in Congress earlier that year by the Democrats, and set out to revise the tariff upward. As was tradition, the bill that was introduced into Congress received the name of the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman William McKinley of Ohio, and became law on the first of October, 1890. The McKinley Tariff, as it was known, repealed the duties on raw sugar, steel rails and plates and other commodities of little commercial interest in America. However, it raised the tax on imported goods such as gold, silver, paintings and other valuables from thirty to forty-nine percent of their value. The only exception was foreign art that was declared

7 The first issue of the Art Union, edited by Charles M. Kurtz, contained an article on Congressman Hurd's "Art Should Be Free" speech on May 19, 1884.


10. Andrew C. McLaughlin and Albert Bushnell Hart, Cyclopaedia of American Government, (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1963) p. 471. The complete name is the McKinley Customs Administrative Act. In addition to targeting undervaluation, it also attempted to secure uniformity of appraisal at different ports, increased the number of general appraisers, and organized courts of appeal.
educational; it allowed to enter the country duty-free, unless it was sold while in the United States. The McKinley Tariff also gave the President the power to levy duties if, in his opinion, a country imposed unreasonable taxes upon products from America.\textsuperscript{11} Consequently, paintings sent to America during the Harrison administration (1889-1893) when the McKinley Tariff was in effect had to be sold for much higher prices to accommodate the increased tariff and still generate a profit for the seller. It was modified a bit in 1893, when the Wilson bill narrowly passed the House of Representatives and was later adopted in 1894 during the Democratic administration of Grover Cleveland (1893-1897) as the Wilson-Gorman Tariff. Although still protective in nature and unpopular with many, its chief impact on the art world was to provide for the adoption of an \textit{ad valorem} tax based on the commercial value of the imported item wherever practical rather than impose the a uniform, specific rate of duty. The passage of the McKinley and Wilson-Gorman Tariffs also coincided with a downturn in the American economy that culminated in an economic depression in 1893 which lasted until 1896 and had ramifications that will be considered in the discussion of the 1893 Chicago World's Fair.

In 1897, another major tariff reform was passed called the Dingley Tariff, after the Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, Nelson Dingley of Maine. It raised duties on imported goods to an average of fifty-seven per cent, the highest in the country's history. This time, art objects were included among items deemed "household necessities" such as brandies, wines, and vermouth. Duties on those things were not taxed as at the maximum rate, making imported art more expensive, but still more affordable\textsuperscript{12} than other goods

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p.383.
\end{itemize}

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
such fabrics and sugar. The changes the Dingley Tariff introduced lasted twelve years, longer than any other tariff since 1828.

The final flurry of tariff debate during Charles Kurtz's lifetime began in 1908 as a prelude to the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff. During that year, the American Free Art league published a brief, reminiscent of Congressman Hurd's "Art Should Be Free" speech in 1884, stating its position in favor of removal of duties on works of art. This position was also taken by Kurtz in his final issue of *Academ y Notes*:

> If a duty be levied upon foreign art--an educational influence--brought into the country, why not require the foreign visitor to the United States to pay an entry fee commensurate with his intellectual attainments--especially if he be a writer, lecturer, painter or musician? There is always danger of intellectual infection from such persons. And why not tax the home-coming American for the education he has gained from foreign travel?13

The adoption of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff on August 5, 1909, once again substituted specific duties instead of the *ad valorem* tax as a check against undervaluation of art objects being imported into the United States.

As outlined in the preceding paragraphs, it is clear that the tariff emerged as a national issue at the beginning of Kurtz's career, and demanded his attention throughout his lifetime. It was also closely allied to political party identification. Kurtz, who called himself "a [Benjamin] Harrison man" during the 1888 Presidential election campaign was, not surprisingly, a Republican with a sense of entitlement, intent on becoming wealthy and cognizant of his position in society as a descendent of Pilgrim ancestors, the Wilders.14


14. AAA Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4816 (141), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 29, 1898. Kurtz took a certain amount of pride in his Pilgrim ancestry. Although he did not...
The Republicans, like American manufacturers, wanted a high tariff that would not only raise the price of imported goods, but also allow American producers to sell products at a higher price. The Democrats, supported by farmers and Americans who were not employed by industry, wanted a low tariff so they could buy goods inexpensively. In Kurtz's day, affiliation with a particular political party was a significant part of one's identity, as the historian, Richard L. McCormick, has noted:

Party loyalties ran deep in the Gilded Age. Appealing to voters on the basis of the same values they learned in their homes and churches, party leaders reminded men of their ethnic and religious identities, of their community's history and perhaps above all, of the Civil War—still a vivid memory for most Americans. Republican stump speakers observed theirs was the party of morality, the party that had abolished slavery and saved the Union, the party of Lincoln. Sometimes Republican candidates in the North might also remind audiences that theirs was the party of native-born Protestants, the party that would purify the community by imposing right behavior upon its members.15

Charles Kurtz was a model Republican, secure in his position as a white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, and confident of the righteousness of his behavior. However unlike most Republicans he was not engaged in an occupation that would benefit from a high tariff. He also realized early on that his finances were limited as were his opportunities for European travel, circumstances that would not bode well for collecting and dealing in foreign art. As early as 1882, he wrote a piece for The Tribune that was a report on the tariff hearings then taking place. Although factual in nature, it presented an argument made to the Tariff Commission at hearings in New York City in favor of a high protective

join any Mayflower genealogy group, he pointed out to his wife that he could do so if he so wanted. However, he did not seem to relate as well to his paternal German lineage. Upon his appointment as director of the Albright Gallery in Buffalo, he declined an invitation to join a German heritage society (see AAA #4818 (9) Kurtz to Director of German-American Club. Nov. 6, 1904) because he said he felt he was too removed from his German roots, even though that side of his family came to America later, in 1722, from Darmstadt, Germany.

The Seney sale confirmed his optimism about the future of American art, and the rising tariff, the major issue in the election of 1888, gave him added reason to promote artists from his own country. So, while many wealthy Republican capitalists such as William H. Vanderbilt or John Wanamaker were importing art from Europe to add to their collections, Kurtz took a more pragmatic path to build his by looking to America.

That Charles Kurtz was indeed conscious of political party affiliation is borne out by a comment he made in 1889 after accepting a position as art critic for the New York newspaper, *The Star*, a publication known to favor the Democratic Party. In writing


17. Armin B. Allen, *The Cornelius Vanderbilts of the Breakers, A Family Retrospective*, (Newport, Rhode Island: The Preservation Society of Newport County, 1995). William H. Vanderbilt (1821-1885) collected Barbizon and academic genre paintings. His collection was on view in the gallery of his Fifth Avenue house in New York City. The collection remained in the family until 1945 when it was sold by the estate of General Cornelius Vanderbilt III at Parke Bernet Galleries. Kurtz was invited to the opening of the renovated picture gallery in 1883.

18. William Zulker, *John Wanamaker, King of Merchants*, (Philadelphia: Eaglecrest Press, 1993). Mr. Zulker is the archivist of the Wanamaker Archives at the Pennsylvania Historical Society. He confirmed that Wanamaker, founder of the Philadelphia based department store, was a staunch Republican who was nominated by one faction of the Republican Party for Vice-President in 1912. Wanamaker, however, opposed the tariff for both his business and his art collection depended heavily on imports.

19. The Fifth Avenue Galleries, *Private Collection of the Paintings of the late Charles M. Kurtz*, (New York: The Fifth Avenue Galleries, 1910) lists 158 oil paintings and 44 drawings in the collection at the time of Kurtz’s death. 65 American artists were represented as opposed to 37 European artists, however 13 of the European artists were members of the Glasgow School, which Kurtz promoted.
home to his father, he said he believed that there was "no politics in art, anyhow." Consequently he could continue his Republican party affiliation, which favored a higher tariff, because in the 1880s a higher tariff could only work to his benefit by gradually shifting the nation’s attention to American art.

From 1880 until 1887, America experienced an economic boom period that increased the purchasing power of a substantial part of the population. Conscious of the rise in the tariff from ten to thirty percent in 1883, Thomas B. Clarke, the well known dealer and collector of American art, wrote to Kurtz in October of 1884 regarding the sale of paintings from the Southern Exposition exhibition: "I fancy that little is doing yet in sales—it would be exceptional if you have any luck at all under the present conditions of trade and politics." It was only later, when Kurtz's career took on a more international aspect through his work at the 1893 World's Colombian Exposition, that the tariff became problematic for him professionally, although he noted the effect the McKinley Tariff was having on his personal living expenses in his "The Man About Town" column in the daily newspaper, The Star, as early as 1890.

---

20. Presnar, p. 72, citing letter in Kurtz Papers, Lawrence County Historical Society, C.M.Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, Feb. 20, 1889. Kurtz also noted that the entire management included Republicans, a fact that he found "comical," in view of the paper's bias.


22. AAA. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (661), scrapbook, "The Man About Town," December 9, 1890. This column was occasionally subtitled "What He Hears and Sees Worth Noting in the Daily Current of Metropolitan Life." It was not limited to Kurtz's observations on the New York art world.
From his vantage point as a writer and an editor, he kept informed about an issue that polarized Americans. Protectionists argued that increasing the duty would help American artists residing in the United States sell their work since imported art would cost substantially more. Those who opposed an increased duty, the “free traders,” argued that imported art was educational and should be allowed to come to the United States duty free, unless it was purchased while in America with the new owner intending to keep it there. Articles about the tariff appeared in Kurtz’s first major art publication, The Art Union, and his last professional periodical, Academy Notes, a testament to the enduring relevance of the topic as well as his personal interest in it. In retrospect, the tariff, in conjunction with the economic depressions of the early 1890s, may be viewed as being responsible for directing not only Kurtz’s attention, but the country’s in general, towards American rather than foreign art during that period.

As editor of The Art Union magazine, Kurtz published several commentaries on the subject of the tariff, and underscored its relevance by putting it in historical perspective and citing the enduring nature of the debate. In it he said:

The subject of the tariff is one of the vexed questions which has come down to us as a part of our paternal inheritance, whose roots run back through all the history of the republic. There has never been unanimity upon the tariff question.23

Various aspects of the tariff issue were raised in The Art Union. Should the work of American expatriates be taxed at the rate of that created by foreign artists? Should recognized masterpieces with educational value be subject to duty? Is it possible to assess a fair ad valorem duty on a work of art? The 1884 inaugural issue of the magazine introduced the first of these topics with a piece that debated the rationale for a duty on imported art by focusing on the resident versus the non-resident artist.

In consequence of the protection given to all other industries, the expenses of a resident artist while producing a work of a certain degree of excellence, are at least fifty per cent higher than they would be if he were living in Europe. It follows, therefore that as long as these conditions obtain, there can be an equal competition between the resident and the non-resident artist only when there is a duty upon the works of the latter that is equal to the difference in the cost of production in the two continents.  

An anonymous artist echoed the same sentiments in less polished prose in a letter to the editor:

The American artist who sticks to his own country certainly should not be burdened in order to place an American who lives abroad and the European artist on the same footing...if he [the American expatriate artist] don't like it--let him come home.

Printing an argument in favor of a tariff on imported art would seem to reflect the sentiments of the magazine’s Republican editor, Charles Kurtz, along with some of the more established American artists. It was noted that American collectors, who seldom bought American pictures, American expatriate artists, and French and German picture dealers were the ones most likely to be effected by an increase in the tariff, and that very few artists had strong opinions and had given the subject much thought. The controversy, continued in the second issue of The Art Union, dealt with the problems of imposing a tax on imported art.

It has been urged as a reason for the removal of the duty upon art works, that they are educational; if that is an honest reason, why not begin with books--But the people at large take another view of the matter; why should any discrimination be made in favor of the few rich men who can well afford to pay a duty on the high priced pictures they buy as luxuries, while they--the people--are heavily taxed upon the hardly gotten necessaries of life?...most of the artists...are willing to make a concession of their rights for the sake of facilitating the importation of works that are calculated to aid in the art development of the country. Most of them think this can be best accomplished by a specific duty that would be light upon works of


any merit, and would become merely nominal as the pictures increased in excellence.

Any ad valorem duty is a premium for fraud, and will be taken advantage of by dishonest importers (who run little or no risk of detection as there is no standard of values for works of art and it is impossible for any third person to know the prices that may have been paid for them in Europe—such prices being known only to the buyer and seller.

The American artist wants no special favors from the citizens. If we are to have free trade, let it be either free trade upon the necessaries of life, or free trade all around.27

In each of these essays, the author is indicated only by the initials, Y.Z. However the third issue, which published an article authored by X.Y.Z, titled “A Defence [sic] of Foreign Art Dealers” answers the argument against a tariff by focusing on the effect it would have on the American art dealer. The argument paraphrases many of Kurtz’s own sentiments as expressed in his private correspondence and suggests that he was the author of this piece.28 The essay states in part:

The foreign art dealers of this country have been blamed from time to time by some of our artists and their friends for their apathy towards American art. I propose to defend them from these unjust accusations. The art dealer is just like any other trader, and turns his opportunities to those channels where there is the greatest opportunity for profit, and we should not blame him for that. He has no particular sympathies for the art of any country.

Some of our smaller dealers who have made American art a specialty, have done so not from patriotic motives, but simply because they have not possessed the means requisite to buy a foreign stock. They can do an American art business on comparatively small capital as they need buy few pictures, obtaining all they wish to sell on commission.29


28. See AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4805. Numerous letters from this time period to his family and to Julia Stephenson document his picture selling activities in 1884 and his commissions from the Southern Exposition and the American Art Association Gallery as well as his profits from sales from his personal picture collection. This is discussed at length in later chapters.

Whether or not Charles Kurtz authored the piece himself, it nonetheless mirrored his own modus operandi at the time—a small dealer with limited capital and stock, who used his seasonal employment around the country to “do an American art business.” In his view, the apathy of foreign dealers towards the art of the United States gave American dealers the opportunity to promote a relatively untapped source of talent for a maximum profit. However, despite its pro-American art stance, it does not wholly endorse American art, as it clearly states that it is profit, not patriotism or aesthetic quality, that should be the primary consideration. A tariff on imported art would serve to help a dealer such as Kurtz, who specialized in American pictures, but not an American dealer of foreign art for “it is well known to those who have bought pictures in European studios that there is generally very little profit made.” Charles Kurtz found himself in a situation in which he could be sympathetic towards the plight of the foreign art dealer facing an increased duty, while, like his fellow Republican entrepreneurs, he reaped the benefits of an importation tax.

Kurtz’s change in attitude towards the tariff can be traced to 1890, after the passage of the McKinley Tariff, which significantly increased the cost of imported goods. He first addressed the issue professionally in March of that year before it was enacted. Writing in The Star in his regular “The Man About Town” column, Kurtz related what American artists, who had previously been largely ambivalent concerning the issue, now thought of it by relating a conversation he witnessed over dinner at one of New York’s French restaurants.

...When I entered the place they [the artists] were discussing the tariff on works of art imported from abroad. “It is an outrage,” said one of the younger men with considerable vehemence, “that we impose a tax upon art—one of the most civilizing elements that can be brought into a country. No other nation in the universe fines a citizen who is willing to spend his money to add to the art treasures of his country.”
"Besides," said another young man... "Look at the attitude in which this tax places us in the eyes of other nations—particularly the French nation. The French schools are open to American students, who can study in them free of charge; prizes are awarded to our artists in their exhibitions; and yet, if a Frenchman wants to send one of his pictures to America to sell it, he must pay 30 per cent of his valuation of it for the privilege."

"Yes; but if the Frenchman wants to come here and paint, he can do so," said one of the elder men, "and nobody will interfere with his competition with us on our own ground. Some of the French painters... have made American forays under the direction of some of our art dealers which have been very successful, I believe, from a financial point of view. Even Munkacsy came over a few years ago and painted some portraits, for which he received such prices as no American artist ever was paid.

"Now, for my part, I haven't a particle of objection to the coming of these French painters among us. We need not be afraid of any competition on our own ground, but it is not fair that we should be called upon to compete with men who live in a country where the cost of subsistence of models, of artists’ materials and everything involved in art work is less than that of the same elements here..."

"Then why don't you go to Paris to paint?" "Because I am an American artist and prefer to paint American subjects. Personally, I have no sympathy for the asparagus green landscapes or the stolid, stupid French peasants that are spread over most of the acres of canvas that have been brought into this country from both French and French-American artists during the past dozen years or so. The American of French training who simply repeats these subjects is doing nothing for the art of his own country he is simply weakly echoing what some clever men have done for their country. American art will grow and become recognized as a national art only as it draws its themes from American life and as it is itself American, and not a reflection from the Barbizon painters, the Impressionists, from Puvis de Chavannes, from Gerome, from Piloty or from any other master or school."

"But we are losing sight of this tariff question."... "we do not want an abolition of the duty on art works, but we should have a change in the present tariff instead of an ad valorem duty, which discriminates against the importation of good art, and does not to any extent interfere with the bringing in of cheap work, we should have a specific duty of a given amount for each oil painting brought in. The present ad valorem duty of 30 per cent is very disadvantageous to the art interests of the country. If a citizen wishes to bring in a ten-thousand dollar picture, he must pay $3,000 for the privilege, which is absurd, while if the dealer wants to bring in a lot of trash invoiced at from $50 to $100 a canvas, what difference does the 30 per cent make to him? Now, this country can stand the importation of good art. The more good pictures our people see the more surely will they become educated in art appreciation, and then there will be greater demand for the work of the American artist. The poor stuff brought into the country perverts the popular taste, retards art educational work and indirectly injures American painters. A specific duty of $100 upon each picture brought in—whether painted by a foreigner or an American living abroad—I think that in justice the two should be put upon the same footing under the circumstances—would keep out a large proportion of the trash, and would be a very small percentage upon the
inclined to bring in. It would only be 1 per cent on the ten-thousand dollar picture.”

The reported discussion concluded with an account of a scheme to deceive the Custom House inspectors by having an artist residing in France cover a valuable painting, purchased there by an American, with sizing. It would then be repainted with an undistinguished image before being sent home to avoid the high duty.

Shortly after the McKinley Tariff was passed on October 1, 1890, Kurtz devoted an entire column in The Star to the new art tariff which reduced the import tax from thirty to fifteen per cent of the value of the work of art. His personal familiarity with it was evident from his use of a direct quotation from the new law:

The duty upon paintings, in oil or water colors, and statuary not otherwise provided for in this act, shall pay 15 per cent, ad valorem. ... The following art productions come into the free list: “Works of art, the production of American artists residing temporarily abroad, or other works of art, including pictorial paintings on glass, imported expressly for presentation to National institution, or to any State or municipal corporation, or incorporated religious society, college or other public institution—except stained or painted window glass or stained or painted glass windows; but such exemption shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Works of art, drawings, engravings, photographic pictures and philosophical and scientific apparatus brought by professional artists, lecturers or scientists arriving from abroad for use by them temporarily for exhibition and in illustration, promotion and encouragement of art, science or industry in the United States and not for sale, and photographic pictures, paintings and statuary, imported for exhibition by any association established in good faith and duly authorized under the laws of the United States or of any State, expressly and solely for the encouragement of science, art and industry and not intended for sale, shall be admitted free of duty ... but bonds shall be given for the payment to the United States of such duties as may be imposed by law upon any and all of such articles as shall not be exported within six months after such importation.31

30. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (555) scrapbook, "Among the Artists," The Star, Sunday, March 2, 1890.

31. AAA. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (625), scrapbook, “In the World Of Art,” The Star, October 6, 1890.
Kurtz had clearly studied the McKinley Tariff and its implication, for he went on to note that the provisions of the law gave the Secretary of the Treasury a great deal of freedom "to wink at any infractions of the spirit of the law, but they are capable of being abused with great liberality." He went on to discuss how an unscrupulous person might circumvent the tariff by suggesting that a person could bring an art collection to America and circulate and present lectures on it for profit, provided it would eventually be presented to an institution. One could then apply for an extension of the six month Treasury ruling or join with friends in becoming an educational institution in order to establish a permanent exhibition—ideas gleaned from personal experience gained from circulating and promoting art exhibitions for the American Art Association. He lost no time in pointing out in print that his old nemesis, the American Art Association, had taken advantage of a "loophole in the law" and through its charter as an institution "for the promotion of art" imported *The Angelus* [Fig.22] by the French artist, Jean Francois Millet (1814-1875), free of duty, a fact that was resented by other dealers.

Despite Kurtz's resentment of the Art Association's maneuver, the art dealers he interviewed generally responded favorably to the McKinley Tariff. Samuel P. Avery said that "I think that as long as we cannot have free art, the 15 per cent duty is preferable to that of 30 per cent." Gustav Reichard thought the law was a decided improvement, but he thought that a specific duty would be preferable to an *ad valorem* duty because he believed a set duty of twenty-five dollars would not discriminate against quality work but would keep poorer pictures out of the country. Roland Knoedler also found a fifteen per

32. Ibid.

33. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (519), scrapbook, "Art Dealers Aroused, A Strong Feeling Against the Free Admission of "The Angelus,," pp. 192-3.

34. Ibid.
cent duty more agreeable but favored a higher, specific duty of $50 to $100. Despite an attempt to overturn the McKinley Tariff as unconstitutional, it endured for the next seven years, but not without continuing controversy.

By 1891. Charles Kurtz himself became publicly embroiled in a debate over the McKinley Tariff. As a result of his appointment as Assistant Director of the Art Department of the forthcoming 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. He had become increasingly involved with the importation of foreign art and shifted his position from an interested observer to active participant as the administrator responsible for receiving and hanging the works of art to be exhibited in the Art Department. Consequently, he did not appreciate an effort to abolish duty on art launched by Kate Field (1838-1896) [Fig.23], a former actress who was schooled in Boston but resided in England and maintained a life long friendship with the American expatriate artist, Francis Davis Millet (1846-1912). After she retired from the stage, Miss Field, a well known figure in her day, became a journalist and also wrote art criticism. As the publisher of the journal, Kate Field's Washington, she kept abreast of current political issues and successfully lobbied Congress to reduce the tariff from thirty to fifteen per cent in 1890. She was a free art advocate, who believed the duty on art would have a detrimental effect on the upcoming World's Fair. The Chicago Herald for November 29th, 1891 printed an extended interview with Kate Field in which she was quoted as saying that

35. "Tariff Act Attacked," The Chicago Herald, December 1, 1891 [Library of Congress Microfilm #3443 (Nov.1-Dec.31, 1891)]. Lead by Marshall Field & Company of Chicago a suit was filed against the collectors of customs on the grounds that the McKinley tariff bill was not enacted properly because the bill signed by the President was not the same bill which had passed both houses of Congress due to an omitted section that was restored after both houses of Congress voted on it.

consular reports indicated "indifference or hostility to the fair on account of the Mckinley bill." She once again echoed the earlier arguments that asserted the tariff was an affront to the generosity of foreign artists and schools that trained so many American artists and acknowledged them through awards in official salons. Miss Field aroused the ire of Americans officials involved with planning the fair by stating that the medals to be bestowed in Chicago were less prestigious than those from foreign competitions.

What honors has Chicago to bestow after the salons and the universal exposition of 1880? [sic] What distinction can an American exposition confer in comparison with the awards of international expositions at Berlin, Munich, Vienna, London, Brussels, Amsterdam, St. Petersburg? An artist of any spot in Europe would rather have an honor at Paris than a score elsewhere, least of all in the United States. No other country collects toll on art. No other is so deeply indebted to foreign schools.37

She also stated that the commissioners who went abroad to secure works of art for the exposition38 were less than candid about the depressing effects of the tariff on the foreign artists, and apparently believed that because of the tariff, the exposition's art exhibition would not be successful. In an attempt to insure the success of the art exhibition at the Chicago World's Fair by pressing Congress to lift the tariff on art, Kate Field planned to convene a national art congress in Washington, D.C. with the support of many prominent American artists39 the following year and organize a loan exhibition of one hundred

37. "Kate Field's Mission," *The Sunday Herald*, Chicago, November 29, 1891. [Library of Congress microfilm #3443] Miss Field was apparently misquoted, the victim of typographical errors or misinformed as there was no Universal Exposition in 1880. There were Universal Expositions (Barcelona, 1888 and Paris, 1889) and State-Sponsored Fine Arts Exhibitions (Milan, 1881; London, 1881-2; Rome, 1882-3; Berlin, 1883; Munich, 1888) throughout the decade.

38. Although not named in the article, she was referring to Professor Halsey C. Ives and Charles M. Kurtz.

39. See Congress 52-1, May 18, 1892, Committee on Ways and Means, "Free Art" statement by Kate Field. The formation of the National Art Association, which took place six weeks earlier, is documented. Kate Field suggested to Mrs. Benjamin Harrison,
representative American pictures.\textsuperscript{40}

Charles Kurtz, then acting director of the Chicago Fair owing to Halsey Ives’ being abroad, was indignant and responded both privately and publicly.

Today I found an “interview with Kate Field” in \textit{The Chicago Herald}, in which that somewhat antiquated spinster declares that she is working to secure the abolition of the duty upon foreign works of art, in order to win the favor of the European artists for our Exposition, and thus prevent our art show from being a failure.

I sat right down and wrote a mild, gentle protest against Miss Field’s “Sympathy” so publicly expressed, on the ground that we didn’t need it.--That our only trouble was a fear that we couldn’t provide as much space as the foreign artists want, etc., I took my article to \textit{The Herald}, and the city editor promised to use it if possible. I only hope that, if used, it may not be garbled in the customary Chicago fashion. I think that, if published, it will cause the good but officious sister’s eyes to open.\textsuperscript{41}

then First Lady, that American artists and art patrons should be invited to meet Congress socially at the Executive Mansion. Caroline Lavinia Scott Harrison (1832-1892) was herself an amateur painter and an accomplished pianist who was noted for her elegant social functions. The National Art Association was organized as a result of that event for the purpose of advancing art throughout the country, with special reference to the capital. Daniel Huntington was made President, and the Vice-Presidents included both artists, among them: Albert Bierstadt, William M. Chase, Frank D. Millet, Augustus St. Gaudens, Richard M. Hunt, Stanford White and Mrs. Candace Wheeler and art patrons: Mrs. George Hearst and Mrs. Potter Palmer. Miss Field also claimed the support of John Singer Sargent, Eastman Johnson, and George Inness among others.

40. Ibid. Kate Field, in her capacity as Secretary of the National Art Association, appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means which was conducting hearings on “Art Objects Tariff Removal.” In addition to her own statement on “Free Art” she also read a statement by Albert Bierstadt, Vice-President of the National Art Association, against the “Tariff On Art.” J. Carroll Beckwith, the President of the Free Art League, which had 641 members, also appeared in an attempt to secure the removal of duty on works of art. The third group represented at the hearing was the Society of American Artists which was represented by William A. Coffin. See also: AAA, \#MB511 (12436-43) \textit{National Art Association} catalogue. The National Loan Exhibition of American Art was then on view at the Smithsonian Institution from May 18-27, 1892. Aside from the artists themselves, the most frequent lender was the dealer/collector Thomas B. Clark who loaned 17 paintings.

41. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, \#4811 (319-320), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, Nov. 29, 1891.
Kurtz's point-by-point rebuttal stated that to date the applications had exceeded expectations. Professor Ives had been greeted not with complaints but a cordial spirit of cooperation in the countries he visited, and foreign artists were embracing the opportunity to exhibit and introduce themselves here. In addition, he objected to the idea that Chicago had no prestigious honors to bestow. He also corrected Miss Field's statements on whose responsibility it was to unbox and hang a county's entries (the country's commissioner, not the American administrator's) and noted that duty was not to be levied upon works simply exhibited, but only upon those works that may be sold directly from the exhibition. Kurtz also revealed his own opinion on the tariff, which had evolved from a protectionist stance as his career developed and transformed itself into one which advocated free art.

Personally, I am in favor of the repeal of the present tariff on foreign art and should feel inclined to co-operate with Miss Field in every way in her laudable work, but I do not desire the false impression to go abroad that the success of the art department of the World's Columbian Exposition depends upon the passage of Miss Field's favorite measure. Its success is assured as matters stand, and it is not at all crying out for succor.42

Despite Kate Field's best efforts, the McKinley Tariff was not repealed. For Kurtz, who had become increasingly involved with European art after managing the circulation of the Hungarian artist, Mihaly Munkácsy's paintings in the late 1880s, a tariff was no longer advantageous, either professionally or personally.

Since the passage of the McKinley bill I have found all my living expenses increased. There is a slight increase of price upon almost everything I buy. When I ask why this is, the invariable answer of the smiling tradesman is "The McKinley bill, you know." Often I happen to know that the particular thing I am buying has been entirely unaffected by the bill, and when I say so I am simply informed that, "of course, as everything else has gone up, this must go up in proportion."

Another pleasing answer is that while the thing itself does not pay a duty, articles used in its manufacture are dutiable.\footnote{114}

However, Kurtz’s intimate knowledge of the tariff law and its loopholes enabled him successfully to circumvent professional tariff restrictions during the years in which the McKinley Tariff was in effect. It was only in 1897, a problematic year for Kurtz personally,\footnote{115} that the passage of the Dingley Tariff on July 24th once again caused Kurtz concern not only because the tax was increased, but also because the penalty for undervaluation was modified. Writing to his friend and colleague, Halsey C. Ives, in April of that year, Kurtz, who was now director of the Art Department of the regional Saint Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association, an annual event, admitted to being “somewhat uneasy about the Dingley tariff.”\footnote{116} Three days later, Kurtz, preparing to leave on May 8th for Europe on behalf of the Exposition to arrange the annual art exhibition in St. Louis, again wrote to Ives about tariff developments.

I think I can reassure you a bit as to the tariff. George H. Story, Curator of the Department of Paintings of the Metropolitan Museum, went to Washington and succeeded in getting an amendment attached to the Dingley bill allowing museums and public institutions to bring in pictures in bond, as according to the old law Story has a “pull” in Washington which he explained to me, but which I cannot write you--though I can tell you about it. ... 

For “our business,” we should decidedly prefer the \textit{ad valorem} duty of 25%—though perhaps the specific duty would be better for the country and for the “home artists.” By the way, a peculiarity of the new bill is the non-provision for bringing in works of “American artists abroad” free of duty. I understand that the framer of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{114}{AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (661), scrapbook, “The Man About Town,” \textit{The Star,} Dec. 9, 1890.}
\footnote{115}{Kurtz’s health had begun to deteriorate from kidney problems, his first born daughter, Daisy, died in March of 1897 and his physician’s bills were above $100 per week. In a letter to Halsey C. Ives he reported that “there is nothing in the picture business!” (AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, March 5, 1897) and he was also concerned about the “odd behavior” of his assistant, Charles Ward Rhodes, who espoused the teachings of Christian Science and was uncommunicative for periods of time.}
\footnote{116}{AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, April 1, 1897, pg.2.}
\end{footnotes}
the bill has strong feelings upon this subject. He is reported to have said that American artists abroad ought to be discriminated against more than foreign artists, if possible. "The American artist who lives abroad pays no taxes in America or Europe; he makes unusual demands, however, for "protection as an American citizen. ... he produces work at a cost to himself (in studio rent, materials, living expenses etc.) which enables him to compete with enormous advantage to himself--with his struggling brethren at home, ... Please do not repeat this. It was told me in semi-confidential way to illustrate the feeling underlying some of the Congressional activity." 46

The Senate had amended the bill so that a specific instead of an ad valorem duty would be applied. All pictures valued at one hundred dollars or less would pay a fifty dollar duty. That basic duty would be increased by five dollars for each one hundred dollars over that amount to a maximum duty of one hundred dollars, no matter how high the value of the picture. From $1,100 in value upward, all pictures would pay only one hundred dollars in duty. For Kurtz, who was now routinely importing pictures for exhibition and then buying and selling works from the same,47 the new tariff law had disturbing implications, for much of the work that he was importing was by artists who were little known and valued in America, as, for example, the Glasgow School. Personally, he would be forced to sell at relatively low fees while paying a rather stiff tax. Moreover, the bill that was before the Senate had "no provision for the transfer of paintings in bond from one museum or exhibiting institution to another," so costs among institutions could not be shared.

46. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, letter, April 3, 1897. The reference to "our business" refers to the fact that Ives often helped Kurtz sell pictures privately through the many contacts he made travelling. Both men also bought paintings directly from the exposition exhibitions they managed and later resold them. Kurtz also became a silent partner in a short lived gallery managed by Charles Ward Rhodes, who acted as administrative assistant to both Ives and Kurtz in St. Louis which is discussed in Chapter 6.

47. See AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, letter, April 28, 1897. Kurtz, who was preparing to leave for Europe, told Ives that: "Today I took the liberty of ordering a small box of pictures sent to the Museum [St. Louis Museum]...They are for the Exposition....I have put all my pictures into storage except these..."
Kurtz told his friend Ives that "it would be a very good idea for all you 'influential Museum Directors' to get together and have the bill fixed before it gets out of the committee, if possible."48

By the time that Kurtz had returned home from his European trip on July 28th, 1897, the tariff was in effect, and he was anxious that his two Paris shipments had arrived in time to beat the new tariff rates.49 Kurtz's fears were well founded for his correspondence reveals that there was indeed a "Custom House difficulty" in regard to shipments sent just before the tariff law.

I learned today that a great many recent importers here [New York] whose importations left Europe before the passage of the Tariff bill, but reached here after the bill became law propose to claim exemption from the new law because their consular certificates antedate the law. They claim that the consular certificate once issued, the act of importation is begun. Durand-Ruel is making this claim, so is Kraushaar and so are many others. Kraushaar's lawyer assures him that it is reasonable.50

Kurtz, like the commercial galleries he mentioned, "nearly got caught this time," as one colleague said, and he continued to lobby against the tariff and provide explanations of its nuances in print for the remainder of his life. Interviewed about the subject just seven months before his death, as the controversy about the Payne-Aldrich Tariff51 revived

48. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, May 2, 1897.

49. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, July 28, 1897.

50. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744, Charles M. Kurtz to Halsey C. Ives, August 5, 1897. Kraushaar was a New York dealer and gallery owner.

51. *Cyclopedia of American Government*, Vol. II, p.656-657. The Payne-Aldrich Tariff was enacted August 5, 1909. It made some adjustments and reductions (e.g. on print paper) but once again, as a check against undervaluation, it was agreed that specific duties should be substituted for *ad valorem* taxes whereever practicable.
interest in the topic once again, Kurtz, now director of the Albright Institute in Buffalo, New York, explained why he had come to believe that a tariff on art was detrimental to art in America.

...I could not, however, in conscience ask painters to send their pictures to America for a period of several months, without offering them any possibility of selling their pictures. By the ruling of the Secretary of the Treasury, two years ago, it is no longer permitted educational institutions to bring into the country, in bond, pictures for exhibition and possible sale, as was the case for the ten years previous to this last ruling. Formerly, we could bring pictures for exhibition purposes and had the privilege of selling them, so long as we paid duty on the works which we sold. This privilege was taken away two years ago. The present tariff on foreign pictures brought into this country from abroad is a serious drawback to art education in this country. I feel very sure that this law will be abrogated within the next year or so—and when it has become a thing of the past, we will endeavor to show in Buffalo, from year to year, the best works which are presented in the annual exhibitions abroad.

This attitude stands in sharp contrast to what Kurtz had expressed in one of his earliest pieces on the subject in 1882, in which he took a protectionist stance and argued for a change in the tariff to nurture American art. Years of experience and opportunities to travel abroad had changed his point of view from a champion of American art to a more cosmopolitan connoisseur, as an 1890 column in The Star reveals.

...in this country we are as yet wholly devoid of all art atmosphere, and that means a great deal to the student and the painter, however much the philistines may deride the idea. The surroundings and the associates of the student in Paris, Munich or elsewhere abroad are a constant inspiration—often, indeed, unseen, but none the less potent. It is this stimulus, and not the mere acquisition of technical knowledge and facility of execution, that constitutes the main advantage to be derived from a course of study in any one of the art centers of Europe.

52. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4824 (59) scrapbook #12, "Director Kurtz Describes the Exhibitions He Visited in Europe," Buffalo Express, August 31, 1908.


54. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4823 (563), "Art Education At Home And Abroad," The Star, March 24, 1890.
Although guarded in his printed remarks, Kurtz’s personal correspondence is filled with scathing remarks about Americans, and particularly aimed at those “Philistines,” primarily from outside of the New York area whom he encountered while managing regional and international expositions. By mid-career Kurtz realized that the art world was indeed expanding and he argued for the exhibition of fine art from all nations to be exhibited in the United States for the edification of its people. The tariff transformed the walls and gallery spaces from Eurocentric to American oriented before international expositions gave them a more cosmopolitan appearance once again. It had also changed Charles Kurtz’s viewpoint on the kind of art that should be seen by Americans.

CHAPTER 6
The Picture Business

After Charles Kurtz died in March of 1909, his heirs offered most of the contents of his private collection at an auction held less than a year after his death. One hundred and four artists, both American and European, contemporary and earlier, were represented by one hundred and fifty-eight paintings and eighty-eight drawings. As an acknowledged connoisseur, a friend of many artists, an arts journalist and an administrator, it was not surprising that he possessed a considerable collection of art. There were a variety of circumstances through which he was able to acquire art, from artists' engravings of their paintings for *National Academy Notes*, to direct purchases from exposition exhibitions and his travels, along with the occasional gift. However, acquiring art for his personal appreciation was not Kurtz's only motivation. From examining his personal papers, it is clear that for most of his career Charles M. Kurtz harbored the hope of becoming an art dealer. Had he been offered the opportunity to do so in New York City, along with a

1. See: *The Private Collection of Paintings of the late Charles M. Kurtz*. The auction was held on February 24 and 25, 1910. There were oil paintings, water colors and drawings offered for sale. Fifty-nine of the paintings were sold.

2. Forty of the artists were foreign and the remainder were American; however many of the Americans spent part of their career in Europe.

3. See AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4821, Record book and lists kept by Kurtz and later his wife and daughter document the collection and the estate sale and disposition of remaining paintings kept by the family until 1989. Although he kept records of his inventory at various times, and often notes where a work was acquired and/or when a work was sold and the price, he rarely indicates to whom he sold the work. Kurtz also collected coins and medals.
substantial salary plus commissions, it is likely that his career would have taken a much
different turn. His earliest letters home to his parents attest to his interest in the
commercial side of the art world. Kurtz first outlined his plan for beginning his career as
an art dealer to his family in an 1883 letter.

I think I shall insert a card in my book [National Academy Notes] stating that as I
am in constant communication with the artists and am always thoroughly
acquainted with the contents of the various studios, I may be able to furnish
valuable information to prospective picture buyers if they will call upon me. Then
if anyone calls and I take him to a studio and he buys anything, I will receive 10% of
the amount of the sale from the artists. One of the artists suggested this thing
and about twenty-five I have seen say they will very willingly pay me ten
percentage on all pictures they may be able to sell through my instrumentality.
After I insert the card, I shall get an agreement signed, I think, from each artist.
What do you think of the idea?4

The appeal of attending auctions, negotiating with and encouraging artists, escorting
wealthy collectors and buying and selling paintings is evident in Kurtz’s correspondence,
and he remained convinced that the business of picture dealing held the promise of an
affluent future for him. Although his father remained skeptical about the propriety of art
dealing as a profession, the prospect of lucrative financial rewards mitigated his parent’s
objections. His optimistic attitude was evident in this letter to his parents:

I tell you this picture dealing is a great business. All I need is to increase my
acquaintance among picture buyers, and have a little cash with which to watch the
auctions and indigent artist, and I will be financially “fixed” before you know it.5

Fueled by the ever increasing passion for collecting art that emerged after the
Civil War among well-to-do Americans, the art market became increasingly attractive as a
profitable business enterprise. H. Wayne Morgan, in his study of the period, New Muses,
Art in American Culture, estimates that by 1880, just after Kurtz moved to New York,

4. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804 (1092), Kurtz to Mr. & Mrs. D.B.
Kurtz, March 14, 1883.

5. Presnar, p. 64. Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, August 15, 1885.
there were about one-hundred and fifty significant private collections in the country. A genteel and erudite young man such as Kurtz would have had little difficulty gaining entree to them. Homes of wealthy capitalists such as the Vanderbilts, the Wanamakers and the Seneyys, particularly in New York, were, in the words of the art critic, Sadakichi Hartmann (1869-1944), "really forced to have a gallery, if only to ward off foreign criticism." Kurtz himself knew this from his visit to the Vanderbilt gallery and his work on the George Seney catalogue. In 1886, he reported to his parents he was able to sell George Seney an Emil Carlsen (1853-1932) painting for six hundred dollars, although even he found the ease with which he earned the commission hard to accept.

Yesterday I received from Carlsen his check for $225, my commission for selling his picture for him. I almost felt ashamed to accept the money, it was earned with so little labor to me and so much to him. Still, I suppose it was only "business" to take it. He is certainly a gainer by the transaction, in having his picture put into the collection of a man who, once interested in an artist, stops at nothing (in reason) to "do him good." Mr. Seney is, without doubt, the most generous man, with his pictures, of all the collections in the country.

As he moved around the country, Kurtz also encountered well-heeled art patrons like Halsey C. Ives who straddled the line between patron, art administrator and dealer. By the time that Kurtz met Ives in St. Louis in 1885, Ives was already known as a well-to-do collector who, Kurtz realized, could be quite useful to him. Ives, who was originally from New York, was the director of the St Louis Museum and President of the Art School there. He used his income from the Museum to buy art, a contribution that


greatly increased the quality of the institution’s collection.9

Kurtz’s description of Ives’ activity in buying and selling art, might have been typical of the well-to-do, but it did not represent the average buying habits of middle class Americans, and these were the people with whom Kurtz most often came into contact at exposition exhibitions. They were also the ones who were most reluctant to invest in art. The national interest in collecting art by the general public was described by the venerable critic, Clarence Cook (1828-1900), in an 1884 issue of *The Studio*.

The American public as a whole is not in the habit of buying pictures at all, whether of home or foreign production, and the people who do buy are, as a rule, bent for one reason or another, on buying foreign pictures, chiefly French.

This unwillingness to risk our money in the purchase of original works, comes perhaps from the fact that we have so long been practically a poor but thrifty people, principled against spending money for luxuries, and certainly counting art among the chief of luxuries. There was too, in our younger days a prejudice against art as a corrupting influence. ... It is only in the last twenty-five years that we are beginning to outgrow this pastoral simplicity and to spend money on the things that pertain to culture and intellectual growth.

For many years now, the America picture market has been supplied with works from France and Germany, which have created a false standard of art among our people, and having nothing in common with our sentiments, our ways of life, or the stage of progress we have ourselves reached in the arts.10

As Kurtz found himself travelling throughout the United States on behalf of regional exhibitions, it was not Ives’ wealthy friends that he encountered as much as the average to upper middle class citizen that Cook called “the American public.” As the economy recovered from the Depression of 1885, Kurtz found himself in the proverbial “right place at the right time.” Within ten years of Cook’s assessment, the *New York Times* reported that “pictures are no longer a luxury of the rich, but a necessity of the less


wealthy classes, like comfortable and sanitary houses.” It was this segment of the population that Kurtz, as an independent dealer, hoped to reach with his inexpensive pictures by lesser known but competent American artists who became the mainstay of his collection—artists such as George H. Bogert, John B. Botto, Charles Warren Eaton, Irving R. Wiles, George Wetherbee and DuBois F. Hasbrouck, most of whom were Kurtz’s contemporaries.

In DuBois F. Hasbrouck (1860-1917) [Fig.24], Kurtz saw the possibility of discovering someone whose talent had not yet been acknowledged and becoming the artist’s exclusive agent. He thought that Hasbrouck’s work occasionally reminded him of the Barbizon painters and showed promise. But Hasbrouck lacked self-discipline and lapsed into bouts of alcoholism. In the mid-1880s, Kurtz, acting on the advice of his old teacher, William Morgan, encouraged Hasbrouck to paint and provided him with studio space and supplies as well as ideas for paintings. Kurtz believed that if he could guide the artist’s output and buy his landscapes inexpensively, he could turn a quick profit among middle class collectors outside of New York. Kurtz took a half dozen of the Hasbroucks he commissioned12 to the Southern Exposition that year where he sold two of the six he


12. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4807 (437), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 16, 1886. Kurtz describes his working arrangement with Hasbrouck:

“Yesterday Hasbrouck spent the day in our room and painted two pictures there: two of the best he has painted--for which I paid him $12., which was fair pay for his day’s work. At the same time, however, I shall not take less than $50 apiece for the pictures. One is an upright “autumnal evening” of the same sentiment as my Tryon, and the other is a “Winter”--the best one he has painted. The pair in frames would be cheap at $100.

Morgan considers Hasbrouck one of the most talented young men “in the business”--if you may “degrade” art by calling it a business. He says he has the most wonderful facility of any many he knows. . . Hasbrouck says he can work twice as fast and
took with him. Ultimately his faith in the artist’s talent was unrewarded despite some early success with selling his work. Although Hasbrouck’s reputation as a minor landscape painter who specialized in seasonal scenes of the Catskills [Fig. 25], continued to grow, by 1889 Kurtz’s investment in them peaked at fifty-one pictures.13 As his career became more crowded, and he found less time to coax Hasbrouck along, the artist sought other dealers to help him sell his work and severed his arrangement with Kurtz. By 1891, Hasbrouck irritated Kurtz by making arrangements with dealers connected to the American Art Association to sell his work.

A letter just received from Hasbrouck tells me he is going to have a “sale” in February at the Draper Galleries. ...Rose and Co. (Sutton’s partner) are to make his frames and “manage” his sales. The poor fellow will simply be “out” his summer’s work;--but anybody who is such an ass as to do with such people, when he already knows them, ought to be bitten. I should like, however, to attend the sale. I think likely I should get a lot of good pictures at a trifle above the value of the frames.14

At the time of the estate sale, twenty years after he counted his Hasbrouck holdings, there were still thirty-two landscapes remaining in the Kurtz collection, representing about one Hasbrouck sale per year. Most did not find buyers and some were twice as well in our room as he can in his own. He is a fellow who needs someone to “brace him up.” For the past three days he has been with me constantly and has not tasted liquor--if he is to be believed,--and I think he is in this case.

N.B. Here Kurtz is probably referring to Dwight William Tryon’s Evening, which was in his collection until it was offered for sale in Philadelphia by the dealer J. G. Craig in 1888.

13. Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, #1993.39.426C, Kurtz to his parents, September 8, 1889. In this letter, there is an account of his financial transactions regarding Hasbrouck:

“Hasbrouck is now sober again, and I have bought some more pictures from him. He is doing some good work now. I have bought from him, in all, seventy-five pictures...and have yet fifty-one pictures. Invested: $510.25, Received (net): $1,862.50. So the Hasbrouck pictures have not done so badly, have they?”

14. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4811 (225), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 20, 1891.
eventually shipped to New Castle. Unlike many of the other artists that Kurtz collected, Hasbrouck did not have a distinguished, award-filled career. Kurtz’s attempt at championing an unknown artist, rather than luminaries such as William M. Chase, (1849-1916) [Fig. 26], Childe Hassam (1859-1935), Eastman Johnson (1824-1906), Jervis McEntee (1828-1891) and Thomas Sully (1783-1872), whose work also found a place in his collection, was not quite the success that he had hoped for and the experience undoubtedly served as a caveat to him that even with his connections and promotional abilities, picture dealing could be a risky business.

Kurtz continued to work as an art journalist and complemented his art dealing with his reviews of exhibitions and accounts of studio visits. In one instance, a series of exposé style articles on art dealers that were probably inspired by his dealings with the American Art Association appeared in The Star. In them Kurtz discussed less than

15. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4821 (282), “Paintings Not Sold, Charles M. Kurtz Collection, 1910.” This typed list, with annotations by his daughter, Isabelle, lists the titles and date of the paintings. Another list in the same place of “Paintings Bought In By Mrs. Charles M. Kurtz” states that “Eight Hasbroucks and a couple of Reiffels were sent to his mothers’s home in Pennsylvania.” These paintings are probably no longer extant. According to Robert Presnar, Director of the Lawrence County Historical Society, when the Kurtz home was razed in July of 1963, local residents reported seeing paintings in the trash bins. The only known paintings from the Kurtz home that survived are portraits that are in the Historical Society and the local library.

16. Dubois Fenelon Hasbrouck has remained one of the more obscure American artists, despite the fact that one of his paintings, Autumn Landscape, a memorial gift, is in the collection of the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of American Art. His biographical entry, if included at all in standard references, contains scant information. The best record of his activities and early career can be found in letters in the Kurtz Papers in the Archives (#4807) as there are many references to him. Kurtz himself published a profile of Hasbrouck that can be found in the collection’s scrapbooks of clippings [#4823 (728)]. It is one of a series of biographical sketches he wrote as promotional material for the Chicago World’s Fair which appeared in the column, “Art and Artists,” The Chicago Graphic (December 9, 1893), p. 490.
honorable aspects of art dealing. Through his newspaper work as a journalist and the public relations and advertising experience he gained while circulating the Munkácsy pictures, Kurtz became increasingly aware of the fact that he could champion a particular artist's reputation. As he learned with Hasbrouck, strategies such as placing articles in the local press and making personal contact with the public at exhibitions, often translated into sales of pictures. His initial foray into the picture business as an independent dealer was supplemented by his career in journalism, which provided him a steady income, as well as the opportunity to promote his artists with picture selling. Later, as he began to manage exhibitions, he arranged to receive a commission for the pictures that he sold in addition to receiving a regular salary. His Record Book reveals that regional exhibitions were more often the source of his inventory than points of sale for his pictures. Frequently he bought paintings directly from the exhibitions he was managing, assuring himself of choice selections and the best prices as well as the artists' gratitude and future cooperation. His father suggested that perhaps he should acquire less and sell more from his collection in order to make it a profitable venture. The exposition exhibitions then became opportunities to act on that suggestion by exhibiting his pictures and occasionally selling them. He reassured his father that he would indeed try to sell some of his paintings:

I now possess about twenty pictures—quite a collection isn't it? I also have most of my money wrapped up in them, but if I am able to sell some of them the investment will prove very profitable, I think. Most of them—except the ones I intend to keep, I shall take to Louisville with me, if I do not sell them beforehand.

17. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823, Star clippings scrapbook (486), (497), (508). Articles by Charles M. Kurtz for The Star include: "Some Frauds in Art, The Business of Counterfeiting Paintings" (August 25, 1889), "How Frauds Are Floated, Ignorant or Dishonest Dealers" (September 1, 1889), "An Old Trick Revived, How Some Enterprising Picture Dealers Do Business" (September 22, 1889).

18. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz, #4821, Record Book kept by Kurtz from 1894 and inventory sheets kept by his daughter to 1989.

19. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (613), Kurtz to Julia Stephenson, May 31, 1885.
By nature Charles Kurtz was pragmatic and hard working, and he realized early on that he had relatively little financial backing and lacked the time and funds to travel to Europe. He did, however, enjoy cordial relationships with many American artists who sold their work directly from their studios or through exhibitions such as those he managed rather than through established dealers. By capitalizing on those personal relationships he had developed while visiting studios on behalf of the publications for which he wrote, Kurtz was able to obtain quality examples of an artist's work for his personal collection or for the exhibitions he managed. He then generated interest in the artists and sales by publicizing those same artists in the press and introducing collectors he met on the road to artists when they visited New York.  

Rather than work from an established gallery, Kurtz usually engaged in the business of art dealing by being a liaison between collectors, who were mostly outside of the New York City area and the artists who were based there. During the 1880s Kurtz had some success in selling to collectors he met out of town. However, the lingering effects of a downturn that affected the American economy in 1885 demonstrated that even wealthy businessmen were not immune to financial considerations, as this reply to one of Kurtz's letters from William Semple, a Louisville collector, attests:

I feel sincerely sorry for the poor artists who are feeling the pinching times so severely and if I could, would buy some more pictures to help some of them out, but I feel that I cannot.  

---


21. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4806 (1456), Semple to Kurtz, December 18, 1885. William Semple was a member of the Southern Exposition's Board of Directors who became a personal friend of Kurtz. He owned a railway supplies and metals business and on his trips to New York he often accompanied Kurtz on visits to artists' studios and bought paintings through him.
As he increased his circle of professional acquaintances, Kurtz realized that even well established dealers like Charles Sedelmeyer and Eugene Fischhof also were affected by economic considerations. They had asked Kurtz to keep them abreast of the American market and he did this from about 1885 through the 1890s. Writing to Kurtz in early 1887, Fischhof acknowledged that the picture business was "rather dull" in Europe and that they would come to America\textsuperscript{22} in search of business opportunities. Kurtz, who kept them informed about the New York art market, was able to report a more favorable climate there among the established art dealers. Nevertheless, Kurtz still remained cautious about entering the commercial art world himself and his career mirrored the unsettled economic times in which he lived. Nevertheless, in 1887, the New York art market was promising:

Now, however, there are a hundred collectors here who will spend from $1,000 to $10,000 for a picture. The picture business has almost entirely concentrated around Madison Square-Knoedler, Crist-Delmonico, Schaus, Reichard and Blakeslee (from Boston) \ldots and Avery.\textsuperscript{23}

Of the dealers he names above, only Samuel P. Avery was more than a business acquaintance. Their friendship was social as well as professional and dated back to Kurtz's days with the American Art Association. It grew because of their mutual interest in American art and continued even after Avery's retirement. However his role in Kurtz's career seems to have been mainly peripheral as Kurtz was never able to take advantage of Avery's offer to consider a business association.\textsuperscript{24}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{22} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4808 (112). Fischoff to Kurtz, March 25, 1887.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{23} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (404) Charles M. Kurtz, "New York Art Gossip," clipping from the \textit{Courier-Journal} (Louisville, Kentucky), January 9, 1887.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{24} The Getty Center for the History of Art, Charles M. Kurtz Collection, Kurtz to his parents, February 25, 1896. "S.P. Avery, Jr. [1847-1920] has come to see me and has suggested that perhaps he and I might for a business "combination." He says his business}
Charles Kurtz enjoyed some success with buying and selling pictures in the 1880s but his efforts remained stymied by his financial situation. In addition to his own expenses, by 1886 he had a wife and daughter to support.25 His father, D.B. Kurtz, was a self-made man and not inclined to indulge his five children. Each of his sons was expected to enter a proper profession after completing his education and provide for his own financial support.26 Although Charles was rarely refused a loan, D.B. Kurtz always stipulated a specific rate of interest that was to be added on to the original sum. By the time Charles was able to repay the accrued interest on the original loan, the profit from many of his sales was consumed.

Beginning about 1888 and coinciding with his tour of the Munkácsy paintings, Charles Kurtz turned to another approach to selling art that gave him a higher profile and shifted his public image from that of dealer to collector. He began exhibiting his paintings, prints and drawings at galleries, both commercial and non-profit, outside of

has become so considerable despite the dull times that he cannot carry it on “all by himself.” He says he thinks the next five or ten years will be a great period in art purchasing in this country and that there ought to be a great deal of money in the business. Avery’s father retired from this same business a few years ago with a fortune of several millions. It is the oldest and most respectable establishment in New York.” This proposal, made by Avery’s son, who succeeded his father as head of the firm when he retired in 1886, was made while Kurtz was Director of the St. Louis Annual Exposition, where he spent a considerable part of the year.

25. Kurtz maintained memberships the New York Press Club and the Fellowcraft Club. He also absorbed many of the expenses related to National Academy Notes during the 1880s. His financial support of DuBois F. Hasbrouck, and expenses associated with the picture business such as insurance and framing were all in addition to the interest he paid on the loans from his father.

26. Louis Kurtz (1863-1903) followed his father in the practice of law and joined his firm. Edward “Fritz” Kurtz (1869-1962) was a mining engineer who taught at Columbia University. Both were self-sufficient. The two Kurtz daughters, Emily (1860-early 1940s) and Catherine (1875-1947) studied art and music respectively and never married. They too remained financially dependent upon their father.
New York City. The checklists from these shows also give some insight into his personal taste at the time. In 1888, the Philadelphia dealer, J.G. Craig, Jr. exhibited thirty-two works by mostly contemporary American artists, including Dwight William Tryon, Douglas Volk, Jervis McEntee, F. Dubois Hasbrouck, James Hart, Charles M. Dewey, John F. Kensett, Frank Knox Morton Rehn, Francis C. Jones, Worthington Whittredge, William Morgan, Charles W. Eaton, Max Weyl, John B. Botto, and Patty Thum.27

In November of that year, he exhibited another part of his collection in Kansas City, a place that he felt had much potential, and added to his American paintings some of the Munkácsy prints he had acquired during the tour of the pictures. All the work on view was for sale.28 Later that same month, he also exhibited a small collection of fourteen paintings by Dubois F. Hasbrouck, Ralph Blakelock, Irving R. Wiles, Jervis McEntee and William Morgan in Louisville, Kentucky.29 He does not report that any sales were transacted, but the fact that some of these same artists are represented in his estate sale seems to indicate that they probably did not find buyers.

In July of 1889 Kurtz made another attempt to establish himself as an independent art dealer. Though his plans were still tentative, he obviously had devised a strategy whereby he could offer both American and European art by capitalizing on his connections with Sedelmeyer. It would allow him to compete with the American Art Association.

27. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4825 (110-114), checklist, "Some Paintings Collected by Mr. Charles M. Kurtz, Editor of National Academy Notes, New York, On Exhibition and for Sale by J. G. Craig, Jr., 1525 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 1888.

28. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4825 (115), checklist, Some Paintings, Etchings and Monotypes Loaned by Mr. Charles M. Kurtz of New York, Exhibited under the auspices of the Kansas City Art Association and School of Design at the Sketch Club, until Nov. 26, n.d.

which had just received major attention from the New York press with its importation of Jean François Millet's (1814-1875) genre painting, *The Angelus*. A letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, William Windom, outlined his plans to join with a few unnamed colleagues, to form an organization that was undoubtedly inspired by his former employers:

I am entertaining the idea of engaging in the art business in New York, in the course of which I should expect to import pictures from abroad. I am informed that Messrs. Boussod, Valadon, & Co., the American Art Association and possibly some other art dealers doing business in this city have incorporated themselves as institutions “for the encouragement of Art” or something of the kind, whereby they are enabled to bring in pictures “for exhibition purposes” without the payment of duties, provided that at the end of six months from the date of the importation, the pictures be sent out of the country or the duties be paid upon such as may have been sold.

Now I respectfully ask what is required in order that a few friends and myself may become incorporated as a “society for the encouragement of art” in order to secure the same privileges these other dealers have. Will it be necessary to maintain a public gallery with free admission to the public or to give free admission to art students or anything of the kind? I do not wish to organize any enterprise for evading any law or laws, but I desire to obtain any privileges which are legitimate and which other dealers enjoy.30

Kurtz was told that the Treasury Department was unable to advise him and he was referred to the Tariff Act of 1883 regarding the necessary requirements regarding an incorporation. By the autumn of 1889, after studying the legal implications, Kurtz came to the conclusion that his idea of being a private dealer was not feasible, but his familiarity with the specifics of the tariff would serve him well later during his years in Buffalo. His sense of frustration is evident in an 1889 letter to his wife in which he considers his career:

Somehow I have a “hopeless” feeling tonight: perhaps because I am tired and overworked; but there seems no outcome to all this work I am doing. I am simply drifting along, doing nothing for the future. And one cannot do much here without a pile of money to build upon—and he can never get that pile out of journalism. Yet, I don’t know what else to get at. Professor Ives thinks he may sell some of my pictures for me. I hope he may. But I can’t write a letter tonight, I am too

30. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4810 (59), draft of letter, Kurtz to Windom, July 7, 1889.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
"demoralized." ... I am disgusted with everything here.31

Kurtz's friendship with Halsey C. Ives deepened and continued to provide opportunities to sell his paintings in the 1880s. During that period, Halsey Ives acted as an agent for Kurtz in St. Louis, enabling him to reach collectors who would otherwise be unknown to Kurtz as this letter confirms:

Professor Ives writes me that he has just sold for me my Tryon, my Palouse and My Lavieille. I am really sorry to see them go. They cost me $660 ... They sold for $1,900. I allow 15% commission ($295). [Profit] $1,605. As a speculation, not so bad, was it? I might perhaps have done no better with real estate. The pictures have really cost me nothing to carry except interest and insurance—the latter small. I have paid no taxes on them as they have not been in my possession much and I have had "no residence." Now, I shall not have to borrow any money, I suppose. The pictures go to John T. Davis, "the richest man in St. Louis."32

As he began to travel abroad with Ives on behalf of the Expositions, new buying opportunities presented themselves, as this letter written to his mother from Belgium attests.

At Delft we went through the great china manufactory and I became well acquainted with one of its managers—M. Labouchère. I bought several small pieces of the ware. Did I tell you of having bought a Napoleon III Sévres plate, at Paris? It is a beauty. I also bought at the Hague a splendid little painting by Artz—one of the famous artists of the modern Dutch school, who died only last winter. It also is a beauty, and I ought to make two or three hundred per cent on my investment. I bought also, at Paris, a marine painting by Boudin—the best marine painter of France. I got it at about a quarter of its value.33

32. Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, #1993.39.427A Kurtz to his parents, September 16, 1889. The two paintings Kurtz refers to were offered by Maddox and Whittingham in Louisville in 1888, the titles and their sale prices are: D.W. Tryon's Evening, ($1,000) and Germaine Leon Pelouse's (1838-1891), Landscape ($400). Another painting specified only as by [Eugène Antoine Samuel] Lavieille (1820-1889) sold for $500, and Halsey Ives was also able to sell an unspecified painting by A. Lormier (probably A Paristienne) for $150.
Although the extant Kurtz files do not record selling anything other than paintings and works on paper, there is some evidence that his dealing may have also extended to the decorative arts, particularly Japanese porcelain. His interest in Asian art is also evidenced in some miscellaneous fragments of lecture notes in which he expresses an appreciation for Japanese art, a gift of Japanese porcelain to his sister on the occasion of her twenty-fifth birthday and by his 1896 election to The Japan Society of London.

In the spring of 1890, Kurtz was again acting as an agent for Charles Sedelmeyer. He was appointed the American representative for the sale of the noted Crabbe Collection of Brussels which consisted of primarily French, nineteenth-century and old master paintings and the Secretan Collection of Paris. Both were to be auctioned in Paris in June. His task was to circulate lists of the pictures to be sold, answer any queries about them and cable offers to Sedelmeyer. For his efforts, Kurtz was paid one hundred and thirty dollars and an illustrated catalogue of the collection. Throughout the decade, Kurtz was retained by the firm on an “as needed” basis, but Sedelmeyer never provided him with steady employment.

By 1891 he gave up on the idea of becoming self-employed in the commercial art market, declaring that “there is nothing in the picture business.” Although he occasionally flirted with the possibility of joining an established firm like Sedelmeyer and Fischhof or

34. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4821 (205-07). Undated sketch of pottery owned by Kurtz with the rather curious notation, “Several small Japanese cheap vases ready for ‘treatment.’ -C.M.K.”

35. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4810 (676), announcement letter from Charles Sedelmeyer, April 5, 1890.

36. Eugene Fischhof hired Kurtz in the late 1890s as a free lance writer. Fischhof also allowed Kurtz to use his office when he was in New York on Exposition business.
working with Samuel P. Avery, the erratic economy, which slumped into a four year depression with the Panic of 1893, caused him to opt for a position as Director of the St. Louis Annual Exposition, which provided some long term security and a regular salary along with yearly, all expenses paid, trips to Europe. In 1902 he wrote to Ives concerning another offer from Sedelmeyer and Fischhof, but once again the issue of joining the firm came at an inopportune time:

I saw Mr. Fischhof last evening, and he said he wished he could afford to make it to my interest to join with him. He said that of course he could understand how important to my future my connection with this St. Louis work might be, and how I could not afford to relinquish it without a very large benefit. I told him I had no idea of relinquishing it, that it was work which was extremely interesting to me and that my associations were most agreeable. He said that after the Exposition was over he would like it if I would see him before making any other business engagements. Very nice, wasn't it? — He has been doing an unusually large and successful business this year.37

In some instances, the line between art administrator, dealer and collector blurred. Following the exhibition of the Glasgow School of Painting, which Kurtz introduced at the St. Louis Annual Exposition when he was director, he arranged a tour for the paintings beginning in Klackner's Gallery in New York City (see Chp. 8) in 1896. By that time, many of the Scottish painters were personal friends of Kurtz. He had purchased their paintings for his collection and then loaned them back to travelling exhibitions, promising to promote the work. Kurtz himself was present at the New York exhibition opening to "chat up," visitors, encourage sales and provide the press with informative articles about the artists.

By 1898, the year after the passage of the Dingley Tariff, Charles Kurtz's involvement in European picture dealing was limited to writing. Eugène Fischhof, the son-in-law of Charles Sedelmeyer and his American representative, engaged Kurtz to

37. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, February 4, 1902.
write the Preface to a sale catalogue that was billed as representing *Leading Masters of the Early English and Modern European Schools*. The paintings, which were originally scheduled to circulate among several American cities, were detained in transit. Consequently, Fischhof decided to offer the paintings at a public auction in New York rather than to return them to Europe or hold them until the following year. Curiously, the exhibition consisted of sixty-seven paintings ostensibly dominated by the English School, yet forty-one were in effect a special exhibition of works by Eugene Jettel (1850-?), a Viennese landscape painter whose paintings were in the collection of John Wanamaker and Morris K. Jesup as well as the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Art Institute of Chicago. He was described as “worthy to be compared with the great painters of the Barbizon school ... [and] ... especially Daubigny.” Kurtz’s comments indicate an admiration for both the English and modern European masters:

> It is very rare that works of such quality as the portrait of Miss Le Nain by Thomas Gainsborough; the portrait of Mrs. Barnard by Sir Joshua Reynolds; the portrait of Miss Eleanor Gordon by George Romney; the portrait of Mrs. Norton, by Sir Martin Arthur Shee, and the portrait of Mrs. Coxe, by John Opie are assembled together in one collection to reflect honor upon the greatest school of Portrait Painting the world has ever seen. ...

> And not only are the early English portrait painters represented—the two men most potent in early English landscape are also have contributed to this collection. John Constable is represented by “The Embarkation of George IV, at Whitehall on the Occasion of the Opening of the Waterloo Bridge,” ... While the picture by J.M. W. Turner is one of his earlier works, it has in it the promise of what was to come after it.

> Among the men of the modern European schools who is represented there are several giants. Meissonier, Pettenkoten and Fortuny stood at the head of the artists of their respective countries. Each of these men possessed certain of the characteristics of the others, but each also was most distinctly individual absolutely unique in his line. ...

> The greatest of modern—indeed of ancient and modern landscape painter was Corot, and Corot is here represented by a thoroughly characteristic and beautiful work. It was painted in that enchanting region whence Corot drew inspiration for

38. Charles François Daubigny (1817-78)
many of his most charming pictures—Lake Nemi, in Italy.³⁹

Kurtz’s appreciation for French art and culture always seemed more sincere and consistent than for that of almost any other country. In a burst of frustration at the rejection of his comic opera in 1889, Kurtz expressed his admiration for that country.

It does seem as if the trashier and more worthless a thing is, the better chance it has to succeed here. I wish I could think and write in French, and I would gather up you and the ‘cubbies’ and we should settle in an intelligent country, where ‘horse-play’ isn’t the chief end of dramatic representation.⁴⁰

He followed this private comment with a more public statement at the time of the Chicago World’s Fair:

At the present time France generally is regarded as the leading art country of the world. After the Japanese, the French people as a race, are more thoroughly imbued with the art spirit perhaps than any other people. The reason for this is not difficult to ascertain. From the time of Francis I (1515-1547?) until the present day the French government has exercised oversight over the fine arts and the art industries.⁴¹

Kurtz’s pro-France comments on art are somewhat surprising given the nationalistic era in which he lived and are no doubt a reflection of his personal experiences with both art and music. His cosmopolitan preferences are further evident in the 1898 Sedelmeyer catalogue, published in the year in which American political activity reached a climax with the Spanish-American War. In it Kurtz professed a very public appreciation for foreign art. Although this may seem to be at odds with the climate of the time, he was at a point in his career when he was hoping to leave regional exhibitions like the St. Louis Annual Exposition behind in favor of what he called “the 1900 prospect” or


⁴⁰. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4810 (214), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, August 8, 1889.

the Paris World's Fair. Had his ambitions not been thwarted by ill health (discussed in Chapter 7), which forced him to return to America and his need for financial security been paramount, it is likely that his career as an international art dealer eventually might have been realized. By 1902, it is evident that while Kurtz still kept abreast of the international art market, he seemed to realize that he had reached a juncture in his career that made it unlikely that he would ever be able to enter it as a commercial dealer. Instead of joining Fischoff in Europe at the conclusion of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Kurtz in effect brought Europe to America by organizing exhibitions of foreign art—particularly Scottish, German, French and Danish—42—for an audience that Clarence Cook would have called "the American public." He circulated the exhibitions throughout America,43 first in Buffalo at the Albright Art Gallery and then at other specially arranged venues such as the St. Louis Art Museum.

Halsey Ives, who had returned to his position as Director of the St. Louis Museum after the Chicago and St. Louis World’s Fairs (see Chapter 7), continued to reap the benefits of Kurtz’s endeavors. By agreeing to take exhibitions that Kurtz had already organized for exhibition in St. Louis and later on when he was a museum director in Buffalo, Ives alleviated some of his own work load and also reduced the expense of

42. Kurtz introduced these painters at the St. Louis Annual Exposition. In February and March of 1896, he brought exhibitions of *The Glasgow School* and *The Danish School* (at the behest of the Copenhagen Artists' Committee for the exhibition of Danish Art in the United States) to Klackner's Gallery in New York City.

43. Kurtz began importing foreign exhibitions during his tenure as Director of the Art Exhibitions at the St. Louis Annual Exposition. It was there that the Glasgow School (discussed in Chapter 8) and the Danish School (exhibited in 1896) were first seen in America. The exhibition of Contemporary German Paintings was presented at the Albright Art Gallery in 1907, followed by the Durand-Ruel exhibition of French Impressionist paintings the following year.
mounting exhibitions at the Museum. These exhibitions also enabled Ives to purchase some of the paintings for his personal collection or the St. Louis Museum. An annotated 1894 catalogue for the St. Louis Exposition in the Kurtz Papers records that Halsey C Ives bought four paintings from the exhibition.44 In exchange, Ives offered to provide Kurtz with exhibition, storage space and insurance for his personal collection. In 1904, Kurtz loaned the St. Louis Museum sixty-four paintings from his collection that were insured by the Museum and could be withdrawn from the institution by Kurtz at any time, free of transportation expense. Of that group, thirty-four paintings were eventually recorded as sold. Those unsold included a Bavarian Landscape by August Fink, a painting of a French Farmyard by Charles Courtry, a watercolor landscape by Georges Michel, a Mauritz Frederick Hendrick De Haas painting of Old Wrecks, High Tide, a scene of Summer in New England by Frederic Rondel and an Edmond Yon, Landscape, St. Auld, France. (all of which remained in the Kurtz collection and appeared in the estate sale) and fifteen by DuBois F. Hasbrouck.

Although the 1903 scheme to front a business for them that these two colleagues proposed to their St. Louis assistant, Edmund Henry Wuerpel (1866-1958),45 did not materialize (see Chapter 7), Kurtz did make one last attempt to enter into a commercial venture. In 1905, shortly after he assumed his responsibilities as director of Albright Art Gallery, he became a silent partner in a gallery called The Gedge Shop, in Buffalo.46 The

44. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4824 (648), St. Louis Exposition catalogue, 1894. In addition to Ives acquisitions, Kurtz himself bought eleven paintings by both American and French artists (including George Willoughby Maynard, Charles Adams Platt, and Léon Augustin Lhermitte) and Charles Ward Rhodes bought six.

45. Edmund Henry Wuerpel studied in St. Louis and Paris and later became Acting Dean and Director of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts.

46. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4821, Record Book, p.71. A notation indicates that Kurtz also placed two Glasgow School paintings in The Gedge Shop, Whitelaw Hamilton’s The Ebbing Tide and Macaulay Stevenson’s Rhapsody. They were returned in August, 1905.
business was handled by his long-time assistant from the St. Louis Annual Expositions, Charles Ward Rhodes (1860-1905) who had followed Kurtz to Buffalo after an unsatisfying experience as the gallery business manager of the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh. Kurtz wrote to his wife about the arrangement.

Rhodes comes here in a few weeks, to go into the art business. I am taking a small interest in the business. (This between ourselves,) I believe it ought to be very profitable. Through it perhaps I can sell a few Hasbroucks and other pictures. The thing is to be incorporated with limited liability---so there can be no risk beyond the cash invested--and I do not anticipate any risk at all. Of course, I expect to be able to help the enterprise a good deal through my increasing acquaintance. 47

Kurtz continued discretely to promote the people that he favored in Academy Notes. On one occasion in 1907, he devoted a column to publicizing in advance the sale of the Charles Sedelmeyer collection. Although it was to take place in Paris, Kurtz took great care to specify the dates of the four different sales and what would be offered in each, acting in effect as Sedelmeyer’s publicist once again. 48 Sometimes he used works from his own collection--although they were not identified as such--to illustrate his articles and create interest in the work to encourage sales and higher prices. One particularly blatant example occurred in the May 1906 issue of the journal. In an article entitled “Art An Investment,” Kurtz reported on a recent New York auction in which the

47. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (508), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 7, 1905. Kurtz owned two of the four hundred stock shares that were offered and purchased a few more shares later. Rhodes, who was introduced to Kurtz through Ives, moved from one art related position to another, beginning with the St. Louis Museum and the Chicago World’s Fair, where Kurtz first met him. He was not a stable personality. Rhodes moved from St. Louis to Pittsburgh, where he was the business manager of the Carnegie Institute and then to Boston before joining Kurtz in Buffalo. Rhodes became a Christian Scientist and his partner in The Gedge Shop, John Fell Mills was probably the same individual who wrote a Master’s thesis at the University of Chicago in 1893 on the “Authority of Christian Consciousness” and not a professional in the art world. Kurtz’s terminated his involvement with the gallery after Rhodes’ suicide. No business records or other information about the firm have been located.

works of the Dutch painter, Anton Mauve (1838-1891) were featured. Mauve, a Hague School painter whose work is sometimes compared to the Barbizon painters, was, like the French landscape artists, a particular favorite of Kurtz. He had purchased Mauve’s *Sheep on the Dunes* [Fig 27] for his own collection during one of his trips abroad (see Chapter 7). In the piece, Kurtz relates how a similar painting, *The Return of the Flock*, purchased for the sum of $2,250 reached the record price of $42,250. However, the illustration that was used was a photograph of Kurtz’s painting, though it was not identified as belonging to him. Likewise, an article on the highlights of the Loan Exhibition of 1907, which used John J. Albright’s painting by Mauve, *Sheep-Evening*, as the cover illustration contained a ringing endorsement of the Glasgow painter, William Kennedy’s picture of a *Buckinghamshire Farmyard*, which was a loan from the Kurtz collection.

Here is ... that wonderful piece of realism painted by William Kennedy representing a “Buckinghamshire Farmyard,” a picture in which it seems as if the visitor might walk down the road and through the open out-building. There is no work in the exhibition finer in values, in artistic quality and atmospheric effect than this.

As the director of a new institution that had a relatively small permanent collection, these subtle promotions of work from his own collection appeared to be generous loans to a fledging institution for which he was not publicly criticized. But a careful study of *Academy Notes* during Kurtz’s editorship reveals a number of other instances in which personal investments and friendships were presented to the readers of the journal ostensibly for their edification. It is interesting to note however, that neither


51. Another particularly personal illustration appeared in *Academy Notes*, Vol. III,
Kurtz nor his family seemed to benefit from his promotional efforts. Moreover, his integrity and trustworthiness in regard to the quality and provenance of the pictures that he was advocating was impeccable, as were his efforts to help Buffalo collectors avoid being susceptible to fraudulent dealers who peddled "false pictures."52

At the time of the Kurtz estate sale, seventy-four paintings were bought in by Kurtz's widow, probably for lack of achieving a minimum acceptable price. They remained in the estate collection until about 1982, when Isabelle Kurtz began to disperse the substantial collection and donate works in her parents' memory.53 What Isabelle Kurtz

no 11 (April 1908): 190. A Portrait of Mrs. L. A. Coonley Ward by the Glasgow artist, Harrington Mann (1864-1937), was used to illustrate a column on recent exhibitions at the Albright. Mann became a friend of the Kurtz family and kept in touch with them even after Charles' death, on his visits to America. The subject of the portrait, Mrs. L.A. Coonley Ward,[Fig.28] was a wealthy Chicago art patron who frequently invited Kurtz to her home during the time he was working in that city on behalf of the World's Columbian Exposition. In Academy Notes, Vol. II, No. 9, February, 1907, p. 133, Kurtz also reproduces a painting from the exhibition of Contemporary German Art, which he had purchased from show, (Sleeping Child) Study In Gray and Green [Fig.29] by the Munich artist, Thedor Hummell (1864-1939), which was #109 in the Kurtz estate sale catalogue. Kurtz also began to collect photographs and some of those were also reproduced in Academy Notes. Wilbur H. Porterfield's Tree Branch, which appeared in Vol. III, no. 1 (June, 1907) p.73, was one of the 1982 gifts to the Albright-Knox by Isabella S. Kurtz.

52. Charles M. Kurtz, Academy Notes, "Editorial," Vol. III. No. 8, January, 1908, p. 142. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4823 (486), (497), (508), scrapbook of Star clippings. In the Academy Notes essay as well as in the three articles he wrote earlier in his career for The Star (Aug. 25, Sept. 1, Sept. 22, 1889), Kurtz addressed the issue of dishonest dealers and how bogus pictures get into the market place.

53. This number was ascertained through an annotated edition of the catalogue for the Kurtz Collection sale which was signed by Isabelle S. Kurtz and is in the possession of the author. The collection itself was larger than what was offered at auction as it did not include prints, medals and paintings that remained in the Kurtz home and were not included in the sale. A number of the works in the collection were given to relatives immediately after the sale and then later, from 1982-1990 by Isabelle Kurtz. The Yale Center for British Art received a bequest of eleven paintings by members of the Glasgow School in 1990.
chose as a remembrance of her father's tenure as the founding director of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery is a reflection of his own interests during the last four years of his life. The majority of the eight works she chose to donate to the Albright-Knox Gallery then are not, as one might expect, by mid-to-late nineteenth-century American landscape painters, and a Hasbrouck is not to be found among them. Rather, a more progressive and/or European trained strain of art is represented with three photographs by the Pictorialist, Wilbur H. Porterfield (1873-1958), a painting of a Japanese woman that was formerly attributed to the Glasgow artist, Edward A. Hornel, and the 1909 Portrait of Charles M. Kurtz [Fig. 2] by Joaquin Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923). The only painting by an American who worked in this country is a genre painting, Ruth [Fig. 30] by Eastman Johnson.

As his career came to a close, Kurtz once again turned to journalism to sell art by encouraging the readers of Academy Notes to buy art directly from the exhibitions held at the Albright Art Gallery (discussed in Chapter 9). He pointed out that sales not only benefited the museum, but also encouraged artists to send their work there and regularly reported on how much was sold from each exhibition. However, in 1907, art world associates54 accused Kurtz of bringing in an exhibition of contemporary German paintings (discussed in Chapter 9) primarily for the purpose of selling them, which was a violation of

54. Although Kurtz generally enjoyed congenial relationships among his colleagues, he was involved in several controversies during the course of his career aside from the long-standing vendetta with James F. Sutton of the American Art Association. In April of 1907 (discussed in Chapter 9), he had accused Roger Fry, Curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of ruining three paintings and implicated the Museum's administration which refused to acknowledge the correctness of his charge. His long-standing opposition to the tariff was well known from his early days as a journalist and his outspoken stance on it during the Chicago World's Fair. He speculated in Academy Notes, Vol. III, no. 1 (June 1907): 12 that the charges were made by "persons evidently inspired either by malice or hired by certain malicious persons."
The charge that the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy has been going into the business of "dealing in pictures" may be applied equally to the other art institutions of this country which have been referred to—or to most of them. The pictures brought in from abroad have been offered for sale at the artists' European prices plus the duty exacted by the Government and ten per cent commission charged by the institution effecting the sale. This commission of ten per cent is a very small matter in comparison with the profit usually charged by professional art dealers. In fact, in the case of the most successful exhibitions, the commissions usually would cover only a very small proportion of the cost of organizing the exhibit. The fact is, that out of ninety-two pictures imported, twelve were sold. Three of these, becoming the property of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, were admitted free of duty and were bought at net prices involving no payment of commission.55

By studying Charles Kurtz's activities in the commercial aspect of the art world and the purchases he made for his collection, much is revealed about his personal taste. The pieces that did not appear in the estate sale: a Landscape by the French painter, Georges Michel (1763-1843) [Fig.31], a Mary Cassatt (1844-1926) color print of a Peasant Mother and Child [Fig32], photographs by the Pictorialist Wilbur H. Porterfield (1873-1958) along with the substantial number of Glasgow paintings that were retained by Mrs. Kurtz reveal a broader taste than Charles Kurtz is thought to have had. The art that he bought and sold for his own collection, from the mid-1880s to his death, is frequently not American, but European and favors landscapes in the Barbizon or Hague School styles. It is an intimation of his increasing appreciation for foreign art. Except for his investment in DuBois F. Hasbrouck, Kurtz's taste was remarkably prescient. Kurtz saw many of the artists represented in his collection receive awards in the Chicago, Paris, Buffalo, and St. Louis Expositions.56 By 1909 an early preference for conservative and


56. e.g. Childe Hassam: Paris, 1889 (medal), Chicago, 1893 (gold), Buffalo, 1901 (gold), St. Louis, 1904 (gold); Dwight William Tryon: Chicago, 1893 (medal), Buffalo, 1901, (gold), St. Louis, 1904 (gold); Frank Knox Morton Rehn: Buffalo, 1901 (medal), St. Louis, 1904, (medal); George H. Bogert: Paris, 1900 (medal), Buffalo, 1901 (medal), St. Louis, 1904 (gold). Hasbrouck received no recorded commendations.
lesser known American painters had given way to a predilection for contemporary European or European trained American work. Charles Kurtz, as evidenced by his writings in *Academy Notes*, his selection of works for the Albright Art Gallery and his personal collection, became the beacon that guided the direction of the Albright Art Gallery in forming its collection as well as those of its members. For as he himself said, "In almost every town there is at least one reputable art dealer whose knowledge and honesty may be relied upon."

57 For the citizens of Buffalo, as well as those who he encountered on the road, that person was Charles M. Kurtz.

---

CHAPTER 7
All The World’s A Fair

Among the many documents in the Charles M. Kurtz papers is a draft of an
incomplete letter that Kurtz wrote to Augustus G. Bullock, the chairman of the World’s
Columbian Commission’s Fine Arts Committee. Dated October 24, 1890, it is a clear
indication of the direction that Kurtz would have liked his career to take.

Dear Sir.

After a few moments conversation with Mr. Ellsworth of your World’s Fair Art
Committee yesterday, I feel inclined to make application for the position of
Superintendent of the Art Department of the Exposition, subject to satisfactory
agreement as to details.2

Kurtz’s interest in international expositions was a natural outgrowth of his situation. Like
many college-educated, white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants of the period, he believed that
hegemony was a part of his birthright, and events designed to attract and influence the
populace at large were the most efficacious way to do so. As Robert W. Rydell has stated
in his study of international expositions, the fairs were vehicles for maintaining or
increasing status.

Between 1876 and 1916 a network of international expositions spanned the nation
and ... shaped the world view of millions of Americans. Without exception, these
expositions were upper-class creations initiated and controlled by locally or
nationally prominent elites. ...

1. See Robert W. Rydell, All the World’s a Fair (Chicago: University of Chicago

2. AAA, Charles M.Kurtz Papers, #4810 (948), Kurtz to A.G. Bullock, October
24, 1890.
...exposition promoters also saw the fairs as vehicles for maintaining or raising their own status as regional or national leaders and for winning broad acceptance across class lines for their priorities and their decision-making authority.  

Kurtz, who had settled in New York City after completing the tours of the Munkácsy paintings in 1889 had returned to journalism in order to provide a home and steady income for his wife and two daughters. He had also tired of "this travelling business" and, having seen a good deal of the United States, had little regard for any place other than New York City. He wanted to keep working on his comic operas, write books and continue to try his hand at selling art. His regular work for the Star covered a range of art topics and book reviews and also offered him a forum to discuss some of his favorite issues. However by January of 1890, The Star was undergoing a change of

4 Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, #1993.39.407 and #1993.39.415. Kurtz had settled his affairs with John Wanamaker by February 6, 1889 and by February 20th had been appointed art critic of the Star. In that capacity, he would have a "couple of columns" in each Sunday issue and brief notices from time to time during the week. He also intended to continue his work on Academy Notes.
5. Ibid.
6. Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, letter #1993.39.407, Kurtz to D.B. Kurtz, January 20, 1889: "I have now marked Pittsburg 3rd in my list of 'hog towns.'--St. Louis is first and Boston second. Sometimes I think it is about an even matter between Boston and Pittsburgh. I think I shall soon be able to choose as a connoisseur of towns, having lived in: New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Louisville, St. Louis, Kansas City, Topeka, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Nashville and New Castle!--almost forgetting Washington, Pa., and besides I know Omaha, Chicago, Memphis, Atlanta, Detroit, Brooklyn, Harrodsburg and Malioningtown!--This much in America."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ownership and his other freelance writing was not particularly lucrative and came to the conclusion that for him, journalism was “a poor, piddling business” with not much to recommend it “beyond what enjoyment a fellow can get out of his work.” His disillusionment may have been provided the impetus for his application for the position of director of the Art Department at the Chicago Fair, but there was also another pragmatic reason for doing so, which is hinted at in Rydell’s description of international fairs.

Involvement in planning such an extravaganza would give Kurtz access to people who might be interested in buying his pictures. In fact, he applied for the position at the urging of James W. Ellsworth a Chicago art collector who was a member of the Columbian Exposition’s Board of Directors’ Fine Art Committee. If he were successful in his application, Kurtz would not only increase his stature in the art world but also his financial situation in the future. New contacts made through an international exposition would also increase his opportunities to work as an independent dealer. In a letter dated December, 1891, he alluded to this possibility.

I received a letter from [Eugene] Fischhof from Vienna, today. I rather think he will manage to get the appointment to represent the Austrian government as Art Commissioner to the Exposition. I hope he may:—then he will no doubt secure his “Legion of Honor” [medal] and all this may turn some business in my direction. Ives favors Fischhof’s appointment, and I imagine has spoken in his favor.

reviewed [#4823 (463-64)] a controversial book by Joseph and Elizabeth Robbins Pennell, Our Journey to the Hebrides, which gave “a depressing idea of Scotland and the Scotch.” His review foreshadows his future relationships with many Scottish artists as well as the Pennells themselves. It is interesting that he took a defensive view of the topic, noting that “When the articles which contribute so largely to this book first appeared in Harper’s Magazine, they aroused a great deal of feeling in certain quarters, and many of their statements were denied.”


9. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4811 (427) Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, December
Kurtz did not allow the fact that he was only thirty-five years of age get in the way of his personal ambition. The basis for his application was his great strength as a New York based organizer of traveling exhibitions of American art, but it was also his greatest weakness. The friction between East and West (in this case, Chicago) and the necessity for appointing a man with cosmopolitan experience effectively eliminated Kurtz and his closest competition, Sara Tyson Hallowell (1846-1924), a Philadelphian who had curated the Chicago Inter-State Industrial Expositions in the 1880s. 10

Fortunately for Kurtz, the man the commission eventually appointed was his friend and colleague, Halsey Cooley Ives.11 Married to the daughter of a wealthy banker from St. Louis, he was originally from New York State and also effectively bridged the divide between the East and the West. Ives not only had experience as an administrator, but had traveled abroad extensively each summer on behalf of the Museum and was known for his affable and diplomatic demeanor [Fig.33], which Kurtz described in verse.

Here's a man who's devoted to art
Who gives it his head and his heart;
In every World's Fair
Professor Ives has a share

16, 1891.


11. Joseph D. Ketner, A Gallery of Modern Art: A History of the Art Collections at Washington University in St. Louis (St. Louis: Washington University, 2000). For the Museum’s inaugural exhibition, Ives mounted what is considered the most ambitious art exhibition to date in the West. One hundred and forty-three paintings were exhibited, with almost three-quarters of them created by living artists who were principally from France and Germany. Ives established himself as the central cultural figure in the region and under his leadership, the St. Louis Museum began to acquire modern art and establish itself as itself in a position of “intellectual leadership in art and education that influenced the entire region.”
And takes a most prominent part.

He’s the head of a rigorous school
Where his ardor has never grown cool
In art educational
Fame international
Marks his beneficent rule.

He is artist and architect too
There’s nothing he don’t try to do,
But he’s never so able
As when he’s at table
Engrossed with a filet or stew!12

In order to function effectively, Ives was allowed to appoint two assistants who were to handle different aspects of the American exhibition. Sara Hallowell, who had European contacts and travel experience as well being an occasional Parisian resident, was placed in charge of organizing the loan show of foreign masterpieces borrowed from American collections. Charles Kurtz, who was appointed in late June of 1890, obtained the more important position of supervising the exhibition of work by contemporary American artists. He was hired at a salary of $2,500, which was $500 less than what Ives had wanted for him.13 [Fig.34] Hallowell, who originally declined the appointment because of the salary, eventually accepted her position in April, 1892.

*The Chicago Evening Post* lauded Kurtz as “Just The Right Man,” and noted that he was “able to accomplish an immense amount of work in a given time.” It cited his “intimate familiarity with current art and artists” and “his ability to form wise and well-grounded opinions, which he expresses readily and with clearness which it is not easy to


His duties initially included soliciting work from and corresponding with artists, preparing application circulars and attending weekly planning meeting as well as supervising progress on the art building\(^{15}\) [Fig. 35] when Ives was traveling. He also drew upon his experience in promoting past exhibitions and consented to interviews and well placed press releases. Nevertheless, the American attempts at promotion were not discreet enough to escape European criticism.

While we are by way of hunting up oddities, let us find place for the following. It comes from the United States in a printed envelope. The wrapper contains one of those advertising communications which the Barnums of the future Exposition of Chicago send out regularly to Europe to drum up their enterprise in advance.\(^{16}\)

With money, or the lack of it, being a constant concern, Kurtz further supplemented his income by producing the official illustrated catalogue with biographical entries for an additional fee of one thousand dollars, which not only added to his income but also to his work load. Ever the pragmatist, he also carefully cultivated friendships among the many well-to-do people that he met while working on the Fair with an eye for doing future business with them.

Last evening I spent with Ellsworth over at the Union League Club. I wasn’t able to get away until considerably after midnight. Spent a very pleasant evening. I think I shall be able to do some business with him after awhile. I am going to “write up” his collections for *The Art Amateur*.\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\) AAA. Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (704) clipping scrapbook, *The Chicago Evening Post*, November 13, 1891.

\(^{15}\) The Palace of Fine Arts was designed by Charles B. Atwood from the firm of D.H. Burnham & Co. Although built as a temporary structure in the classical revival style, it housed the Field Museum of Natural History until 1920. It was rehabilitated in the late 1920s and became the Museum of Science and Industry on South Lake Shore Drive and East 57th Street in Chicago. The building occupied more than five acres and contained 145,000 square feet of exhibition space. It was erected at a cost of $670,000.

\(^{16}\) Lawrence County Historical Society, letter #1993.39.2706, Kurtz to D B. Kurtz, August 31, 1891.

\(^{17}\) AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4811 (427). Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, December 16, 1891.
Kurtz’s piece was published the following March, and it leaves no doubt as to why Kurtz was hopeful that he might “so some business” with Ellsworth.

Like Mr. Clarke, Mr. Ellsworth has confined his collection of modern paintings to the works of American artists, and the hundred and twenty or thirty pictures he possesses show some of the highest achievements of American art. Changes doubtless will be made from time to time, for it is the ambition of the owner to represent each artist by an example of his best work. ...

Mr. Ellsworth has no pictures that could be characterized as “bad.” There are some, however, which do not represent the artists as well as they should in such a collection—where the works of some of the best men are of such exceptionally high character. However, Mr. Ellsworth, like every other intelligent collector, will doubtless improve his collection by additions and substitutions as time goes on.

This article is notable not only for his assessment of the Ellsworth collection, which, Kurtz noted, was highlighted by a Rembrandt portrait, but also for his rather patronizing comments that were indicative of Kurtz’s feelings toward Americans who had the misfortune to live outside of the New York area. It is also indicative of his own increasingly cosmopolitan sensibilities.

Only a few years ago scarcely any private art collections were known in this country outside of New York; now, almost every American city of any considerable extent numbers a few enthusiastic collectors among its wealthy

18. Thomas B. Clarke was a New York based collector and private dealer.


citizens and the Eastern visitor often is surprised at the number, extent and high artistic quality of these "provincial" collections. 21

After Kurtz's appointment, his travel itinerary expanded markedly. With his new position, he was required to travel with some regularity to New York, Boston and Philadelphia, where he consulted the artist, John Sartain, who was the art director at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in that city. In addition, Kurtz, who had only visited Europe once in 1881, joined Ives in Europe in mid-August of 1891 on behalf of his work for the Fair. In a letter to his father written from Belgium, he comments on being joined by a group of American dignitaries who he believed were exploiting their position. It was a charge that he would level at Halsey C. Ives some ten years later when he spent the better part of two years in Europe while organizing the art exhibition for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition:

We arrived in Belgium late Friday night. I met our party at Rotterdam on the way over here from the Hague. ... While at Prince de Chimay's, we were joined by the "General Committee" of the World's Fair, which had just arrived here from St. Petersburg. This committee—really a "Commission of Exploitation and Junketing at the expense of the U.S. Government"—consisted of Honorable Benjamin Butterworth, Chief Justice Lindsay of Kentucky, Moses P. Handy of Philadelphia and General Grosvenor of Ohio. 22

21. Ibid.

22. I have a prospect of being offered the Directorship of the Art Dept. of the St. Louis Exposition for a term of years (after the World's Fair) at generous figures. I shall investigate the thing pretty fully. There might be $3,000 or $4,000 a year in it—and it would require only about 3 months of my time—leaving me free for the rest of each year. --What do you think of it? In that event, we would return to New York, take a house either in the city or suburbs and live there. I would have to be absent—in St. Louis—probably during Sept. Oct. and Nov. each year. --Of course I might arrange to serve the Chicago people with the same exhibition, and might work up sales of my own pictures in both cities. 23AA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4812 (479-480), C.M. Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, December 5, 1892. »His 1896 European trip resulted in his bringing the work of the German Secessionists, the Glasgow School and American artists based in Paris to St. Louis. During his trip he met with Edwin Austin Abbey in England and Charles Sprague Pearce in Paris.
This trip began a pattern of annual European travel that continued for the remainder of Kurtz's life, either on behalf of the Chicago Fair, the annual St. Louis Expositions, the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition or the Albright Gallery. As Carolyn Kinder Carr has noted, "part of the attraction of the job for Ives and Kurtz was the opportunity to hobnob with important artists, political figures and socially prominent individuals. The frenetic but nevertheless glamorous life-style that Ives and Kurtz enjoyed while abroad is glimpsed in the latter's letter to his wife (who usually remained at home with her family in Harrodsburg or in New York)."23

Yesterday forenoon (Sunday) I wrote 16 letters for Professor Ives and then took a walk and visited the "Mauritshuis"... After lunch, Minister [Samual]Thayer invited us to drive with him and took us first to his Club's "summer house" in the beautiful woods near the city, where we heard some splendid music by the Royal Military Band, in the grove near-by, and afterwards took us to call upon the Baroness Ode-Muller, who has a most superb chateau on an enormous and magnificent estate near the Hague... after another drive... we returned to the city and took tea at the mansion of the Baroness Van Grovestein... We met a lot of prominent Dutch and English people... we all went out to Scheveningen and heard a splendid concert at the Kurhaus... This morning... we called upon Mr. Mesdag [Hendrik Wilhelm], and went over the details of the Exposition project, and then Mr. Mesdag took us to the Exhibition of the Dutch Water Color Society... From the Exhibition we visited Mr. Tanhoven—Minister of Foreign Affairs... From the Minister's, we went to call upon ISRAELS--Josef Israels, in some respects the greatest painter living. His house like that of Mesdag, is a palace, filled with beautiful things. It is an enormous house, with a long gallery—like the passage across the Ponte Vecchio in Florence, connecting the Uffizzi and Pitti Palace galleries—connecting the front house and the studio building... After lunch, Mr. Thayer's carriage came after us, and we drove out to Delft with him. When we got home I found a note from Ranger [the American artists, Henry Ward] telling me... to see him. W.[illiam] H. Howe, the [American] artist, also called to see us, and invited us to go with him to call upon Mrs. Mauve--the widow of [Anton] Mauve, the artist... We all go to Amsterdam in the morning, with the expectation of visiting the museums, some of the leading artists, and then returning here, via Leyden and Haarlem. The 'booring' commissioners of the show expect to be here from St. Petersburg on Thursday.24


24. Carr, p. 72, quoting AAA, C.M. Kurtz Papers, C.M. Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, August 24, 1891.
Kurtz’s early admiration for elegant American entertainments such as the opening of the Vanderbilt Gallery that he experienced earlier in his career transferred quite easily to similar European situations while his disdain for some of the habits of his vulgar countrymen increased proportionately. As he travelled, he bought art, and at the time of his death, his personal collection contained paintings by European artists like Anton Mauve as well as by American artists.

Because he was acquainted with so many prominent American artists, Kurtz was called upon to work with the three regional advisory committees that recommended work for exhibition at the Fair in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. It was in this capacity that Kurtz had the most difficulty. Unlike Ives, who was diplomatic when dealing with difficult people, Kurtz, always certain of the righteousness of his position, tended to be more outspoken and stand by his opinion. Given his personal dislike for the New England area, he was profoundly insensitive to the feelings of Boston artists when he informed...

25. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4813, Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, May 9, 1894. He comments on his American ship mates: “The woman opposite me shocks me more and more. She cuts her spaghetti and puts sugar in her chianti. What do you think will become of such a woman after this life? What kind of place can there be in the next world for such people? The man sitting next me—the young man with the young wife and the “Cook and Gaze tickets,” turns out to be a young preacher from Akron, Ohio, and a member of my college fraternity. ...The people who sit opposite me are named Moore. They hail from Philadelphia! We have had a fresh display of toilets and additional diamonds sprung upon us today. I have made the acquaintance of two or three inoffensive persons today—whose names I do not know—but the congregation is very deficient in interesting features.”

26. The Private Collection of Charles M. Kurtz (New York: Fifth Avenue Galleries, 1910). 104 artists are listed, of which 41 were not American. Kurtz bought a Mauve painting, Sheep on the Dunes, (#153 in the estate sale catalogue). In the AAA #4821, one list of paintings in the Kurtz Collection. has the date 1899 next to the painting, presumably the date of his purchase.
them that their selections would be subject to review by the New York committee.\textsuperscript{27}
Likewise, he personally favored the artists he considered "bold innovators" [e.g. William M.Chase, John S Sargent, Winslow Homer, George Inness, Thomas Eakins] over "the rest of the pre-historic crowd" [Albert Bierstadt, Thomas. W Wood, Enoch W Perry, William. H. Beard and James and William. Hart]\textsuperscript{28} and let his opinion be known. While Ives, using the regional advisory committees and national jury, had ostensibly conceived of a fair system of representation for artists, he had also managed to allow some artists to circumvent the jury system by giving himself and Kurtz the authority to accept works directly. Since the actual records of the Art Department (as differentiated from Ives' and Kurtz's personal papers) have not been located, it is difficult to determine how much power the two directors personally exerted in selecting works for the exhibition.
However, as opening day neared, Ives had delegated all of the responsibility and decisions for hanging the show to Kurtz, which added to his already substantial work load as well as to his ego.

I have done some superb hanging in the past three days. Prof. Ives says it is the best he has ever seen. Zorn [Anders Zorn, the Swedish commissioner], Vos [Hubert Vos, the Dutch commissioner] and others also have complimented it enthusiastically. Actually, I believe the United States will surpass in interest and merit the art section of any other country! Never before has such a collection of American work been seen!
... I suppose the bad artists will want to mob me however, when they learn that I have acted as a "committee." Ives now leaves all the hanging to me. Such as it is, it is all mine, and I am hanging "strictly according to Merit," and so as to produce a harmonious composition in form and color--without regard to a man's reputation or my previous acquaintance with him. I do not believe that this has ever been done before.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Carr, p. 117, note #70 citing AAA. Charles M.Kurtz Papers, undated clipping.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Carr, p. 86.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Carr, p.96, quoting AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, April 26, 1893.
\end{itemize}

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Despite his love of ceremony, his responsibilities forced Charles Kurtz to forgo the opening of the Fair by President Grover Cleveland. One thousand and twenty-four paintings were to be displayed, and Kurtz soon realized that the space was not adequate. The prime space was given to his personal choices, with the surrounding areas filled in with smaller works of any subject. 

Although Kurtz was well acquainted with several women artists, including the Louisville landscape painter, Patty Thum (1853-1926), and had done a series on women artists for the Star, his hanging of their work did not reflect the personal esteem he had for some of them. Of the one hundred and thirty-nine works by women, forty-five per cent were hung in the upper, less accessible alcoves suggesting that he did not anticipate an enthusiastic reception for them. Kurtz was not finished hanging all of the works by opening day, and the hanging process continued until mid-May.

The Chicago critic, Lucy Monroe, found the installation unharmonious, "great pictures are often tucked away into obscure corners or surrounded by inferior and discordant works." Yet despite the crowded appearance, the exhibition was praised for its merits. It adequately reflected the progress of American art since the 1876 Centennial and the fact that American art had finally triumphed over French art, particularly given the number of artists who had studied abroad. The favorable reviews did little to encourage sales. After one hundred and seventy nine days and twenty-one million visitors, only thirty

30. Carr, p. 93. Edmund C. Tarbell’s In the Orchard. John Singer Sargent’s Ellen Terry as Lady Macbeth and Julius L. Stewart’s The Baptism received prominent placement while Thomas Eakins’ Portrait of Dr. Agnew was displayed in a second floor alcove because Kurtz feared the subject matter was indelicate.

31. Patty Thum’s credentials included study at Vassar College, and at the Art Students League with William Merritt Chase.

five works by American artists were purchased. Even allowing for the financial depression that had gripped the country, it was a poor show of interest in American art. The European artists sold ten times as many works, a fact that spoke volumes to the astute Kurtz, who was involved in arranging the American sales.

Though not a commercial success for the Art Department, the World's Columbian Exposition was, nevertheless, a cultural milestone. Of particular note was a paper, given by Harvard historian, Frederick Jackson Turner (1861-1932) on July 12, 1893, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," which defined the national character. Historians have long debated the source of Turner's theory, and some believe that Turner simply "absorbed ideas that were in the air among American and European intellectuals." Kurtz's correspondence lends credence to that argument and his letters echo many of the same observations that Turner made, although there is no direct evidence to link the two men. However the traits that Turner codified and saw as positive may be viewed as the raison d'être for Kurtz's diminishing enthusiasm for promoting American art around the country. Turner's thesis emphasizes the self-assertive aspects of the American character:

The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness, that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients, that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends, that restless, nervous energy, that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier.

Whereas Kurtz, in a letter written the year preceding the Chicago Exposition, was


35. Ridge, p.87.
sensitive to the less savory attributes of Americans and did not necessarily see them in a favorable light. Commenting on the political climate in the country at the time, it is clear that he was becoming increasingly dissatisfied with life in America.

We are simply in the hands of a horde of ignorant, vulgar, bigoted cowardly, selfish thieves, liars, hypocrites—the cloaca maxima [abyss] of all that is vile in human nature. There will be a bloody, beastly revolution before many years as the fruit of it. The Homestead trouble is only a “rumble” of the coming earthquake. I hope we may be able to leave this sinkhole of corruption for a decent country before the “roundup” comes. I am glad you are not in a “labor” region.

Kurtz’s writings resonate with Turner’s assessment that coarseness and a lack of an artistic sensibility were an integral part of the American character. This excerpt, from a letter written by Kurtz just one year before the World’s Columbian Exposition, for example, describes Chicago and its people in less than complimentary terms.

I think I hate this sink-hole of the sewage of humanity more and more every day. I will rejoice when the time comes to go back into something a bit nearer civilization. This town is simply hopeless in its vulgarity, filth, ostentation, bragadocio, and lack of the commonest elements of decency. However, it is the environment, perhaps that is to blame—as in Massachusetts. The people here live in an atmosphere of sewage which fills river, lake, water-mains, and streets, the climate is utterly unreliable and beastly, the city has its foundation in mud and swamp—and how could the people be expected to be decent?

The traits that were ascribed to the pioneers—the traits that made westward settlement possible and, by extension, made America great—were precisely those that Kurtz found

36. Here Kurtz is specifically referring to the 1892 strike that occurred in the Carnegie Steel Company’s plant in Homestead, Pennsylvania. Carnegie attempted to employ nonunion men and hired three hundred armed security officers to protect them from the strikers. A battle between the two groups ensued. It resulted in ten killed and sixty wounded and the state militia was brought in for protection of the non-union workers. The union’s demands were not recognized. According to Robert Presnar, Kurtz had a particular interest in Carnegie, whose Pittsburgh base was not very far from his own New Castle home and hoped to publish an article on him.

37. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4811 (1371), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, May 14, 1892.

38. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4811 (1383), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 16, 1892.
most objectionable. As Turner said, “The advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines.” Charles Kurtz did not embrace those American characteristics that Frederick Jackson Turner so carefully described at the Chicago World’s Fair. Rather, they caused him to look away from America, towards a more cosmopolitan vein of cultural inquiry. It offered him the opportunity to escape from what he perceived as a provincial environment, and allowed him to look towards Europe and develop a cosmopolitan demeanor that was more in keeping with his elitist sensibilities. The World’s Columbian Exposition then, may be seen as an ironic turning point in Kurtz’s career. While he publicly became a visible and well known representative of American art, privately he became an increasingly enthusiastic advocate for European culture and all that it produced.

The Chicago World’s Fair secured the professional reputations of both Kurtz and Ives. Ives, who returned to his position as director of the St. Louis Museum and School, continued his friendship with Kurtz and collaborated with him on exhibitions that would benefit their mutual interests. As a result of his efforts in Chicago, Kurtz was offered the directorship of the annual St. Louis Exposition (which will be discussed more


It is ironic that some of Turner’s descriptions were later used to eulogize Kurtz. Sprague, a trustee of the Albright Gallery and Kurtz’s personal attorney, quoted William Kennedy, one of the Glasgow painters, who said of Kurtz: He was ... an enthusiast who had the inner instinct for what is fine in many phases of Art, and the energy and power to carry out public schemes for the good of the world.”

40. Ketner, p.3. In March of 1894, Ives mounted an exhibition at the St. Louis Museum of 183 works that he acquired from the Columbian Exposition including the first place medal painting, Another Margarita! [Fig. 54, Washington University Art Gallery, St. Louis] an 1892 painting by the Spanish artist, Joaquin Sorolla.
extensively in the next chapter in relation to the Glasgow School). The position was a scaled down but well paid version of the position that Ives had held in Chicago, and allowed Kurtz to remain in New York for most of the year.41

The Directorship of the Art Department of the Annual St. Louis Exposition required that Kurtz continue his annual trans-Atlantic trips in order to present the most interesting European art at the annual regional exhibition in St. Louis42 as well as draw on contacts in America that he had cultivated.43 It was a position that Kurtz held from 1894 until 1899 and administered with the secretarial help of his colleague, Charles Ward

41. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4812 (479-480), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, December 5, 1892. In this letter, Kurtz described the position:

"I have a prospect of being offered the Directorship of the Art Dept. of the St. Louis Exposition for a term of years (after the World's Fair) at generous figures. I shall investigate the thing pretty fully. There might be $3,000 or $4,000 a year in it---and it would require only about 3 months of my time--leaving me free for the rest of each year.-- What do you think of it? In that event, we would return to New York, take a house either in the city or suburbs and live there. I would have to be absent--in St. Louis--probably during Sept. Oct. and Nov. each year. --Of course I might arrange to serve the Chicago people with the same exhibition, and might work up sales of my own pictures in both cities."

42. His 1896 European trip resulted in his bringing the work of the German Secessionists, the Glasgow School and American artists based in Paris to St. Louis. During his trip he met with Edwin Austin Abbey in England and Charles Sprague Pearce in Paris.

43 Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, Kurtz to his parents, March 4, 1894.

"Day before yesterday I spent in Philadelphia. I saw Mr. Wanamaker and Mr. Ogden and had long talks with each. Very likely I will borrow some pictures of them. Mr. Ogden asked me to write him concerning good things I might see abroad which it would be desirable for the firm to secure. Mr. Morris, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Academy, told me he thought the Trustees would be willing to let me have some of the Academy's pictures for my show on account of the assistance I gave him in Chicago in getting works from the exhibition to Philadelphia in time for the Academy's winter exhibition."
Rhodes (1860-1905), who had studied art abroad and worked for Ives at the St. Louis Museum before joining his staff at the Chicago World's Fair as an administrative assistant. Under Kurtz's direction, the Annual gained the reputation as "one of the most advanced art exhibitions held annually in the United States." Much like Ives, Kurtz visited Europe each year on behalf of the Exposition in search of work that appealed to him, both for the exhibition and for his personal collection.

Because of his expertise, Kurtz was often contacted by other regional art association directors in an effort to bring art to their areas. J. Harrison Mills, the New York based director of the "American Circuit," urged Kurtz to use his services when museum directors desired to bring art exhibitions to their areas and reduce the cost by sharing expenses. Writing to Kurtz in February of 1894 he acknowledged receipt of Kurtz's circular for the forthcoming Annual exhibition and urged Kurtz to consider engaging him to handle the details of circulating the exhibition to other parts of the country.

44. AAA, Charles M Kurtz Papers, #4804, miscellaneous, typed, biographical profile of C.M. Kurtz, undated.

45. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4824 (648 & 791) St. Louis Exposition catalogues record the purchasers of paintings from annual exhibitions. In 1894, Kurtz bought eleven paintings, Halsey C. Ives purchased four, and six paintings were sold to Charles Ward Rhodes. In 1896, Kurtz bought Glasgow paintings, including David Gauld's *Haunted Chateau*, J. Whitelaw Hamilton's *Ebbing Tide*, E.A. Hornel's *Flower Market, Nagasaki*, Stuart Park's *Daffodils*, and a painting by R.M. Stevenson. A total of twenty-six paintings were sold.

46. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4823 (660) Mills to Kurtz, February 20, 1894. There is little documentation on this organization. In the letter, Mills refers to the American Circuit as an "agency." He received regular notification of touring exhibitions and was involved "in the practical work of handling the pictures in New York." He organized the details involved with shipping pictures from New York, ranging from packing to security for Kurtz's selections for the Chicago World’s Fair. Although Mills preferred "to connect exhibitions" rather than to organize them, he did occasionally "make a collection, a thing that I do not like to do ... from the pictures placed here in my care." The American Circuit, much like the present day American Federation of Arts, attended to "all the details of canvassing and forming a collection when required, issuing circulars and arranging for a Jury as required."
country. It was a sentiment that had earlier been expressed by the president of the Kansas City Art Association who also had contacted Kurtzk, telling him that "We starve however for good pictures to look at and I so wish we might be in a circuit by which we could secure the exhibition at intervals of one or more good pictures." 47

In 1898, the directors of the Trans-Mississippi International Exposition conferred a medal on Kurtz “in recognition of valuable sources of an advisory nature in connection with the Fine Arts Exhibition.” 48 Kurtz undoubtedly took note of these requests and was encouraged to form his own exhibition “circuit” which would increase his opportunities to sell pictures. As will be discussed in the next chapter, he began with the Glasgow School, which he was instrumental in bringing over to the United States. It had its inaugural exhibition at the St. Louis Exposition and then traveled to several different venues. While affiliated with the St. Louis Exposition, he continued to work with Halsey Ives by recommending works of art that he had seen or displayed himself for exhibition in the St. Louis Exposition. Official Catalogue of the Fine Arts Exhibit, Illustrated (Omaha, Nebraska: Klopp & Bartlett Co., 1898). The June 1-November 1, 1898 Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition was organized by Omaha business leaders as an attempt at economic revival after the financial panic of 1893 and depression of the 1890s. Although not an official national endeavor, it was modelled on other international world’s fairs, and there were exhibits of the fine arts, mining, agriculture, machinery transportation and government. By its close, over two and a half million people had visited the Exposition. The Superintendent of the Bureau of Fine Arts was Armand H. Griffith, Director of the Detroit Institute of Art. In the “Prefatory” of the official catalogue, Charles M. Kurtz’s name (along with Halsey C. Ives’) is listed first, as one who especially “aided in the formation of the present exhibit.” This is likely due to Kurtz facilitating the inclusion of Glasgow School paintings by David Gauld, J. Whitelaw Hamilton, William Kennedy, William York MacGregor, T. Corsan Morton, William Mouncey, Stuart Park, James Paterson George Pirie, Robert Macaulay Stevenson and Grosvenor Thomas. Also included in the Fine Arts section were loans from the Durand-Ruel Gallery, Paris, and other artists with whom Kurtz had been associated such Patty Thum, a personal friend.

47. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4812 (551), C.C. Ripley to Charles M. Kurtz. December 16, 1892.

48. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4804, miscellaneous, typed, biographical profile, undated.
Louis Museum and facilitate the coordination of exhibition between museums. Ives later cited Kurtz's cooperation with museums when writing him a recommendation for his position as Director of the Albright Gallery, mindful that his appointment would also benefit his institution.

Should you secure Mr. Kurtz's services as Director, we would re-establish the circuit of five institutions—Philadelphia, Buffalo, Cincinnati, St. Louis and Chicago—saving to each one a very considerable sum in the expense of annual exhibitions.

Although the years between the international fairs were professionally successful for Kurtz, they exacted a personal toll. His first born daughter, Elizabeth, known as Daisy, died in 1897 after a long illness that left Kurtz feeling despondent. In addition to his anxiety, his own health, which was never robust, began to deteriorate. Writing to Ives from Paris, while on his annual trip abroad, Kurtz informed him of his impaired health.

I suppose Rhodes has told you of my "upset" in Glasgow. I was tied up in a hospital there for more than two weeks with inflammation of the kidneys. I spent a week and a half in London, and there again suffered tortures from my kidneys. I have seen the best doctors—all have agreed as to my trouble and as to the treatment to be followed—which I have followed religiously, but without any improvement whatever. If it were not for my family and my work I would not hesitate to shoot myself on the occasion of my next attack. Existence absolutely does not "pay expenses" with such suffering as I have endured during the past two months.

49. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4824 (597) 1904, "List of paintings lent to the Museum and on exhibiton in the galleries" 64 paintings were "Lent by Charles M. Kurtz" and 34 of those are designated as "sold."

50. AAA, The Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1746, Ives to Edward B. Green, August 2, 1904.

51. AAA, The Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Department of Art Papers, #1744 (4), Kurtz to Ives, June 8, 1896.
Kurtz's trouble—bladder infections and severe pain in the kidneys—led to an increasing dependence on the treatment: lithium and creosote and eventually opium derivative drugs that began to affect his behavior. By March of 1897, at the time of his daughter's death, he required injections of morphine to ease his pain. In October of 1897, Kurtz was admitted to St. Luke's Hospital in St. Louis for surgery. Although no kidney problem was found, his bladder was totally obstructed. His health improved subsequently, but his family in New Castle remained concerned about his condition.

Writing to his wife, his sister Emilie noted that Charles had been nervous while in New Castle and described him as having "a strange imprudence." This may have occurred because for the first time, the sales at the St. Louis Annual Exposition were significantly less than expected probably due to economic considerations. Nevertheless, acting on his father's advice, he accepted the directorship of the St. Louis Exposition for another year in November of 1897. His affiliation with his friend and colleague Ives proved beneficial during this difficult period in his personal life. Ives managed some of business of the Annual during Kurtz's illness and allowed him to store a large portion of his personal collection at the museum gratis.

In 1898, Kurtz, ever mindful of his audience, reflected public sentiment and mounted what was perhaps his most consciously nationalistic exhibition of American art in response to the Spanish-American War. In the catalogue of the exhibition, he explained

52. Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, #1991.11.215, Emilie Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, October 1, 1897.
53. Presnar, p. 85.
54. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, #1744, Kurtz to Ives, March 5, 1897. "Our doctoring alone runs above $100 a week for every week of this current year! ... And there is "nothing in the picture business!"
55. Presnar, p. 82.
why the number of works by foreign artists was not as large as in previous years, but they were “notably fine” nonetheless.

In this year of aggressive Americanism it has seemed fitting that the annual Exposition Art Exhibit should consist mainly of the works of American artists. It is a fact that our painters and sculptors have been winning victories in art exactly as the men composing our army and navy have been winning victories in war, and though the achievements of the former are less apparent to the multitude than those of the latter, they are none the less important, enduring, and for the good and glory of the Nation.56

This trend of exhibiting more work by American artists continued the following year. Kurtz said that “It is a gratifying fact that, as the years go by, it is less and less necessary to go abroad for art works worthy of satisfying the demands of critical and discriminating amateurs.” However, it must be noted that the compromised state of his health and the expense to the Exposition of going abroad each year may have also been factors in his decision to exhibit more American work.

While he was steadily employed by the St. Louis Annual Exposition, Kurtz communicated with Ives regularly from 1896 through 1898 about the possibility of securing a position in “the 1900 prospect,” as he referred to the upcoming Paris World’s Fair. In March of 1899,57 again after some deft and discreet political lobbying by Ives, Charles Kurtz accepted the position of Assistant Director of Fine Arts for the 1900 Paris World’s Fair. In Diane P. Fischer’s thorough study of the 1900 Paris Exposition, she attributed Kurtz’s selection to the fact that the Director of Fine Arts, John Cauldwell


57. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4816 (713), Ferdinand W. Peck, Commissioner General to Kurtz, March 24, 1899. The appointment letter specified Kurtz’s salary as $2,250. per year plus expenses beginning April 1, 1899 and that he would be headquartered in New York and that he would report to Director [John] Cauldwell.
(1855-1932), wanted to present “his best case for a national art” and so appointed the one person who had distinguished himself publicly by almost exclusively working with American art and artists.  

However, once again he was seriously incapacitated shortly after sailing for France in June of 1899 on behalf of the Exposition and his contribution was limited to some initial contacts and public relations articles. He was confined to his hotel for thirty days before being allowed to sail back to New York. There he was admitted to a sanitarium and underwent surgery to remove his dysfunctional kidney. His illness was directly responsible for his resignation in July, 1899, a bitter disappointment to him. Although his health improved, in December he was once again troubled by bladder problems, which his father believed were caused by overwork. In the intervening months, Kurtz renewed his working relationship with the European art dealer, Eugene Fischoff, acting as a New York agent for the firm, and ironically, spent part of the summer of 1900 in Paris.

In the interim, Halsey C. Ives, who remained a steadfast personal friend as well as a professional colleague, had secured the directorship of the international exposition that was planned to commemorate the centennial of the 1803 Louisiana Purchase. By August of 1900, Ives saw to it that Charles M. Kurtz was appointed the Assistant Chief of the Art Department of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.


60. Lawrence County Historical Society, #1991.1.239, D.B. Kurtz to Kurtz, December 10, 1899.
At a meeting of the Committee on Fine Arts of the La. Purchase Exposition of 1903, I recommended you as assistant in the executive work of the Department-that is as my assistant-

The rate of compensation is fixed at $3,000 per year. The amount I named as a proper sum was considerably more than this... but the executive committee had adopted the salary list of the Chicago Exposition.

While the salary is not as large as the position-with all it means-still I hope you will accept assuring you that I will do what I can to make your position bearable. 61

Although Kurtz initially said that Ives was "better qualified, perhaps, for this position than any other man in the country,"62 he undoubtedly harbored hopes of such a position for himself. The Louisiana Purchase Exposition would mark the end of the Kurtz-Ives Exposition Collaborations. This World's Fair was planned as the largest international exposition the world had ever seen. It was determined that over forty million people lived within a twelve hour train ride, and to accommodate the expected visitors the total acreage was double that of 1893. In keeping with its theme of progress and national harmony, the first Olympic games ever held in the Western hemisphere were organized.63 A series of scholarly conferences were planned, and transportation displays featuring the automobile and the airship were included. With its thematic emphasis on anthropology, the Fair became a "vast museum of ethnology of man and his works."64

Ives and Kurtz slipped easily into a working relationship that was modeled on the format they had established for the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair. Ives spent much of his time in Europe, leaving Kurtz to deal with the day-to-day developments in St. Louis.

61. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818, Ives to Charles M. Kurtz, August 8, 1901. Ives' salary for the two year period was $10,000.

62. Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, Charles M. Kurtz, "Original Notes on Professor Halsey C. Ives", as quoted in Presnar, p. 87.

63. Rydell, p. 155.

64. Rydell, p. 160.
Kurtz wrote and sent out circulars to artists both at home and abroad, and substituted for Ives at official meetings and functions. He also monitored the progress of the Art Palace [Fig. 35], designed with the intention of its becoming the new fine arts museum for St. Louis. In September of 1902, the Department of Art’s office in the Administration building was opened, and Kurtz divided his time between the St. Louis Museum and the Fairgrounds. Once again, Kurtz was given the task of preparing an illustrated handbook for the Art Department. The number of artworks submitted by the regional advisory committees had presented problems during the planning of the Chicago Fair, so there was a strict limit of two pictures imposed on each artist by the jury. Kurtz was to accept these regardless of his personal opinion, to circumvent dealing with dissatisfied artists. Ives then instructed Kurtz to “take whatever comes through the jury, then we will borrow, paying all expenses, just what we want. If there is space, we’ll take five or six each from the strong men.” for that way the artists that they favored would have adequate representation. The artists that Kurtz preferred were contemporary, often trained

65. The original St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts was part of the art department of Washington University. The Fair coincided with a plan to build a new museum on property purchased by the University in Forest Park. The Palace of Fine Arts, designed by Cass Gilbert, was built to house the collection of St. Louis Art Museum, which was owned by Washington University, after the Fair closed. The new St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts was dedicated on August 13, 1906. Due to issues relating to taxation, the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts dissolved as a department of Washington University in 1909 although the University continued to loan its collection to the new City Art Museum.

66. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1747 (77), Kurtz to Ives, March 25, 1904. “I only arrived home from Philadelphia to-day, after a busy time there. ... There was a pretty rocky lot of stuff presented. Each juryman reserved the right to send two pictures “on list.” Gutherz offered one picture for the consideration of the jury, and proposes to send two pictures from Washington. The one he offered before the jury was, of course, accepted. It was a great, big, rotten thing, a representation of General Lee in a muzzy-colored landscape; and we will have difficulty to find a sufficiently obscure place to put it. It is a terror! I am afraid he has two other atrocities of acreage expanse awaiting shipment from Washington.”
abroad and worked in a style that showed the influence of impressionism\textsuperscript{68} rather than in more conservative modes.

Kurtz and Ives had to contend with other problems as well. The opening date of the Fair was delayed by a year, a fact that Kurtz wanted to keep from the artists for as long as possible. He feared that if they knew they had additional time, they would submit new rather than already recognized work that had been exhibited at other international venues. The pair kept abreast of the work the artists they were interested in during their sojourns abroad, such as John Lavery,\textsuperscript{69} whom they visited in his London studio and colleagues like Sir Purdon Clarke,\textsuperscript{70} the Director of the South Kensington Museum.\textsuperscript{71}

Despite their personal attention, John Lavery chose not to exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition due to a dispute within the ranks of the British artists. Ives preferred having Britain represented by a select group of progressive artists like Lavery, many of whom were active in the New English Art Club, the Society of Sculptor’s, Painters and Gravers and the Glasgow School. In addition to the St. Louis exhibition, Ives wanted to have their work circulated later among the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts.

\textsuperscript{67} It is interesting to note that both men included works from their personal collections in the Exposition. Mrs. Halsey C. Ives loaned the Portrait of Professor Halsey C. Ives [Fig. 17] by Anders Zorn to the Swedish section and Charles M. Kurtz loaned A Summer Sea by the American born but British trained and resident artist George Wetherbee. It was the only Kurtz loan to the exhibition.

\textsuperscript{68} e.g. J. Francis Murphy, Thomas Dewing, Dwight Tryon, Henry O. Walker and James Whistler,

\textsuperscript{69} John Lavery (1856-1941) was a Belfast born painter who achieved fame while exhibiting with the Glasgow School before moving to London and establishing himself primarily as a portrait painter.

\textsuperscript{70} Sir Purdon Clarke later became Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

\textsuperscript{71} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (790), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, July 21, 1902.
Arts, the Art Institute of Chicago and the St. Louis Museum. Joseph Pennell reported that when he put forth this proposal at a meeting of the International Council in 1903, which was responsible for sending an official representation to St. Louis, the Englishmen unanimously rejected the idea. Sir John Lavery, as the Vice-President of the International Society of Sculptors, Painters and Gravers and a leading member of the Glasgow School, which was anxious to exhibit in America, had been approached about choosing works to represent Scotland. However, he then declined to participate in the selection process, citing the previous commitments by members of the group.

The uncooperative spirit continued until the Exhibition's opening, with Great Britain, France and Germany refusing to supply reproductions of works in their nation's section for the illustrated catalogue. Nevertheless, when the Exposition opened on April 30, 1904, twenty-six countries were represented by 10,905 works of art. Of these, the United States, not surprisingly, had the largest representation with 3,668 works. It was followed by France, exhibiting less than half that number of works (one thousand, five hundred and thirty) and Great Britain, which submitted one thousand, four hundred and thirty-two works of art. Each of the other twenty-three countries was represented by less than six hundred works of art. Despite the difficulties with Great Britain, in the Catalogue's "Introduction", Ives stated that "The British display here is superior in character to that at Chicago." Two countries which had never before exhibited work at

---

72. A.A., Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1746 (537-542) Pennell to Ives, March 20, 1903.

73. A.A.A., Louisiana Purchase Exhibition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1746, Lavery to Ives, June 22, 1903. In this letter, Lavery explains that "The Council of the International Society has decided that as exhibitions of members' works have already been arranged for in America they would be unable to contribute to the British Section in St. Louis' Exhibition."

international fairs, Argentina and Bulgaria, \textsuperscript{75} were also represented. Due to space limitations, some countries divided the art that was sent between the Art Palace and the country's main exhibition building.\textsuperscript{76} Medals in the three traditional categories of gold, silver and bronze were to be awarded, and when the commendations were announced, the United States artists received a total of thirty-five medals. The Grand Prize in the United States section was awarded to the portrait painter, John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) and a Diploma with Medal of Honor for Distinguished Service in Art was bestowed upon the painter and stained glass artist, John La Farge (1835-1910).

Although acquiring work for the Palace of Fine Arts Exhibition may have seemed like the largest task faced by Kurtz and Ives, there were other issues to contend with that ultimately resulted in a less than satisfactory Exposition experience for Kurtz. Beginning in February of 1904, a series of letters from Kurtz implore Ives to lobby on his behalf for overdue salary and expense account checks.\textsuperscript{77} By July of that year, the \textit{New York Times} reported that the World's Fair Executive Committee had announced a reduction in salaries for all officers and employees ranging from five percent for lower paid employees who received fifty to eighty-five dollars a month to twenty per cent for the 350 department chiefs and directors who received 500 or more dollars a month.\textsuperscript{78} Financial difficulties were not the only problem plaguing the Kurtz. A group of artists--all members of the

\textsuperscript{75} Charles Kurtz was awarded the Cross of the Order of Merit from Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria in 1905 in recognition of his assistance with the Bulgarian exhibition. His sketch of the medal he received is in his papers at the Archives of American Art. [Fig.37]

\textsuperscript{76} e.g. Austria-Hungary.

\textsuperscript{77} AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, Kurtz to Ives, February 21, 1904, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{78} "World's Fair Salaries Cut, Reductions Announced for August 1." \textit{New York Times}, July 29, 1904, p. 1. Kurtz's salary was about \$250 per month.
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Lotos Club in New York—led by Henry Ward Ranger (1859-1916), threatened not to contribute to the Exposition, believing that they had been snubbed when an Exposition planning meeting was held there.79 Another problem was presented by the collector, William T. Evans, who was organizing a landscape show for Kurtz’s nemesis, the American Art Association. Evans wrote personal letters to prominent collectors asking them not to lend their best landscapes to the St. Louis Exposition. Kurtz regarded this as a distinct conflict of interest since Evans was a member of the Exposition’s National Advisory Committee, and asked Ives to intervene.80 However Ives, who was in St. Louis hobbled by an orthopedic injury while supervising the decoration of the galleries and the arrival of foreign art works, was more disturbed by comments attributed to Kurtz, who was in New York. Ever the diplomat, he chose to ignore Kurtz’s request to confront Evans. Instead, Ives cautioned Kurtz to be careful of his remarks.

By the way, please do not make too much of the “strike situation”81 in your lurid criticisms of everything connected with Saint Louis and our work. In this connection, I venture to suggest that you hold up a bit in giving picturesque descriptions of the situation and the general doing up of the enemy, and Saint Louis as a whole. Some of your friends have quoted your remarks. It can do you no good and may do you a great deal of harm.82

In keeping with his past performance, Kurtz pointed out that he had done more to promote the Exposition than others connected with it.

On the contrary, I have given more publicity to the Exposition’s prospective attractions, I believe, than most persons who have been connected with it. The four [slide] lectures I have given and the books I have prepared I should think ought to be sufficient refutation of the slander that I have been discrediting the

---

79. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1747 (31-34), Kurtz to Ives, March 16, 1904, pp.1-2.

80. Ibid. p.3.

81. The preparation of the Exposition space was delayed by various labor actions.

82. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, #1747 (45). Ives to Kurtz, March 17, 1904.
Exposition!\(^{83}\)

To his credit, Ives retreated from his contentious stance and focused upon more imminent concerns. The required subdued colored wall coverings were unavailable, the condition of the grounds were deplorable, and there were protests from the conservative Metropolitan Camera Club of New York City.\(^{84}\)

It is apparent that on a personal level, the relationship between Kurtz and Ives began breaking down as early as June of 1903, when Kurtz complained to his wife that "I have just enjoyed another experience of Pappie Ives's absolute "unreliability."\(^{85}\) when Ives failed to arrive from one of his Exposition excursions on the agreed upon date and time. However the antagonism culminated with Kurtz's suggestion that a special memorial gallery be planned to commemorate the American expatriate, James Whistler (1834-1903). This idea also met with some resistance. That Kurtz admired the American expatriate is clear from the entry he wrote on the artist for the official illustrated handbook of the Fair.

Among modern artists no man has been more discussed, more admired, more condemned, more appreciated or more misunderstood, than the late Mr. Whistler. And there has been no greater artistic personality in the world for many a day. Subtle in feeling and in artistic vision, exquisite in his power of discriminating selection and the delicacy and charm of his interpretation, as well as in his technique; with rare sense of color and its harmonious combinations. Mr. Whistler was a distinguished figure in the world's art. ... His work was distinctively his own. As an etcher, he has had no superior in the history of art.\(^{86}\)

---

83. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1747 (49-50), Kurtz to Ives, March 19, 1904. The AAA Kurtz Papers include the typed manuscript for the slide lecture that Kurtz gave.

84. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817, Curtis Bell to Kurtz, May 1, 1904. In this letter, Bell offers to send a "special exhibition of its members" that was kept ready to travel. He also objected to the appointment of Edward Steichen, a member of the Photo-Secession, as a juror and complained that he had heard that Mr. Alfred Stiegltz "has enlisted your support to get special privilege at this late hour."

85. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1220), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz. June 16, 1903.

Kurtz’s assessment of Whistler was based on personal acquaintance. He had met Whistler in London in 1894 while working for the St. Louis Annual Exposition and was clearly impressed with the artist.

Today I went over and called upon Whistler. He was very pleasant and I enjoyed an hour with him very much. He has nothing “unsold” on hand, but hopes to be able to paint something for St. Louis before it will be time to ship the pictures from here. Whistler is a funny little man—as eccentric in manner as you could imagine him to be; but he is very interesting and original, and he is nobody’s fool! I think I should enjoy knowing him very well.87

Whistler’s attitude toward Kurtz has not been recorded, although Elizabeth Pennell, one of Whistler’s biographers, reported to the artist that she and her husband entertained the St. Louis Commissioners [Ives and Kurtz] at a dinner party. She reported that they ignored the Royal Academy members in order to find good English art, which would argue for a favorable opinion of the Commissioners.88 Kurtz’s admiration for the artist and those who surrounded him (e.g. the Glasgow Boys) was the source of his commitment for a memorial exhibition but it also created some friction between the two men. Kurtz, complaining that he was “crowded with work,” enclosed a list of eighteen Whistler’s and their owners that he urged Ives to secure. Ives responded with a subtle barb.

By the way, you failed to give me the addresses of the people who own the Whistlers. If I am to do anything of this sort, you will have to supply me not only with the names of the owners, but their addresses. I have no means of discovering them. Of course, I know all about Freer, the others I do not; don’t even know the


87. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4813 (964), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, May 5, 1894.

88. AAA, Elizabeth and Joseph Pennell Papers #P204, Elizabeth Pennell to James Whistler, July 29, 1902.
address of the famous Canfield, patron of Art. I suppose you do, being a man of the world and having a knowledge of various professions!  

As his workload continued unabated, Kurtz confided to his wife that he looked forward to the end of the Exposition, as he found himself in a particularly stressful situation that generated much physical and mental strain. Unlike other expositions, his confidence in the quality of the exhibition was dubious, although he admitted. “I think we will eventually secure a good collection of American pictures--but there is a lot of work to be done.”

Ives finally admitted to Kurtz that “we cannot open on time, and a difference of three days at the expense of nervous force is not worth the price.” Upon his arrival in Saint Louis, Kurtz wrote a letter to his parents that is perhaps the most revealing of his attitude during this period. In it he clearly indicates his frustration with his position, as well as with the man who urged his appointment.

I found everything very much behind-hand in our Department. While most of the foreign sections are nearly ready, our own section has done nothing. The building is not yet entirely completed and only about half of our exhibits are here. Of course no beginning of installation has been made. The wall coverings of our galleries are most deplorable--bright reds, crude greens and horrible browns. Ives thinks they may fade however. But after all my work--for which, of course I am receiving no credit whatever here--the result promises to be discouraging, and I am only sorry that circumstances two years ago seemed to drive me to accept this second fiddle position. Had the thing been exclusively in my own hands, I could have made it a success!--I would not have dawdled away nearly two years in Europe, letting things here simply drift meanwhile!

89. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1746 (1229), Ives to Kurtz, March 4, 1904.

90. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1355). Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, March 31, 1904.

91. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1747 (55-56), Ives to Charles M. Kurtz, March 22, 1904.

The St. Louis Exposition opened on April 30, 1904 and closed on December 1, 1904.
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It is not surprising that Charles Kurtz’s attitude towards Ives had been transformed from one of personal admiration to professional rivalry. During the fourteen years in which Kurtz was affiliated with international expositions, his attitude toward art had become increasingly more cosmopolitan. He envied Ives’ ability to move so freely between Europe and America in the name of art. By his own admission, his European travels had expanded his view of and appreciation for the art of the world.

From such collections of art objects, appreciation and knowledge increase together. There is no kind of study, perhaps more thoroughly fascinating, when one makes some headway in it, than the study of the arts of the different peoples of the world. It is a study full of surprises and delights, and one that opens gates to knowledge attained in no other way so easily and agreeably, or so likely to be remembered well.93

To demonstrate that knowledge, Kurtz needed a position that was commensurate with his experience. While the St. Louis Exposition was not the popular success that had been hoped for,94 and Ives was not the hands-on administrator that Kurtz would have liked, it did provide him with the opportunity to demonstrate his administrative abilities in a very public venue. His position as Assistant Chief of the Fine Arts Department lead directly to his appointment as the first Director of the newly planned Albright Gallery in Buffalo, New York, a final appointment that was the culmination of his career.


93. AAA, N597 (319) unidentified clipping of a press review, signed C.M.K.

94. “St. Louis Fair’s Total,” New York Times, December 21, 1904, p.1. The recorded admissions were 19,694 of which 12,804,616 were paid as opposed to the physically smaller World’s Columbian Exposition’s total attendance of 27,539,041 of which 21,479,661 were paid. The St. Louis Fair was also beset by a number of problems after it opened including the mutilation of a portrait of the Czar, fires in the the New York and Missouri buildings, and a slashed organ.
CHAPTER 8
With Kindest Regards: The Glasgow School of Painting

When Charles Kurtz invited New Yorkers to attend the first New York exhibition of the Glasgow School at Klackner's Art Gallery1 [Fig.38] on West Twenty-eighth Street in February of 1896, it was yet another departure from his long-held and publicly expressed conviction that American art was finally coming of age. In the past, he had voiced serious reservations about the popular enthusiasm for various foreign schools that came to the attention of the American public in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and clearly stated them in an 1884 issue of the Art Union. Kurtz wrote that "the recent craze of impressionism was nothing more nor less than a certain exaggerated suggestiveness that might be termed cleverness in some cases, while it was no more than vulgar presumption and ostentation in others."2 So it is somewhat surprising to learn that in February of 1896, Charles Kurtz was ensconced in Klackner's Art Gallery, not to promote American art, but rather to introduce personally the group of artists sometimes referred to as the Scottish impressionists, a group credited with introducing a modern painting style to Britain. His motivation was perhaps most clearly expressed in the Collector magazine of September 1895:

And as surely as I write these words, the bringing of these pictures to America is to mark the beginning of the epoch of a new influence in our own art. Since the

1. C. Klackner was originally located at 17 East 17th Street in New York. Kurtz's association with the Gallery dated back to the Southern Exposition, where it was advertised in the catalogue. The dates of "The Glasgow School" exhibition were February 18-29, 1896.

Some of Kurtz's original doubts about the intrinsic quality of many of the foreign art movements are echoed in a critique of the exhibition at Klackner's that appeared in the 

*Brooklyn Daily Eagle*. The essay began by stating that "one is never surprised at artistic manifestations in this country. Men and schools come up over night like mushrooms and sometimes have no more endurance." Although, the anonymous reviewer quickly acknowledged that this particular case was something of an exception, due in part to the place where many of these paintings originated—the drab, dirty, industrial city of Glasgow. Describing Kurtz as affable, enterprising and available to "offer explanation," the critic urged his readers to avail themselves of the opportunity to look in on the work of the Glasgow School. In his zealous attempt to convince American readers of the freshness, vigor and sincerity of this work, the writer perhaps overstated his case a bit, for there is little evidence that the Glasgow School had a significant influence on American artists. He declared that this new art occurred in "the most American part of Europe, to be sure—Scotland." The "American part" that undoubtedly appealed to Kurtz was the fact that a foreign language was not needed to communicate with the artists. As Kurtz himself admitted, foreign languages were not his forte. Moreover, he had found a


4. C.M.Kurtz Papers, Lawrence County Historical Society, letter 1993.39.268A records that his grade in German in college was a 145 of a possible 250.

5. AAA, C.M.Kurtz Papers, #4822, diary entry for Monday, April 23, 1894, gives an account of his first encounter with the Glasgow School while visiting Barcelona. "I went over to the consulate to see Mr. Bowen who got for me a card for the "opening" of the annual International Fine Art Exhibition today. ... After lunch I went with Bowen to the Exhibition opening. It was quite a formal affair. Opened by a representative of the Queen. All the city dignitaries and most of the "Sassiet" people present. We had very good seats. The exhibition was very fair. Some of the best pictures were by Scotch
group of artists who were anxious to exhibit in America. Harrison S. Morris, the Director of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts who collaborated with Kurtz on circulating exhibitions, boldly suggested that the Scottish artists pay all expenses and work through their Glasgow dealer, Alexander Reid. Morris based his suggestion on the increasing popularity of impressionism, which was introduced in America by the Durand-Ruel Gallery in 1886 and the suggestion by the American press that there was an affinity between the Glasgow School and the impressionists.

The new Scotchmen are impressionists, or nearly so, yet they are not impressionists for notoriety's sake. They really see nature in a different way from that of the narrow commercial eye of the usual British painter. There was a time when Scottish art was a little worse than the purely English Wilkie and his confreres were occupied with story pictures almost altogether. They painted crowded canvases in which ill drawn men and women were eating and drinking artists--not many good ones by Spaniards."

Deeply impressed by this exhibition, Kurtz then visited Scotland and began to organize an exhibition of Glasgow School painters that would be shown in America.

6. The first American Glasgow exhibition was held in St. Louis at the Annual Exposition and then travelled to institutions in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Cincinnati as well as Klackner's Gallery in New York. The second exhibition began in November of 1905 at the new Albright Gallery in Buffalo and then moved to the Art Institute of Chicago, the St. Louis Art Museum, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts and the Toronto Art Museum.

7. AAA, CMK Papers, #2814 (512-13), Harrison S. Morris to Charles M. Kurtz, May 25, 1895. In the letter, Morris proposes that foreign groups interested in exhibiting in America bear some of the financial responsibilities:

"The Danish Group might be included in the same round of exhibitions. As the expenses are to be paid by the Danes, I should think we could well afford to include them. In view of the anxiety of the Glasgow people to be seen in America, could you not make similar arrangements with them viz., they to pay expenses to America and back on all pictures excepting those sold?"

8. However there were significant differences in subject matter. The Glasgow School was less concerned with scenes of bourgeois modern life than the French impressionists and favored local, genre scenes of rural folk. Among the Scottish artists there was also an interest in animal (Joseph Crawhall), still life (George Pirie), and portrait (John Lavery) painting.
and playing and they were as brightly colored a cigar box cover and nearly as
pretty."

Kurtz's conversion from a champion of American art through his critical writings
and early positions as an arts administrator to an international impresario who brought
foreign art to the attention of the American public can be traced to 1886, with the
disappointing attendance at and sales from the exhibition of American pictures in St. Louis
in 1886. His increasing association with European art continued into the 1887-88 season,
with the tour of the two Munkácsy paintings. When he returned to New York in 1889, he
resumed his journalistic work and often reviewed art exhibitions, many of which were
concerned with European works.10 Later, with his appointment as assistant chief of the
Department of Fine Arts of the World's Columbian Exposition, his travel abroad increased
and along with it, his interest in foreign art. It was through these travels that Kurtz was
introduced to the Glasgow School of painting, but it was not until the St. Louis Annual
Exposition of 1894-95 [Fig.38] that he had the opportunity to bring an organized
exhibition of works by the Glasgow School to this country. Later, other foreign groups
were introduced by Kurtz during his tenure in St. Louis including the painters of the
German Secession and the contemporary artists of France, Holland and Denmark.

Charles Kurtz initially became interested in the work of the Glasgow School
through his efforts to ferret out vanguard art for exhibition in St. Louis. It was apparent
that it was substantially different from the nineteenth-century British narrative pictures that


10. See for example *Star* reviews from 1889 in AAA, CMK scrapbook, #4823,
"Men Likely to Succeed the Barbizon Painters in Favor, Fritz von Uhde of Munich," "A
Exhibition For the Barye Fund," "An English Protest Against the [Paris] Exposition
Awards".
usually represented contemporary British art in magazines, journals, and at international expositions like the World's Columbian Exposition.

This new style of British painting, as defined by the Glasgow Boys,\textsuperscript{11} which was the Scottish diminutive preferred by members of the group to the more formal term, usually favored a painterly rather than a linear mode. Initially the work was naturalistic and derived primarily from Jules Bastien-Lepage (1848-1884), with overtones of both Millet's and Courbet's realism. It was characterized by large, bold, squarish brush strokes and bright color. An article written by Kurtz for the American magazine, \textit{Modern Art}, a publication of midwestern origin that consistently reviewed the international art scene, cogently described the group in January 1896 as:

\begin{quote}
one of the strongest that has claimed recognition in modern times, and it seems destined to have tremendous influence. It is not based upon any affectation of the hour, in range of subject or technique, it involves no eccentricities and promulgates no new or startling doctrines. It introduces no innovations in perspective and does not essay to portray Nature under essentially different garb—in fashion or coloring, than was established by the Creator. Primarily, the Glasgow School is different from all other schools in its recognition of that fundamental essential in great art—decorative quality, and in its masterly employment of color to secure this.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

\textit{The Arts} magazine, in the September 1895 issue, agreed:

\begin{quote}
The men of the Glasgow school are especially noted for the strength and refinement in their coloring, for their keen appreciation of values, and for the feeling for decorative quality that they involve in their work.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

Although schooled in the academic tradition emphasizing linearity, accuracy, exotic or dramatic themes and glossy finished, the Scots did not so obviously reflect that training as

\begin{quote}
11. The "Glasgow Boys" became a formal society in 1887 when William Kennedy (1859-1918) was elected the group's President and a constitution was enacted.


\end{quote}
they matured. Nor did they cautiously take on the veneer of Impressionism over an academic armature as many American artists did. In their paintings, the underlying structure of the forms never really dissolves to imitate the optical sensations of light and color as it would in a painting by the French Impressionist, Claude Monet, or as it does in the 1894 work by the Scotsman Edward Hornel, *The Brook* (Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow). Rather the Boys from Glasgow effectively combined a variety of influences to arrive at a fresh style that was hailed by both American and foreign critics. The American artist and writer Charles Francis Browne, writing on “The Glasgow School Exhibition” of 1906 in the *Sketch Book*, commented on this perceptibly different response to French training.

“Our French realistic training, while it has made our American artists good workmen, has somehow affected our choice of subject. As a friend said, “These things are well done, but are not worth while,” referring to a current exhibition. These Scotchmen make it worth while because they are trying to be poets rather than reporters or chroniclers of nature’s doings.”

The Scottish artists usually favored landscapes and portraits, as Americans traditionally did themselves, but they generally employed more innovative brush work, a lighter palette, and a highly decorative arrangement of the compositional elements. It is a school of painting that has had a considerably lower profile than its French counterpart.

The basis for the formation of the Glasgow School of Painting was the comraderie that existed between three separate groups of artists that eventually merged between 1880 and 1890. Ultimately, twenty-three artists were identified with the first generation of the Glasgow School. Its origins may be traced to 1878, when W.Y. Macgregor (1855-1923) published...
[Fig.39], who trained at the Slade School in London and has often been called the “Father of the School,” painted with James Paterson (1854-1932) [Fig.40] at St. Andrews in Scotland. In the winter of that same year, James Guthrie (1859-1923) [Fig.41], largely a self-trained artist met Edward A. Walton (1860-1922), who was related by marriage to the Englishman Joseph Crawhall (1861-1913). These five painters—Macgregor, Paterson, Guthrie, Walton and Crawhall—were later joined by the circle of artists associated with John Lavery (1856-1941). Although an Irishman from Belfast, Lavery settled in Glasgow at the beginning of his career in 1876. He left Glasgow the following year, after his studio burned, to pursue further training, first in London at Heatherley’s School and then for the next three winters at the Julian Academy in Paris, where he studied with William Adolphe Bouguereau. Lavery went to Paris accompanied by his good friend Alexander Roche (1861-1921), who entered Julian’s with him, along with William Kennedy (1859-1918) and Thomas Millie Dow (1848-1919).

Parenthetically, it should be mentioned that this was really the first opportunity for interaction between Scottish and American artists in this generation. The Scots first came into contact with Americans as students in the various ateliers in which they studied. Dow, for example, became particularly friendly with Abbott H. Thayer, whom he probably met in the studio of Jean-Léon Gérôme, where both were studying at about the same time. Although little surrounding the circumstances of Dow’s painting of *The Hudson River* (Glasgow Art Gallery) can be documented, it is thought that it resulted from a later visit to his American friend. It is also possible that he knew Theodore Robinson, who like himself

had studied with Carolus-Duran and had visited the hamlet of Grez-sur-Loing in the years between 1875 and 1878. John Lavery readily acknowledged in his autobiography, *The Life of a Painter*, that he had little contact with the French themselves because he, much like Kurtz, could not learn languages. He fared better with his American colleagues and while studying in Paris he became acquainted with John Singer Sargent, William Merritt Chase and Malvina Hoffman. He also admired Augustus Saint-Gaudens, who had done a number of bas-relief portraits of the Scottish writer Robert Louis Stevenson, most notably the 1887 bronze relief for the Cathedral of St. Giles in Edinburgh.

Although Lavery went on to become perhaps the most celebrated member of the Glasgow Boys and eventually married an American woman, his limited participation in only the second of the two American exhibitions brought him little recognition from the American press at this time, and he was not perceived here as an important constituent of the group. Nevertheless, through his personal ties and his friendship with American artists, Lavery eventually achieved a presence in America unequaled by any of the other Glasgow Boys.

The first of the significant influences on these Scottish artists that must be considered is the French naturalist painter Jules Bastien-Lepage (1848-1884). The full impact of his teaching took hold on the Boys during their idylls in Grez in the early 1880s, as exemplified by David Gauld’s (1865-1936) painting of *The Haunted Chateau, Grez*

16. John Lavery, *The Life of A Painter, Sir John Lavery, R.A.* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1940), p. 44. “Perhaps it was my ignorance of the language. ...I have deplorably little to say about the French names which have since become famous, such as Monet, Pissarro, and Cézanne. The explanation is that I cannot learn languages. ...there was little stimulus, owing to the fact that we foreigners kept together so much by going to the same cafés and rarely meeting any of our French atelier friends except at exhibitions.”

[Fig 42] It was there that they honed their collective style and many of the characteristics that European critics later identified as common to the Glasgow style first became apparent. James Guthrie was one of the first Scottish artists to discover Grez while on a short trip to Paris in 1882. Guthrie’s first great success, To Pastures New of 1883 (Aberdeen Art Gallery), although a British scene, derived much of its color and bright light from his plein-air experiences there, his adaptation of Bastien-Lepage’s advice to concentrate on depicting the figure in motion, using a naturalistic setting, as well as the influence of Impressionism. It is a considerable departure from his rather dour, early style, illustrated by his 1881 painting A Funeral Service in the Highlands (Glasgow Art Gallery).

The strong impact of this picture by Guthrie recalled Lavery, who had spent the summers of 1883 and 1884 in Grez, to Glasgow.18 Guided by Guthrie’s example and Bastien-Lepage’s advice, Lavery began work on his first major success. The Tennis Party (Aberdeen Art Gallery) of 1885. However even at this early date, a perceptible shift in subject matter can be discerned. Instead of a scene from rural country life in the manner of the earlier 1883 painting La Laveuse (Private Collection), Lavery has borrowed an idea from Manet and in depicting the upper middle class engaged in a leisure-time activity has presented a scene from modern life. Lavery, in turn, may have been the inspiration for Guthrie’s 1890 pastel Tennis (Private Collection).

Perhaps an even more significant, later influence than Bastien-Lepage was the American expatriate James Abbott McNeill Whistler, who in 1885 formally voiced his aesthetic theory of "art for art's sake." Lavery later said of Whistler:

Although we at Glasgow worked with a richer palette than Whistler, we recognized in him the greatest artist of the day and thought of his "Ten O'Clock Lectures" as the Gospel of Art.\(^{19}\)

Whistler's influence can be seen in works such as Walton's portrait of *Lillian May Law* (Glasgow Art Gallery) or George Henry's *River Landscape by Moonlight* (Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow) of 1887. As these various influences coalesced shortly after 1885 and remained evident until approximately 1890, the Glasgow School functioned most cohesively as a unified artistic entity. Their landscapes often recalled their French sources in their use of high horizon lines and realist subject matter, while their portraits were reminiscent of Whistlerian arrangements.

In 1887, these artists from the west of Scotland banded together into an organized society with a constitution. William Kennedy was elected president, but it was Robert Macaulay Stevenson who held the group together and functioned as a spokesman for it through the many articles he wrote for the *Scottish Art Review*. The magazine, which was published for eighteen months in 1888 and 1889, not only covered events in the Scottish art world, but also those in London, Paris, and America. The group made its debut outside of Scotland at the Grosvenor Gallery in London during the summer of 1890. Later that same year the Boys achieved their greatest success in Munich, in an exhibition highlighted by works such as Henry's seminal, transitional picture *Galloway Landscape* (Glasgow Art Gallery) of 1889, Hornel's *Winefield Nellons, the Bellringer* (Private Collection) of 1886, and Lavery's series of scenes from the Glasgow International

---

Exhibition of 1888. Since Charles Kurtz was abroad in 1891, it is possible that he became aware of the Glasgow School at this time. However, it is usually assumed that it wasn't until 1894 that he first encountered the work of the Glasgow Boys in Barcelona and afterwards arranged for an American exhibition in St. Louis.

A review of the criticism suggests that the first exhibition of the Glasgow School shown in America was favorably received. However, in the words of the modern art historian Kenneth McConkey, by that time the Boys had begun to "move away from naturalism to lose themselves in a meaningless mosaic of purely decorative dabs of colour." McConkey's observation hints at a possible explanation for the minimal influence these popular painters had on American artists. For by the time that the American public was able to view the work of the Glasgow School, many of the artists had achieved and developed a more personal style and some had met with a fair measure of success. Writing to Kurtz in 1902, James Paterson offered an explanation for the group's lack of a lasting impact in America. He explained that the relocation of many of the members combined with addition of a second generation of artists who were attracted to the work of the Boys made it increasingly difficult to define as a coherent group.

By 1905, the year of the second American exhibition, several members had long since moved away from Glasgow. Although the paintings on view in America were nominally by members of the group, the style, as Paterson indicated, had become increasingly divergent in approach and decorative in appearance. A comparative study of the work produced by the group during its heyday in the 1880s and that created by

---


members of the Glasgow School during the decade in which the two American exhibitions took place, along with an examination of the American critical response, reveal that a noticeable change in thematic content had taken place. This can readily be seen by comparing a painting typical of the group's work during its seminal period, James Guthrie's *A Hind's Daughter* (National Galleries of Scotland, Edinburgh) of 1883, with his later portrait of *Miss Constance Wilson* (Private Collection) dating from 1890. The interest in peasant subject matter—in this case a Scottish farmer's daughter surrounded by the fruits of her father's labor—had given way a decade later to a more fashionable approach to portrait painting. The comfortable, middle-class interior setting, appropriate for a young woman of a higher social standing than the little farmer's daughter, says much about the continued development of the Glasgow School. The interest in rendering realistic subjects and the use of a plein-air method of working had evolved into a more studied studio composition. The British publication *Blackwood's Magazine* discussed the Glasgow Boys and the complex nature of their style in 1895: "They are not copyists of Nature. They are neither realists, romanticists, idealists, impressionists or symbolists."²²

The critical response from the *New York Times* which reviewed the 1896 exhibition at Klackner's was similar and the review quoted the writer for *Blackwood's Magazine* verbatim, adding that "these Scotchmen partake in a measure of all—and yet remain themselves. This is quite true."²³ Of the twenty-one artists who exhibited paintings, all but one (Arthur Melville) still lived in Glasgow or its environs. There were one hundred and eleven pictures on view, some of which, the critics said, were painted especially for the exhibition. Well over half of them were landscapes, several were portraits or flower


paintings, and a few had international overtones which underscored the fact that these were no longer provincial artists. Melville sent scenes from North Africa, Macgregor some from South Africa, and George Pirie, an animal painter, sent a Texas broncho, a souvenir from his visit to America. There were a few Italian scenes and Hornel, who attracted the most attention, sent several paintings from his recent trip to Japan.[Fig.43] It was Hornel, who sometimes collaborated with his good friend George Henry, who was consistently singled out. *Arts* magazine, a Chicago publication, described him in its September 1895 review as “a painter whose art almost finds its beginning and ending in color. There is no other painter living whose color compositions are so daring and at the same time so surprising an delightful to the eye.24

When the exhibition opened at the Annual Exposition in St. Louis in the fall of 1895, *St. Louis Life*, a weekly publication, printed five favorable articles25 about the Glasgow pictures. Among the things said about the paintings, which were called “exceedingly interesting,” were the accolades directed at individual painters. Guthrie’s work was cited for its “exquisite feeling and subtle gradations of color” while Roche’s painting was praised for its “rare combination of strength and delicacy.” James Paterson’s landscapes were considered “thoroughly individual” and seen as related to those of the recently deceased American painter, George Inness (1825-1894), who died in Scotland the previous year.26


26. *St. Louis Life*, “Something of “the Glasgow School,” vol. 12, no. 299 (September 14, 1895), p.5. Edward A. Hornel exhibited nine paintings, three of which were Japanese scenes. Kurtz often purchased paintings that were singled out in the press. The Balcony, Yokohama, (which was cited for its “charm” along with the comment that
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Kurtz accompanied the exhibition to New York in February of 1896, where it was on view at Klackner’s Gallery. He stationed himself there for the duration of the exhibition. An enthusiastic letter to Hornel written the previous year by Kurtz, who was still organizing the exhibition, suggests that Kurtz might have had an entrepreneurial interest beyond simply arranging for the works to be seen in America, particularly since the Glasgow picture dealer, Alexander Reid, acted as liaison between Kurtz and Hornel. Kurtz closed his correspondence by saying:

I shall be very glad to hear from you and to receive such data as you can send me concerning yourself and your work. I shall endeavor to use this in the most effective manner possible, and I trust that “good” may result. I hope I may have a good group of your pictures for our exhibition, and I trust that they all may remain in America.27

His efforts were at least critically well rewarded when, without exception, the artists were cited in the February 1896 edition of the New York Times for “remarkable originality, excellent color, astonishing suggestiveness and all strike a note at once new, harmonious and full of melody.”28 In addition, it was noted that “most of them are highly decorative, all having something new to say.” Works that received particular critical attention in the press were Guthrie’s Miss Constance Wilson and J.W. Hamilton’s Venetian Scene (which Kurtz himself owned), a work cited for its “vigorous presentation...[and] has the warmth of Rico”29 almost, without his elaboration and smoothness. Its seriousness is almost

“It is rare that one sees such painting of flesh and glossy black hair; and the water in the bay beyond makes one think of sapphires while the clouds suggest fire-opals.”) entered Kurtz’s collection and it is likely that it is the picture to which the writer alludes.


29. Martin Rico Y Ortega (b. Madrid, 1833- d. Venice, 1908) was a Spanish landscape painter who was particularly known for his views of Venice rendered in an academic mode.
romantic.” Pirie’s *A Cock* was compared to Delacroix and said to be “painted with flame in the hair of his brush.” Not surprisingly, the landscapes by the Glasgow artists proved popular with the American critics. Paterson’s *Castle Fairn* [Fig.40] (also owned by Kurtz) was described as “a snappy lively rendition of Scotch scenery with a big feeling about it of simplicity, in the modeling of cloud forms, the landscape construction and the envelopment of atmosphere.” Stevenson’s *Rhapsody* [Fig.44] was found to be astonishingly simple. Stevenson was the only artist to receive any negative criticism, for it was noted that he was apt to be “dry and opaque in his pigments” although his painting *By the Mill Pond* was commended for being a “dignified and satisfactory landscape.”

The square brush mark was the one unifying characteristic that drew a derogatory comment from the writer of the *Art Amateur*, who otherwise appreciated the work but thought that its ubiquitous presence detracted from the “school.”

The “square brush-mark” abominated of the Pre-Raphaelites, was everywhere visible; frequently so much so as to puzzle and disturb the spectator. But again, there were in almost every picture uncommon qualities of tone, color and atmosphere and a real feeling for decorative composition.

The critic for the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, also responded more favorably:

These new men have restrained their view and simplified their subjects. Munich has affected them, as it affected Chase and some others in our land. Paris had also affected them, as it has affected Sargent and dozens of others. But the painters represented at Klackner’s are not copyists and their work is individual. Most of it is sober minded, like the Scotch. There are a score of these men and of all of them only one has a playful humor, and that he expresses in color, rather than in incident. Mr. Hornel—that is his name—is especially fond of reds and he uses them up as high as vermilion, with perfect fearlessness.

Citing William Merritt Chases’s Munich experience and John Singer Sargent’s Parisian


training suggests that the American press was indeed attempting to find a common denominator that accounted for the ready acceptance of the Glasgow School in America. It also points out the direction that we might look to for any specific examples of Glasgow influence on American painting, for there is more than the similar bravura brushwork and foreign training to link Chase with the Glasgow School. A letter written by the American artist Charles Hawthorne (1872-1930), a student of Chase at the time and later the founder of the Cape Cod School of Art in Provincetown, definitively links the popular American teacher with the Scots and recorded his own reaction to the 1895 exhibition:

The Glasgow School have an exhibition now which I have seen several times. I wish you could see it also. It is very interesting, they are followers of Whistler so they keep things in tow. It is wonderful to see how much of air and light they get in their out of door work. You may remember Mr. Chase speaking of this school.33

Mr. Chase apparently not only spoke of the Glasgow Boys to his students, but also was influenced by them himself. A comparison between Guthrie's Miss Constance Wilson, the work so frequently cited by the critics, and Chase's The Golden Lady (Parrish Art Museum, Southampton, N.Y.) of 1896, suggests that Chase had borrowed liberally from Guthrie, as he had often done from other sources. Both paintings are portraits of middle-class women who gaze directly at the viewer. There is the slightest suggestion that both had been engaged in some genteel activity before assuming their poses in comfortable armchairs. The warm color schemes of gold and brown in both pictures further extend the comparison.

Perhaps the most controversial review of the 1895 exhibition was that written by Elizabeth Pennell,34 who was later to collaborate with her husband on Whistler's

33. AAA, Robert B. Campbell Papers, Charles Hawthorne to Rose Lamb, February 27, 1896.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
biography. Perhaps because of her personal interest in the Glasgow Boys' revered master, she published one of the more extensive, although not entirely accurate, articles to appear on the group in *Harper's Magazine* in February 1895. It motivated Kurtz, who remained the group's staunchest American supporter, to write a letter to the editor of the *Collector* the following April. In it he took issue with some of Mrs. Pennell's facts. Kurtz pointed out:

Mrs. Pennell omits more than mere mention, however, of several of the especially noteworthy men—as Edward A. Hornel, George Henry, Joseph Crawhall and David Gauld. Indeed in a foot note to her article, "the recent death of Mr. Gauld" is deplored. I am very glad to say that Mr. Gauld is not at all dead, and that he has promised two of his best pictures for St. Louis.35

Kurtz however agreed with Elizabeth Pennell's perceptions of Glasgow School aesthetics and quoted from her article in his introduction to the catalogue of the Klackner Galleries exhibition:

Mrs. Pennell, however, rightly diagnoses the Glasgow School as being founded upon "a refined sense of color, a bright appreciation of values, and a true feeling for decorative quality.36

Kurtz also agreed with Mrs. Pennell's statement in the *Harper's* article that "now it is from Glasgow, and not from the Scottish Academy and schools of London that modern British art has received its strongest impetus; it is to Glasgow one now looks for that art's most brilliant achievement."37

The second and last exhibition of Glasgow School painting in America began its tour in November of 1905 at the new Albright Gallery in Buffalo, New York, which had


named Charles Kurtz as its first director. Upon his appointment, he seized the opportunity once again to display the work of some of his favorite painters. It is interesting to note that Kurtz himself eventually acquired twenty-two paintings by artists associated with the Glasgow School. Along with those of Halsey C. Ives, his purchases accounted for many of the sales that were reported in the press during the circulation of the exhibition. So it is not surprising that he organized another exhibition which offered him the opportunity to promote these artists, many of whom had become personal friends. This tour began in Buffalo, moved on to the Art Institute of Chicago in January of 1906, continued to the St. Louis Museum of Art, and on to the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts before closing at the Toronto Art Museum in May 1906. It proved to be so popular that an extension of the tour was considered, but regulations governing the importation of foreign art prohibited it. A compromise was struck by placing works that were sold during the tour and which were to remain in America, on view at the Rochester Art Club. According to the Buffalo Academy Notes in June 1906, another exhibition was to have been organized there. But Kurtz himself was the Glasgow School’s primary promoter, and his untimely death in 1909 brought an end to group exhibitions by the members of the Glasgow School here in the United States. Several of them, however, later had one-person exhibitions in America.38

During the run of this exhibition, the critics once again noted the Glasgow School’s use of color. The Philadelphia Evening News for November 6, 1905, said:

38. Harrington Mann exhibited at Knoedler & Co., in New York in 1906, and again in 1907. The latter exhibition was a group of recent portraits. He also had a one man exhibition at the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy in 1908 and another in 1914. The St. Louis City Art Museum was the venue for an exhibition in 1916, and Knoedler & Co. in 1934. John Lavery was probably the most recognized member of the Glasgow School in America. He worked in the United States frequently and received numerous commissions for portraits including John Cardinal Hayes of New York. He also sat on the Jury of awards at the Carnegie Art Institute in Pittsburg in 1898.
Color is the great stronghold of these Northern Men... The excessive virility, the splendid vigor and magnificent technique which has secured for the Scotch school its present eminence.39

And once again, the relationship to Whistler and American art was discerned:

R.M. Stevenson's "A Moonlight Scene" shows at the left something of the Tryon treatment of tall, spindly trees. J. Whitelaw Hamilton's "By the Ebbing Tide" [Fig. 45] is like a Whistler, a Whistler set abloom, turned by some unseen process into beautiful tones of color.40

In general, the criticism of the second, smaller exhibition (eighty-seven works by twenty-three artists) was more selective. It also reflected an increased awareness of the decorative aspects of the pictures as well as the strong sense of color and the fact that the group was known to have definitely dispersed.

The review in *Brush and Pencil* magazine for example, apparently choosing not to acknowledge the presence of the "Glasgow Girls,"41 represented by Lena Kennedy and Mrs. Macauley Stevenson, described the Glasgow Boys as "men of virile strength and sharply defined individual character."42 But this time, only those artists who were considered the "strongest men" were discussed. Noting that few of them now resided in Glasgow, *Brush and Pencil* stated that "the only present relationship of the men of the Glasgow School, is that of common sympathy based on love of nature and art." The unsigned article concluded: "The Glasgow men, however, have appeared to realize that, in


40. Ibid.


art, decorative quality is essential. Each artist is a colorist." 43

The February 1906 review in the Sketchbook also acknowledged that the "school is scattered," but still was able to identify in the work that was exhibited in 1906 the "characteristically Scottish quality of tone, color and decorative feeling." It attributed the "colorful, romantic, decorative painting" to the picturesque and varied landscape and constantly changing climate which forced artists to be something other than realistic in the Bastien-Lepage sense.

In 1895, perhaps because the group had not previously exhibited in America, the critical emphasis seemed to be on introducing as many of the artists' names and works as possible, rather than on a detailed analysis of the paintings. Although the way color was used was consistently noted, one reviewer remarked that "the general feeling of the exhibition is one of sobriety of tone." In fact, the constant reference to tone and atmosphere in the paintings suggests that the critics saw in the work of the Glasgow School a style of painting that seemed to have an affinity with the American tonalist painting of the same period. None of the reviews goes so far as to suggest a group of American painters who might be considered an offshoot of the Glasgow School.

It is certainly possible to cite individual examples of American painting that may have been influenced by exposure to the work of these Scottish painters, as the comparison between Guthrie and Chase demonstrated. However in the final analysis, although the critical response seems to indicate that the two exhibitions of the Glasgow School were a popular success, it was not long lasting. Only a few works entered American collections and not many artists can be identified as having been influenced by

43. Ibid.
what has come to be known as the Glasgow School. This was in all probability primarily due to the fact that the American public was presented with a diluted version of mainstream style Glasgow School painting. Perhaps then in considering the question of the impact of the Glasgow School and whether it exerted any significant influence on American art, it is best to keep in mind an observation made by W. Lewis Fraser that appeared in the first volume of the *Quarterly Illustrator* for 1894. In an article entitled "American Art and Foreign Influence," Fraser said:

> We are fortunate in our country in having in art no past and therefore few traditions so recent that they have not had time to crystallize...It is the fashion to bewail the lack of Americanism in our art. I wonder what is meant by this. American art is intensely American. Our nation has grown by assimilating the best that the whole world afforded--the making of it our own, the pruning and trimming of it, and then incorporating it into our system--and our art has grown on these lines.\(^{44}\)

Fraser's observations are key to understanding the Glasgow School's lack of enduring influence. Aside from the dilution of the general style, the introduction of a foreign group was ill timed. Although the 1893 World's Fair, which had showcased many such international schools, would seem to be an augur for the positive reception of European art, in fact the period that followed was marked by growing nationalism. The Glasgow School represented a celebrated international movement from a small country that sought acceptance in an every increasing age of nationalism that continued through the turn of the century. As Robert Rosenblum has noted in his essay for the exhibition, *1900, Art At The Crossroads*, which explored the Paris World's Fair from which Kurtz was forced to resign, "against a backdrop of international unity, so much of the art at the 1900 fair intensified these awakenings of local differences."\(^{45}\) The American public may

---


have been interested in the paintings from Glasgow, but American artists resisted a significant adaptation of its principles.

Although Charles Kurtz had only limited commercial success in introducing modern European art to America, he might otherwise be seen as one of the earliest promoters of modern art in America. While the anti-classical compositional strategies, subjects drawn from everyday life and obvious brush work were hallmarks of impressionism, the emphasis on color might also be seen as a harbinger of the much more strident but color dependent Fauve movement and of the decorative tendencies allied to Post Impressionism that exerted a more obvious influence on American art. The experience of circulating the Glasgow School once again enhanced Kurtz's reputation and brought him to the attention of the art world, where he was poised to accept his final position as Director of the new Albright Gallery.

CHAPTER 9
Gathering the Art Harvest:
The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and The Albright Gallery

In August of 1904, mid-way through his duties at the St. Louis Exposition, Charles Kurtz escorted his boyhood friend, James D. Spriggs, around the Fair. Upon his return home, Spriggs wrote Kurtz a thank you letter. In it, he mused: “I suppose if you went there, your position would be analogous to that of Ives at St. Louis.”1 The location under consideration was Buffalo, New York, the site of the 1901 Pan-American Exposition,2 and the position being discussed was that of director of the new art museum that was being built there. It was a prime possibility for employment at the close of the Fair for at the time, the development of Buffalo as an art center was the subject of much speculation in the art world. The much anticipated new venue for art needed a director for its nearly completed Albright Art Gallery, an institution that would merge several Buffalo arts organizations under one roof. The building was originally intended to house

1. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1416), Spriggs to Kurtz, August 7, 1904.

2. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks, #2763 (460). Eugenie Hauenstein (no dates recorded) was a Buffalo artist who compiled clippings from local papers related to the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and the Art Students League of Buffalo which was under its jurisdiction. One unidentified clipping states: “He [Kurtz] was considered as art director for the Pan-American Exposition but was ill at the time the appointment had to be decided.” William A. Coffin (1855-1925) was appointed director of the Exposition’s Fine Art Department. Kurtz’s previous contact with Buffalo included the circulation of the American Art Union Pictures there in 1883-84, borrowing art for the 1886 Southern Exposition from the Buffalo Art Institute and a visit to the Exposition in Buffalo in 1901.
the art exhibition at the Pan-American Exposition\(^3\) and after its close, the collection of
the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and the Arts Students League of Buffalo.\(^4\) The funds for
the building were donated by John Joseph Albright (1848-1931) [Fig. 46], a local
industrialist and long time member of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy Board of Directors,
who contributed $350,000 in January of 1900, specifying that no expense was to be
spared. In recognition of his donation, the new building was to be named after him but
administered by the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy. The gift was matched by $140,000 from
the City to ensure maintenance of the building and by the time of its dedication in May of
1905, there were five purchase funds in place that totaled $95,000.

Edward B. Green (1855-1950) [Fig.47] a local architect from the firm of Green
and Wicks, was engaged to design the sumptuous, Greek revival style building that was to
be located on property that overlooked the Delaware Lake, one of the most scenic
sections of Buffalo, although much removed from the center of the City. The marble
building [Fig.48 ] was two hundred and fifty feet long and one hundred and fifty feet deep.
On its eastern facade, it featured two porches, inspired by the Erechtheum on the
Acropolis in Athens, with caryatids [Fig.49] that symbolized the arts designed by the
noted sculptor, Augustus Saint-Gaudens (1848-1907) The interior was designed to be a

\(^3\) J. Benjamin Townsend, *The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, 1862-1962* (Buffalo,
time for the Exposition since there was great difficulty in obtaining the white marble
required for the exterior from the quarries near Baltimore, Maryland and the red-brown
marble for the floors from Tennessee due to quarry strikes. Numerous details such as the
above mentioned wall coverings, problems such as broken marble columns and attention
to workmanship prevented the building from being completed until 1905.

\(^4\) Ibid. pp.10-11. The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy was founded in 1862, one of
the organizers being the artist, Thomas Le Clear (1818-1882),[Fig.49], an academic artist,
but it had no permanent home, despite owning some significant works of art. Included in
the collection was Albert Bierstadt’s *The “Marina Grande” in Capri with the Faraglioni
Rocks in the Background* (1859) which became the first gift from an artist to the Academy
in 1863.
modern art gallery with a double glass roof that allowed the galleries below to be illuminated with natural light or by overhead light fixtures concealed between the layers of glass. It featured a central sculpture court measuring fifty by seventy feet surrounded by seventeen galleries that were to have walls covered with the same soft green denim-like canvas that was used in the American art section of the 1900 Paris Exposition. Kurtz had worked with the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy while organizing the Southern Exposition exhibitions, but it was the difficulty in obtaining the fabric for the walls that once again brought Charles Kurtz to the attention of the Board of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy as a candidate for the position of director. The post was open due to the resignation of Lucius W. Hitchcock (1868-1942) in the Spring of 1904, who had left to take charge of the Art Students’ League in New York City. Writing to Kurtz in June of 1904, Ralph H. Plumb (1845-1905), a past President of the Board of Directors who was chairman of the Search Committee, expressed his appreciation for “the great help you are giving us in the matter of wall coverings,” but more importantly, he raised the question of the position of director:

we shall probably annoy you within the next week or ten days and at the same time I shall like very much to again take up the subject of our Director for the Albright Gallery with you.  

The Board, which was preoccupied with the construction of the building, either did not make the selection of a new director a high priority or could not agree on the position description. Like the National Academy of Design in New York City, the Albright Art Gallery would not only house a museum collection and gallery space, but also provide space for a school and a gathering place for local artists. Its director should “have the 

5. Lucius Wolcott Hitchcock moved to Buffalo in 1894 and exhibited at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901. He also received a medal at the 1904 Exposition in St. Louis. He left Buffalo for New York City and was also a teacher at the William M. Chase School. 

6. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1391), Plumb to Kurtz, June 7, 1904.
qualifications and large experience of an artist, who can efficiently fill such an important position. It is just possible that a teacher for the antique class and a director may be combined. It was understood that finding someone with experience as both an artist and an administrator would be difficult to find and consequently the appointment would not be made for some time. Although the Board clearly preferred a man, it was because of the capable administrative abilities of Cornelia Bentley Sage (1876-1936) [Fig. 51] that the Board had some latitude in making a decision. She was appointed assistant secretary in 1904 and was also placed in charge of the gallery because of her organizational skills. So it was not until July of 1904, less than a year before the official dedication of the gallery, that Plumb again contacted Kurtz about the position, which the latter had inquired about the previous year.

Kurtz, now forty-nine years old, was once again weighing the possibility of becoming an art dealer at the close of the Fair to take advantage of the many contacts he had made.

---

7. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (2763) unidentified, undated clipping "A Farewell Reception: New Direction of Albright Art Gallery"

8. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (439), unidentified clipping from Buffalo newspaper profiled Cornelia Bentley Sage. She studied at the Art Students League with J. Carroll Beckwith, John Twachtman, Irving R. Wiles and Robert Reid. Sage was a member of the New York Watercolor Society, where she exhibited her work which was placed on the line. She served as Kurtz's assistant director and then as acting director after his death until 1910, when she was appointed director. She served in that capacity until 1924. She married Major W. W. Quinton, resigned her position and moved to California where she became active in art circles there.

9. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1398), Plumb to Kurtz, July 12, 1904. Plumb's letter asked whether Kurtz was still interested in the position he had been interested in previously: "...[regarding] a letter received from you some months ago, are you still an applicant and what consideration do you expect?"

10. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1317), Brownell to Kurtz, December 29, 1903. Brownell was the First Vice-President of the Erie Railroad Company. In the letter Brownell enquires about whether there were any developments in "the Buffalo matter."
through his work. Nevertheless, he was still dependent upon his father for the occasional extra money that was necessary to finance his picture buying. In addition, his immediate family had increased with the birth of another daughter, Isabella Starkweather Kurtz, who was born in 1901 [Fig. 52]. Kurtz wanted a more public professional recognition, but realized that as long as he remained Ives’ assistant, he would be forever in his shadow. It was his desire to be seen as Ives’ equal that piqued his interest in the Buffalo position, particularly since Ives’ name was being mentioned as a possible successor to the recently deceased director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832-1904). Although the organization of the St. Louis Exposition had strained their friendship, the two men had resumed a more cordial working relationship after its opening. As mentioned previously, they were considering a collaborative effort as dealers using someone else to front their business. Edmund Henry Wuerpel (1866-1958), who served as acting director and dean of the St. Louis School of Fine Arts during Ives’ two year sabbatical while working on the Fair was an integral part of their plans, as an excerpt from one of his letters to Kurtz indicates.

...I trust there will be no hitch in the proceeding. If you can let me know just what is expected of me and where I stand in the affair, I think there will be no trouble. I can’t say that I am sure about the ethical side of the thing, for I do not like the idea of standing for what I am not. You and Mr. Ives want me to stand for a name and want me to share in the profits for the use of the name. That is plain and simple. For it is ridiculous to assume that you could not do the whole thing by yourselves without calling in my assistance. ... [My wife] will want to know how much I invest and will want to know about sales and receipts etc.

11. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4817 (1416), Spriggs to Kurtz, August 7, 1904. In the letter, Spriggs remarks that while visiting the Exposition, he heard colleagues of Kurtz’s speculating that he would become an art dealer when the Exposition closed. Spriggs thought it was time for Kurtz to benefit financially from his years of hard work.

12. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (97), Kurtz to John Quincy Adams Ward, November 26, 1904.

13. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4817 (1211), Wurpel to Kurtz, June 12, 1903.
However tempted Kurtz may have been by the plan, his overriding concern with financial security made him a serious candidate for the Albright Art Gallery position. By October of 1904, both Kurtz and the Albright Gallery Board of Directors had made their final decisions. Ralph H. Plumb informed Kurtz that his “appointment as art director of the Fine Arts Academy was confirmed by the Board last evening.”14 George F. Brownell, another Board member and a Vice-President of the Erie Railroad, sent his congratulations and a vote of confidence a few days later, telling Kurtz that “I ... know you will do more to advance art matters in Buffalo in a few years than has been done in the past twenty years.”15 The local press also lauded the appointment:

A better selection than that of Mr. Kurtz would have been difficult. ... with him at the head, the Albright Art Gallery will take a fitting place among the art centers of this country and it is expected that under Mr. Kurtz’s direction loan exhibitions will frequently be held at the new gallery, much larger than were possible in the Academy’s overcrowded quarters in the Public Library building. ...

It is the right kind of a selection to make for the head of the Albright, for with the new building and the grouping together under this one roof of all the art societies of Buffalo there is a need for a man of brains and skill and experience.16

Before assuming his new position, Kurtz completed his work for the St. Louis Exposition. He remained there after it closed on December and oversaw the return of the borrowed works of art. When he reported to Buffalo, Kurtz’s first task as director was to arrange the Inaugural Loan Collection of Paintings, a daunting task, given that he had only five months to plan it and arrange for loans before the official dedication. However,

14. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4817 (1448) telegram, Plumb to Kurtz, October 11, 1904.

15. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4817 (1463), Brownell to Kurtz, October 20, 1904.

16. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (460) unidentified clipping from Buffalo newspaper, “Mr. Kurtz is Assistant Art Director at the Saint Louis Exposition, Writer, Critic and Artist.”
Kurtz not only had his own contacts, but also had the complete cooperation of the Board of Directors. They provided introductions to prominent collectors in New York City and also in nearby Canada, where his work with the Glasgow School was a valuable asset, because there was a strong Scottish contingent of collectors there. His description of his first trip on behalf of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy was reminiscent of many that he wrote on his European sojourns for the international expositions, and a clear indication that he did not regret accepting his new position.

Our trip to Montreal was most delightful. We had the use of the special car of the first vice-president of the New York Central road with his chef and an elaborate supply of provisions, potables and cigars. ... We arrived in Montreal at a little after nine o'clock and were met at the station by Mr. James Ross, who took us in carriages to his home and showed us one of the most splendid collections of pictures I have ever seen. His house is very extensive and luxurious. I wish you could have seen his pictures and his superb conservatory. We met Mrs. Ross and other members of the family. We went next to the palatial residence of Sir William Van Horne. In the absence of the latter from the city, we were received by Lady Van Horne and shown through the house. After that, we went to the St. James's Club, where Mr. Ross gave us a beautiful luncheon at which were present prominent Canadians equal in number to the members of our party. Those who made the Montreal trip were Mr. Albright, General Hayes, Mr. Plumb, Mr. Green, Mr. Clement, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. MacGraw and myself. You have heard me speak of all these gentlemen. Mr. Clement is not only a member of our board but is also the president of the Marine Bank of Buffalo, the strongest banking institution here. After the lunch, we first visited the Bank of Montreal, in which are interested most of the gentlemen whom we met at the luncheon. Thence we went to the beautiful home of Sir George Drummond, whose pictures were shown us. From there we went to the home of Mr. Angus—whose collection, perhaps, was the finest of all—and lastly we visited the home and saw the collection of Mr. Greenshields.

Every one of these collections contains masterpieces of the first order, and I think we will obtain many of the best of them for our inaugural exhibition. The art collections—and the people in general in Montreal—strongly reminded me of the art collections and their owners whom I met in Glasgow, Scotland. Indeed, most of the prominent Canadians seem to be natives of Scotland. ... I find that Mr. Angus and I have a good many mutual acquaintances in Scotland.17

17. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers #4818 (370-72), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, April 19, 1905. Kurtz sent the second of his Glasgow School exhibitions to Toronto. AAA #4821 record book indicates that in May of 1906, Kurtz personally loaned six Glasgow School paintings to the Ontario Society of Artists exhibition at the Toronto Art Museum and sold four of them.
Kurtz's visit to Montreal netted twenty masterpieces that were loaned from private collections in that city. They included the Portrait of an Admiral by Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669) from the James Ross collection along with works by Diego Velázquez (1599-1660), Frans Hals (1580/85-1666), Sir Henry Raeburn (1756-1823), Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882), Adolphe Joseph Thomas Monticelli (1824-1886) and Charles François Daubigny (1817-1878) from other patrons.¹⁸ He continued his quest for pictures in New York City, using the National Arts Club as his base for contacting old acquaintances and colleagues about potential loans. The visit also allowed him to establish himself among the other directors of American museums who had gathered there to oppose the tariff on art and establish "the Free Art League of America."¹⁹

¹⁸ AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (473) unidentified clipping, "Masterpieces from Montreal, Twenty Superb Pictures for the Loan Exhibition at the Albright Gallery."


"I have been busy every moment since my arrival here yesterday morning. I found Prof. Ives here at the Club, and after some talk over matters with him, made a quick visit to Clootie [Kurtz's sister] and then went to see Mr. Hearn regarding pictures for our Inaugural Exhibition in May. Mr. HEarn did not agree to give us all the pictures I asked for, but he gave me a picture by Bogert [Fig. 53] for the Art Gallery (subject to Bogert's approval and promised to "help us out" in our exhibition... Then I went to the meeting at the University Club in which were present representatives of all the great art museums--the Metropolitan of New York, the Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Washington and other institutions and we organized "the Free Art League of America.

I came up to the Arts Club, had dinner and then went up to John Gellatly's No. 34 West 57th Street and spent the evening there. Mr. Gellatly has just moved into a new house which he is having very beautifully decorated and is filling with beautiful things. I think we will borrow some pictures from him. I met William T. Evans at dinner here... He invited me to visit him at Montclair--but, of course, I cannot."
Kurtz's efforts were successful, for the catalogue for the Inaugural Loan Collection includes: Childe Hassam's *The Bridge*, loaned by the American collector, John Gellatly; Winslow Homer's *Canon Rock* and a John Singer Sargent painting, loaned by a major donor to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, George Hearn; The *Portrait of Mr. Edward Robinson*, the director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and another Sargent, *Portrait of Mrs. George Austin*, the wife of a Genesco, New York collector, loaned by their respective sitters. Also on view in Buffalo were the *Portrait of Dr. Halsey C. Ives* by Anders Zorn (1860-1920) [Fig. 17] which had also been loaned by Mrs. Ives to the St. Louis Exposition, as well as the medal winning *Another Marguerite* [Fig. 54] by Joaquin Sorolla, Fritz von Uhde's *A Sewing Bee in Holland* and Stuart Park's *White Violas*—all from the collection of the St. Louis Museum. In addition, eight of James Whistler's works were borrowed from the Freer Gallery. Glasgow School paintings by R.M. Stevenson (*Evening in Spring, Song Without Words*), Stuart Park (*Daffodils*), James Paterson (*Castlefairn*)[Fig. 40] and Sir James Guthrie (*Street in Oban*) [Fig. 41] were all loaned by Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Kurtz. Kurtz's gratitude to the lenders often took the form of articles about the collectors, the artists or the art works that he published in *Academy Notes*, the art journal that he established under the auspices of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy. Some of these works also provided the inspiration for the special exhibitions that were held at the Albright during Kurtz's tenure.²⁰

---

²⁰ e.g. In November of 1905, Kurtz mounted another exhibition of Glasgow School painting and in December of 1906 he brought an exhibition of contemporary German painting that included work by von Uhde, who was also the subject of a monograph in Vol. II of *Academy Notes*. An article about George Hearn's generosity to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in *Academy Notes* was followed by a gift from the collector of George Bogert's *A Cloudy Day*, *Katwyk, Holland*, to the Albright, which then became the subject of the lead article in the March, 1906, (Vol. I, No. 10) issue of *Academy Notes*. "A Memorial to Whistler" appeared in Vol. III, and the Spanish artist, Joaquin Sorolla was the subject of Kurtz's final exhibition at the Albright.
The inaugural loan exhibition of two hundred and thirty-seven paintings represented Kurtz's first effort to gather together many of the outstanding paintings and artists that he had come across in his work since the 1893 Chicago Fair and introduce them to the citizens of Buffalo.\textsuperscript{21} His selections show a decided preference for modern European and American art in an impressionist or tonalist style as well as an appreciation for the old masters rather than for academic European or Hudson River School art. His agenda for the Albright Gallery was clearly articulated to an associate of the Museum and he clearly allied himself with contemporary art from the major European countries.

Each Fall, he hoped to show a "different phase of contemporary art expression. . . French. . . German. . . Dutch. . . or Spanish." He wanted to give Americans an opportunity to "become acquainted with the best work of contemporary foreign schools." In the Spring, he hoped to show "the best possible exhibit of works of American artists."\textsuperscript{22} Kurtz's stated desire to exhibit diverse national manifestations of contemporary art would distinguish the Albright Gallery from many other museums of the period and established a focus on contemporary art that the museum, now known as the Albright-Knox Gallery, continues to explore.

As with the exposition exhibitions, Kurtz was extremely busy attending to the details of the inaugural exhibition. Writing to his wife, who was hospitalized in St. Louis and unable to join him, he described the days leading up to the dedication of the Albright Gallery.

> As you may imagine, I am very crowded with work. I have been getting up at six in the morning and it is rare that I get to bed before three in the morning. Nearly all the pictures for the inaugural exhibition are already here, and I have hung the "Whistler Gallery" and the "Old Master Gallery." The latter contains pictures of an aggregate insurance valuation exceeding one-half million dollars;—Rembrandt,.

\textsuperscript{21} Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, \textit{Inaugural Loan Collection} (Buffalo, N.Y.: Fine Arts Academy, 1905).

\textsuperscript{22} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (617) Kurtz to Adolf Paulus, 1905. Paulus was a member of the Museum.
Franz Hals, Jan Steen, Velasquez, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Old [John] Crome, Millet, Corot, Daubigny, Mauve, Manet, Fromentin, and so on.

The new art publication, "Academy Notes," is almost completed. I have still an article to write on the loan collection and also have the catalogue of the print collection nearly finished. The catalogue for the loan collection is yet to be begun, and that is a big undertaking, as you may imagine. I look for "a strong constitution," however, to pull me through.23

As in Saint Louis, Kurtz paid tribute to the now deceased American expatriate, James Whistler, by dedicating one gallery to his work [Fig.55]. He later described that installation in the first issue of Academy Notes and in it suggested that the crowd displays of paintings that were typical of exhibitions in the nineteenth century were not appropriate for modern paintings.

In a small gallery especially draped with a gauzy material softening the gray-green wall covering and giving it a somewhat silvery effect hang eight examples of the late James McNeill Whistler ... Most of these works are small in size, but every one of them is permeated with subtle, poetic feeling, and all are in exquisitely harmonious relationship. They are hung with liberal space about them, as pictures should be hung—whenever possible.24

With his past experience in organizing larger and more complicated exhibitions, Kurtz was able to complete the installation in time for the May 31st dedication. It was a festive occasion that was celebrated by the entire community due to the declaration of a half day civic holiday. The program included an address by President Charles William Eliot of Harvard University on the subject of "Beauty and Democracy" and musical selections led by Professor Horatio Parker of Yale University who conducted a chorus of three hundred men. The arts writer and publisher, Richard Watson Gilder, wrote a dedicatory poem, A Temple of Art that touched on the purpose for the new museum.

In this garden of delight,
This pillared temple, pure and white,
We plant the seed of art,
With mystic power


To bring, or sudden or slow, the perfect flower  
That cheers and comforts the sad human heart;  
That brings to man high thought  
From starry region caught,  
And sweet, unconscious nobleness of deed;  
So he may never lose his childhood’s joyful creed,  
Though years and sorrows to sorrows and years succeed.  

Kurtz’s accomplishments were a bit overshadowed by the presence of luminaries who attended the dedication, such as Mrs. Grover Cleveland, nevertheless, he was very pleased with the occasion.

The dedication is over. It was a tremendous success. We had a perfect day and an enormous crowd, yet everything was so splendidly organized that there was not the slightest confusion or derangement of any kind. There was a beautiful breakfast given to all the visitors and the leading society of Buffalo at the handsome residence of Mrs. George L. Williams, and Mr. Albright gave a lovely dinner at his home last night at which seventy persons were present. Among those who were here were: “Poppy Ives,” Charles Ward Rhodes, … and [Royal] Cortissoz of the Tribune. … The whole thing was superb, …

Critically, the new museum and its inaugural loan exhibition were well received. The Brooklyn Eagle, the New York Post and Kurtz’s old paper, The Tribune as well as other major newspapers around the country all carried appreciative reviews of the building, describing it as “very European or metropolitan in its whole atmosphere.” In fact, Royal Cortissoz (1869-1948) of The Tribune specifically compared the building to another in Paris.

I do not know anywhere in America an edifice of the kind which is intrinsically more artistic. Indeed, when I think of the smaller museums in Europe with which alone it is to be compared, I can recall only one, the Galliere, in Paris, which has anything like the same satisfactory quality.

After devoting a fair amount of space to the building itself, Cortissoz then considered the


26. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (500-01). Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, June 1, 1905.

question of the loan exhibition itself and the future direction of the exhibitions. While not entirely pleased with the installation, he felt that the exhibition boded well particularly for American and modern European art in this country.

Just what the academy will do with its wall space in time to come is a matter on which there is something of interest to say, but I must first refer to the loan exhibition arranged for the inauguration of the building. It is, in a word, a remarkable show of more than two hundred old and modern pictures. Many of the masterpieces on the walls have been seen in New York, but I do not know how better to describe this exhibition than by saying that it is nevertheless worth coming from New York to see. Collectors from all over the country have freely lent their treasures, and, although there are works present which could be spared, there are extraordinarily few of them. A more effective system of hanging might perhaps have been adopted. There are enough old masters to have filled a gallery or two by themselves, and in the same way, the modern pictures might have been sifted into groups, according to schools. There could have been one room given to American landscapes, another to the Barbizon men, and so on. As it is, ancient and modern, American and foreign, have been jumbled together; and only in one little room, where Mr. Whistler, Mr. Dewing and Mr. Tryon have all the space to themselves, with a special gray background, has anything been done to simplify matters. But this, after all, is a detail. Looking solely to the merit of the display, one can only praise it, for it contains many of the finest paintings owned in America.28

Cortissoz also carefully listed a number of works by “modern foreigners” who were represented in the exhibition.

Declaring that “The Study of Beauty has been slighted in this country,” the writer for the *Brooklyn Eagle* commented on the necessity of a museum within a community, stating that “Indeed, the depository of the arts is a civic possession of hardly less importance, in these days, than the depository of books.”29 It was an assessment that reflected Kurtz’s own attitude towards the importance of his institution as well as his position in the community. The *New York Post* also considered the function of an art museum and how the smaller, regional institution might make a contribution that is equally

28. Ibid.

29. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (476) “Buffalo’s Art Gallery,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, June 1, 1905.
as valuable as a large, metropolitan museum. It suggested that smaller museums could be
more effective integrating art into the lives of average Americans:

Indeed, it is obvious that in many respects the smaller cities, with their greater
social unity and opportunities for leisure, may in the long run present greater
facilities for culture than the centers of population. One may question whether an
institution like the Albright, which for many years will give art exhibitions of merit
changed at regular intervals, is not a more effective instrument of art propaganda
than the vaster museums which address too often the merely studious and merely
curious.30

Given the Albright’s capacious new space and relatively small permanent
collection,31 filling the remaining galleries and promoting the art that he would be making
available became Kurtz’s main focus. By relying on Cornelia Bentley Sage to act as a
liaison with the local artists and organizations, Kurtz was able to concentrate on more
cosmopolitan concerns. In order to create interest in them and to increase the museum’s
effectiveness in reaching the citizens of Buffalo, Kurtz channeled some of his energy into
the publication he once again called *Academy Notes*. However, this time, his publication
had a broader intent. It was not only intended to be a review of exhibitions held at the
Albright, but also to present an overview of art world events and profiles of contemporary
artists. It was an idea that was suggested by colleagues who had urged Kurtz to consider
publishing such a journal while he was the director of the St. Louis Annual Exposition.32

30. AAA, Eugenie Hauenstein Scrapbooks #2763 (476), undated clipping from the
*New York Post*.

publication’s first issue reported that the collections comprised about fifty casts from
Greek and Roman sculptures, several marble busts, over two hundred oil paintings by
American and foreign artists, a historical collection of prints which numbered about two
hundred and a collection of etchings by Seymour Haden, also numbering about two
hundred.

32. AAA, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Papers, Halsey C. Ives Papers, #1744,
Kurtz to Ives, July 28, 1897. “Some people want me to start an art paper after the fashion
of poor [Alfred] Trumble’s *Collector*. I do not favor the idea—after 1900 maybe [Paris
World’s Fair].

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Academy Notes began publication in June of 1905 and included on the masthead, just underneath the title, Kurtz's personal motto: Amorem Artis Promovere. It left little doubt as to the publication's purpose, to promote the love of art. However, it also reflected Kurtz's past experience in organizing and promoting exhibitions. Another purpose for the publication, a corollary to promoting art, was the attempt to sell much of the art that was presented. Espousing a philosophy that sounded more like an art dealer than a modern museum director, Kurtz believed it was his responsibility to sell the work of an artist who participated in his exhibitions in order to justify removing the painting from the artist's studio, where collectors were likely to visit. It also encouraged the future cooperation of the artist and aided patrons who might not have the opportunity to visit an artist's studio or dealer, whether here or abroad, thus providing a service to all concerned. This was an outlook that emphasized contemporary art, an area to which the present day Albright-Knox Gallery remains committed and one which was not readily understood in the art world of Kurtz's day. Kurtz replied definitely in print to those who questioned whether the Albright-Knox would be acquiring the work of "Old Masters" in the pages of Academy Notes:

An Answer to Numerous Correspondents

No, the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy does not desire to purchase paintings either by real or imaginary "Old Masters." There are no funds available for this purpose and there is no disposition in this direction.\(^{33}\)

He also acknowledged that some people felt that "most of the museums of the United States are engaged in disseminating too much information concerning contemporary art" and attempted to explain why such an approach was pragmatic as well as supportive of American artists.

---

It will be the policy of "Academy Notes," in the coming year to furnish its readers a general resume of current art events and to foster, in every possible way, interest in the better art of our time—especially to bring to the attention of discriminating collectors the admirable work being produced by our American painters...

The principal inducement for an artist to send his pictures to an exhibition is the hope of selling them, and the institution effecting the largest number of sales can command the best support from the artists. The institution best supported by the artists naturally can organize the best exhibitions. The small commission usually charged by an art museum on sales is of comparatively little moment, but the prestige of effecting sales is of great importance.34

_Academy Notes_ was originally conceived of in broad, general terms as a monthly journal that would develop interest in art and the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy among the citizens of Buffalo. Kurtz then modified his objectives and molded it into a publication with pragmatic objectives.

Editorially, it will be the aim of "Academy Notes" to encourage the development of art appreciation among the people, to arouse the spirit of emulation among the trustees, directors, and patrons of art institutions, the collectors of art works and the producers of them, to demonstrate the value of art study and art collecting as a civilizing influence, as a social stepping stone and as a wise investment of time and money; to show the value of Public Art Galleries as civic attractions, as well as educational and refining influences tending toward the improvement of citizens.35

In it, Kurtz discussed current and future exhibitions at the Albright Art Gallery, works in the permanent collection, Art League news, and exhibitions at other venues around the country. It also included an editorial column that provided the opportunity to express his views on current events in the art world and return to themes that had engaged him earlier in his career. He published six articles on the art tariff in the first volume alone, an issue that was being revived and debated as a prelude to the Payne-Aldrich Tariff that was eventually passed in 1909. Kurtz, who was now in a position where he could regularly import foreign art for exhibition and eventual sales, knew that a tariff on imported art would be a detriment to interesting artists in sending their work to America for exhibition.


He argued for the abolition of the fifteen to twenty per-cent ad valorem duty on imported art, and made it clear that while he supported American artists, they could only benefit from the importation of European art.

"In the whole world, only the United States maintains an art tariff. No other country has erected any such barrier against the entrance of an educational and civilizing influence. ... It seems almost incredible that a fairly enlightened country deliberately should place itself on record as opposed to the acquisition of treasures of civilizing influence; and more than that, that it should blindly refuse to recognize even the commercial value of the development of good taste among the people. If our own people had the knowledge and taste to design and make the thousands of objects that we import annually from Europe because the European objects are more artistic than the productions of the same general character which come from our own work-people, millions of dollars would remain in this country which now are expended abroad. It has been stated that nearly three hundred million dollars are expended by Americans every year in foreign countries for the purchase of articles the value of which primarily is dependent upon the superior taste and skill involved in their production.

Is it a reasonable or practical policy, therefore, to withhold an influence tending to advance the artistic development of our own workmen, who, under proper direction and influence, might be brought to equal, if not to surpass, foreign artists in the production of beautiful things?

The present tariff on works of art cannot be defined as a protective tariff; it is not this in any sense. Our artists do not need any tariff for protection; they are superior to it. ... For the importation of a Raphael worth half a million dollars the penalty assessed would be one hundred thousand dollars--a sum to make even the multimillionaire hesitate a moment.36

From his first to his final issue in March of 1909,37 Charles Kurtz remained a steadfast opponent to the tax on imported art, publishing over a dozen articles on the topic. He belief that Americans could only benefit from exposure to foreign art never waivered.

That Charles Kurtz was also committed to educating the citizens of Buffalo about art in general and foreign schools in particular, while continuing to present American art, is evident from perusing the pages of Academy Notes. In his first year as director, he


developed a balanced strategy that became a pattern for each of his remaining years as director. The Inaugural Loan Exhibition was followed by a show from The American Water Color Society of which Cornelia Bentley Sage was a member, a show that became an annual event, as did the exhibition of paintings by American artists that closed out his first year as director and became a yearly feature until 1933. The first of the circulating exhibitions of foreign paintings was also on view (The Glasgow School opened in November of 1905) and an exhibition of works by local Buffalo artists, which opened in January of 1906 completed the template. By his own account, the strategy was successful. The attendance in 1906 exceeded that of the previous year by 25,127, although Kurtz failed to take note of the fact that the museum was only open for seven months during the first year of operation.38

Closing out the museum's first year of operation was The First Annual Exhibition of Selected Paintings by American Artists, a show that opened in May of 1906 and remained on view through the summer. Most of the pictures had already been shown in New York City. The idea of bringing American art to a less populated area was not unique to Kurtz.

The idea of the display is the same as that on which the American Art News Company is arranging a traveling exhibition of selected American pictures to be shown in the leading Southern cities this next autumn and winter, namely, to give to an art public, whose members cannot well see the exhibitions, both private and public, of the season in the larger art center's of the country, an idea of what American painters are doing today to broaden the market for American paintings and to aid the cause of art education in the United States.39

Although Kurtz's judgment in the matter of picture selection may have been astute, his outspoken comments were not always well received, and he no longer had

38. Charles M. Kurtz, "Editorial," Academy Notes, Vol. II, No. 9, February, 1907, p. 140. The attendance for 1905 (a seven month period) was 88,890. During 1906, the first full year of operation, there were 114,107 visitors.

Halsey Ives to smooth things over for him. Perhaps anxious to assert himself as a competent and knowledgeable museum director, Kurtz questioned the judgment of the Englishman, Roger Fry (1866-1934), the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s noted Curator of Paintings, in the May 1906 pages of *Academy Notes*:

Mr. Roger Fry, the newly imported Curator of Paintings of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York, is a “new broom” that “sweeps clean”—altogether too clean in certain particulars. Shortly after his arrival at the Museum, he came to the conclusion that certain of the masterpieces of painting needed cleaning, and with enthusiasm apparently unmitigated by knowledge or experience, and absolutely untrammeled by fear, he boldly proceeded, with the aid of alcohol as a solvent (as has been stated by the art-writer of a New York newspaper who witnessed the performance), to remove “the grime and yellow varnish” from the surface of certain pictures, so that they might appear “as they were when first painted.

One of the results of this has been—in the opinion of the writer—the ruin of the large “Holy Family” by Rubens. Not only the original varnish has been removed, but considerable of the original color seems to have gone with it. Technically speaking, the picture has been “skinned.”

The superb golden glow which permeated the painting before Mr. Fry “got at it” has entirely disappeared, and certain of the colors are left harsh and disagreeable. The depreciation of this picture alone should have been enough to warn the Trustees of the Museum that an error of the gravest character had been committed in confiding the valuable collection of paintings to a person so absolutely lacking in discretion.

“The Boy with the Sword,” by Manet—40—not only one of the most precious pictures in the Museum, but one of the masterpieces of the world’s art—has been varnished so that it has the appearance of a newly polished shoe!

Some pictures require a certain amount of varnish to “bring out” colors that have “dried in.” Other works are greatly depreciated by varnish. “The Boy with the Sword” belonged to the latter class. Painted with broad, simple technique, in quiet, low tones, it had a subdued richness of soft dry coloring with a quality analogous to that of the “matt glaze” in porcelain. When this picture was shown at the Inaugural Loan Exhibition, at the Albright Art Gallery a year ago, it was in superb condition, and held its own in the same gallery with splendid examples of the work of Rembrandt, Velasquez, and Frans Hals. The picture to-day is not

40. “The Boy with a Sword” is a portrait of Édouard Manet’s (1832-1883) stepson, Léon Koella-Leenhoff that dated from 1861, when the boy was ten years of age. His costume recalled seventeenth century Spain and may be read as a tribute to the Spanish artists that Manet admired, particularly Velázquez. This painting, along with Manet’s “Young Lady” of 1866 were the first works by the artist to enter an American museum.
what it was then. The face shines, the background shines—a great deal of the charm of the work has vanished.

The exquisite little picture by Van der Meer, "A Young Woman Standing by a Window"—one of the gems of the Marquand collection—has suffered at some time from cleaning, and the harmony of its former rich coloring no longer exists. The glazes which subdued the purple-blue of the dress and softened the gray of the wall are gone, and the color relationships of the picture undoubtedly are very different to-day from what they were when the painting left the hands of the artist—or what they were before the cleaning fever began.

The destruction of an artistic masterpiece is not a matter of slight importance. It is not to be treated lightly. It is a crime committed against the art lovers of to-day and those of all the future. Such a performance should not be condoned, and those in authority who permit such vandalism will be held responsible for it by those who care for art.

The present administration of the Department of Paintings is a menace to the Museum. It should be corrected just as speedily as possible.41

Kurtz was even less discreet when writing to his wife about the matter.

I went to The Metropolitan Museum awhile yesterday and will go again this afternoon. The new man-Fry-is a terror. He is cleaning and ruining some of the best pictures and knows nothing about arranging pictures. I do not believe he will "last long."42

Kurtz's motivation is unclear for publicly accusing Fry of ruining by overcleaning the Peter Paul Ruben's (1577-1640) painting in the collection,—the Holy Family with Saints Francis and Anne and the Infant Saint John the Baptist [Fig.56] from the early 1630s— and depreciating the value of two other paintings by Van der Meer [Johannes or Jan Vermeer (1632-1675)] and Édouard Manet (1832-1883), Boy with a Sword (1861) [Fig.57].43 Both Kurtz and Ives apparently had a cordial relationship with the director of


42. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (793), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, April 19, 1906.

43. There are two paintings entitled Holy Family by Peter Paul Rubens in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum. Kurtz was calling attention to the Holy Family with Saints Francis and Anne and the Infant Saint John the Baptist which was a 1902

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Sir Purdon Clarke, whom they had worked with on behalf of the St. Louis Exposition. In addition, Kurtz had worked for the Metropolitan Museum writing catalogues early in his career, so it would seem that Kurtz did not bear the Museum any ill will. Nevertheless, by publishing his concerns, the controversy spilled over from *Academy Notes* into the pages of the popular press and subjected Kurtz, who now preferred to be known by the honorary degree title "Dr." to public ridicule. In an account that foreshadows the debate over the late twentieth century cleaning of the Sistine Chapel, the *American Art News* carried a response to the charge by Robert W. De Forest, the Secretary of the Museum. He was the designated spokesperson for the Museum since the charges were made after Fry, essentially a part-time curator, departed for Europe.

I regret that Mr. Kurtz, before giving any article to the press, should not have made inquiry among the officers or trustees of the Metropolitan Museum. Had he done so, he would have found that the criticism of Mr. Fry’s methods of cleaning had already been thoroughly investigated.

In the opinion of Mr. Kurtz, *The Holy Family* by Rubens, has been ruined by Mr. Fry’s cleaning. According to the former, “not only the original varnish has been removed, but considerable of the original color seems to have gone with it.” Let me say that Mr. Kurtz is not the only one who has been disturbed by the change in the appearance of the picture since it was cleaned. Covered as it had been with gift, as the other was only donated in 1955. The Manet painting was donated in 1889 by Erwin Davis along with another by the artist. The *Boy With A Sword* was exhibited in the Inaugural Exhibition and it was that exhibition that was the basis for Kurtz’s comparison and later claim that it had been altered. Kurtz also refers to the Vermeer in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum (Vermeer was also know as van der Meer), the *Young Woman with a Water Pitcher*, ca. 1662, which was a gift of Henry G. Marquand in 1889. It is interesting to note that Kurtz’s associate, Charles W. Rhodes, was a distant relation to Marquand and had previously sought to curry favor with his wealthy relative.

44. In a letter to the editor of *The American Art News* (June 16, 1906) in which the controversy was discussed, a subscriber questioned the appellation “Dr.” before Kurtz’s name, noting that it was not a title, “for in the United States, titles are not recognized when assumed by individuals of native birth.” The editor responded: “We assume that the Director of the Buffalo Academy, who now calls himself Dr. Kurtz, has recently received from some college or university a degree which permits the use of the appellation. ... It sometimes happens that the friends and admirers of some prominent or great man ... bestow the appellation upon him, and it is sometimes employed in a facetious manner.”
successive coatings of varnish and dirt, which concealed previous restorations, and altered or disguised its original colors. ... Sir Purdon Clarke [the museum director] and Mr. [Edward] Robinson proceeded to make a careful inquiry ... Their conclusion was that they had not found in any of the pictures treated by Mr. Fry that the original paint was in any way affected, and they expressed the opinion that the work had been done with great skill and knowledge and without injury to the pictures.

That the writer of the article in Academy Notes has been deceived in his judgment ... is best evidenced by what he says of two of them. Manet's Boy with a Sword he finds to have been varnished so that it has the appearance of a newly polished shoe ... As a matter of fact, nothing whatever has been done to the picture ... except that when it was hung in its present position the glass was removed on account of the reflection it cast. And the same is true of Van der Meer’s Young Woman Standing by a Window.”

I cannot close without a word in regard to the writer’s characterization of Mr. Fry as possessing “enthusiasm apparently unmitigated by knowledge or experience.” Had this description been true, Mr. Fry would never have been called into the service of our Museum.

Charles Kurtz defended his opinion in regard to the paintings and a number of artists came to his defense in the pages of the New York Times. Robert Vonnah (1858-1933), who worked with him on Exposition juries, explained that an obvious patina of years was not a liability.

It is the age we pay for, ... like the vintage of good, old wine. It will hurt values seriously to take from the old pictures the effects that the years have produced. We look for tonality more than for anything else. In restoring the masterpieces we are in danger of destroying the very feature that is finest in them. The old masters' works were never so fine as they are now. It is like taking the bloom from the peach to rob them of their time mellowings.

45. Edward Robinson became the Assistant Director of the Metropolitan Museum after resigning as Director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in December, 1905.


He went on to say that to do so is "artistically criminal" and "No man has a right to do that." J. William Fosdick (1858-?), a mural painter, and J. Carroll Beckwith (1852-1917), an officer of the National Academy of Design were also quoted on Kurtz's behalf. The figure painter, John White Alexander (1856-1915) questioned Fry's ability to carry out the work and suggested that a European approach to the question of cleaning and restoring paintings might be in order.

We should have a committee to supervise the work of restoring and cleaning as they have in France. ... The final painting that is done by the master is the glaze in which he blends his picture. The removal of it undoes his work. That is why there is objection among artists to the restoring of old paintings. The work should be done by painters or under their direction. I understand that Mr. Fry was an art critic, not a painter. No art critic is capable of restoring a masterpiece. In this country we should have a committee which would give permission for the cleaning of valuable pictures and which should supervise the work.

Privately, Kurtz apparently came to regret the rashness of his actions. He admitted to a supporter of the Albright Museum that although he wrote in an editorial capacity "it may not have been strictly in the canons of good taste--in my position--to call attention to misdoings in another institution. Nevertheless, he felt that he had a certain duty and said "I saw priceless masterpieces of art being deliberately ruined by the most wanton stupidity. It seemed to me the situation demanded a protest."

In another incident of questionable judgment later that year, Kurtz found that he was being criticized by his own trustees for submitting a draft of an article that was

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid.

51. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (868) draft of a letter, Kurtz to Mr. Willis O. Chapin, July 18, 1906. Mr. Chapin was a benefactor of the Albright Art Gallery and donated an engraving of Mrs. Siddons in the Character of the Tragic Muse by Francis Haward after the Sir Joshua Reynolds painting. Kurtz reproduced the print and acknowledged the gift in the December, 1906, Vol. II., No. 7, issue of Academy Notes, pp. 104-105.
When his editorial appeared, it considered the question of officially regulating the architectural character of city buildings. Like the restoration of the Rubens' painting, it was a remarkably prescient stance which anticipated the historic preservation movement in the second half of the twentieth century. However unlike his appreciation of modern painting, Kurtz showed surprisingly little sympathy for contemporary architecture, such as that designed by Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959) in the Buffalo environs. Although any specific references to the Buffalo area had been deleted, rendering the comments of a more general nature, it is possible that Kurtz had Wright's work in mind when he wrote his editorial.

The question of official regulation of the architectural character of business and other buildings which line city streets is an interesting and important one. Not only is the beauty of the city involved but likewise the education and character of the citizens, for no one will deny that we all are influenced unconsciously and greatly by the material things with which we are surrounded. . .

Of the architectural designs of many of the business houses it is difficult not to speak impatiently. Doctors, lawyers, chemists, engineers, and others must pass proper examinations before being permitted to practice on the public, but anybody can style himself an architect and without cultivation or training endanger lives and pervert taste. Often one sees colossal structures of stone--or of imitation stone--supported, ostensibly, by thin sheets of glass fronting the lower story. Of course, one knows there are concealed iron or steel columns and that the façade of each floor is fastened to steel beams or girders holding the structure together, but the effect is of instability and is a violation of artistic taste. This is one of the most common faults of modern building.  

52. AAA, Charles M Kurtz Papers, #4818 (929), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 23, 1906.

53. AAA, Charles M Kurtz Papers, #4818 (929), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, November 23, 1906.

Kurtz himself may have come to resent somewhat the way in which he was regarded. His arrogance may be attributed to the fact that his father, who had died earlier that year, left an estate of over a million dollars to be divided among the remaining six family members. Although Charles was finally free of the financial concerns that had made him dependent on a salaried position, he was still subject to the whims of trustees. Although had to wait for his inheritance until property and securities were liquidated and a challenge to the estate was settled, he could now plan on travelling abroad with his family to focus on European schools of contemporary painting.

Kurtz’s decision to present the contemporary work of the Glasgow School as his first foreign exhibition was a practical one, for he had continued to visit and correspond with members of the group, so the exhibition was easily arranged. In 1906, the foreign exhibition did not rely on such personal friendships. The choice of an exhibition of contemporary German painting was designed to capitalize on the ethnic heritage of a significant number of Buffalo citizens, who had noted Kurtz’s German surname early on and invited him to join the German-American Club of Buffalo.55 He realized that an exhibition of German art presented an opportunity to engage that segment of the population by presenting an exhibition relating to its cultural heritage, which was becoming increasingly prominent. Writing to museum directors that he had targeted as possibly being interested in taking the proposed exhibition, Kurtz cited the demographics of the population.

It may be noted that about one third of Buffalo’s 400,000 population is of German birth or descent, of Chicago’s 2,000,000 population a very large percentage is of German extraction, and of the 700,000 population of Saint Louis nearly one half are of German birth or descent. Philadelphia’s principal suburb bears the name “Germantown” and of the 1,500,000 population there is a large German element.

55. AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4818 (9) Kurtz to Joseph Beres, the director of the German-American Club of Buffalo, November 6, 1904. “...I have the utmost admiration for the sturdy virtues which belong to the German character—the good feeling, sincerity, strength of purpose and perserverance toward the attainment of that which is worthy.”
Indianapolis, with approximately 200,000 population has also many citizens of German extraction. And it is believed that in each city where these works are shown the German element of the population will loyally co-operate in making the exhibition successful.\textsuperscript{56}

Kurtz proposed to circulate the exhibition to the St. Louis Museum, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts,\textsuperscript{57} the Art Institute of Chicago and the John Herron Art Institute after its opening in Buffalo, with the transportation and insurance expenses split among the participating institutions. He justified his choice by citing his experience at the international Expositions.

It is to be deplored that contemporary German painting is not known or appreciated as it should be in the United States. It is not appreciated because it is not known. At the great International Expositions at Chicago and St. Louis, while the German Art sections were most commendable, German painting was represented mostly by large canvases belonging to public or private collections and not for sale, and generally depicting historical subjects very interesting to the student but not so strongly appealing to the amateur of painting. ...

It is the aim to secure works of moderate size, and, as far as possible, works that may be offered for sale to American Museums or private collectors. And it is hoped that the exhibitions of these works not only may give Americans good knowledge of, but that they may awaken real interest in, and stimulate taste for, contemporary German painting among American collectors of art works. ...

It is a fact to be much regretted that Böcklin, Leibl, Feuerbach, Menzel, Thoma, Marees\textsuperscript{58} and other great German painters who might be named are almost entirely unrepresented in American public and private collections. This is solely because of American lack of knowledge of them. ... \textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{56} Lawrence County Historical Society, Kurtz Family Papers, #1993.39.200A undated draft of letter by Charles M. Kurtz, c. early 1906, p.5.

\textsuperscript{57} Because the paintings were delayed in leaving Germany, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts was forced to drop out of the plan due to a commitment to a previously arranged exhibition.

\textsuperscript{58} Arnold B. Böcklin (1827-1901), Wilhelm L. Leibl (1844-1900), Adolf Menzel (1815-1905), Hans Thoma (1839-1924), Hans von Marées (1837-1887).

To promote the exhibition, which remained on view from December 26, 1906 until January 20, 1907, a series of articles on contemporary German painting were published in *Academy Notes*. In the first of them, Kurtz contends that his exhibition is essentially different from that mounted at the St. Louis Exposition despite the inclusion of work by many of the same artists, and, in a subtle criticism of his colleague, Halsey C. Ives, noted that the art he was presenting was of a presumably better character because of his requests for specific work.

...it gave a very different idea of contemporary German Art from that presented, for instance, at the Exposition at St. Louis in 1904. It was stated by a member of the committee of organization that the collection was formed much too hastily and that, in most cases, artists were invited "to contribute something" instead of being asked for specific works—which always makes a great deal of difference in the character of an exhibition. ... The collection represented many of the better German painters, but it did not represent many of them at their best. "61

Kurtz's editorial is also notable because it essentially summarizes his aesthetic preferences at the time and states his case for exhibiting contemporary art. Earlier in Kurtz's career, he may have endorsed and purchased the work of living American artists based on his personal financial situation and lack of international travel opportunities, but as he matured, his confidence in the correctness of his taste became an unwavering conviction.

It seems the usual thing in all countries to neglect the best men during their lives and to "discover" them and glorify them after they have passed away. Tardy appreciation is not alone characteristic of Germany. France neglected the Barbizon painters, Great Britain to-day is unaware of the splendid quality of the work of certain painters in Glasgow, and America only came to fairly appreciate George Inness, Homer Martin, Theodore Robinson, Twachtman and some of our other best painters after their demise. And it may not be generally known, but I am informed that it is true, that Whistler's *Portrait of His Mother* once was offered to an American art museum for a sum in the neighborhood of a thousand dollars, but was not purchased because the Art Committee was not quite certain regarding the quality of the "art" in the work!

---


... And here comes the reflection that while these men [the German painters] were producing their master works, we, in America, knew nothing of them, but were buying imbecile productions of the most inferior foreigners at prices that would have appeared princely to some of these artists when they were painting these pictures.

Does not this show the need of the exploitation of good art in our country-both native and foreign-AT THE TIME WHEN THIS GOOD ART IS BEING PRODUCED, instead of writing for knowledge of it to come years hence, when opportunity for its acquisition is extremely limited, and, to any but the multimillionaire, is prohibitively costly?

How much richer, artistically, the United States would be to-day if some of the masterpieces of Boecklin, [Wilhelm]Leibl and [Adolf] Menzel were to be found in our public and private collections!6²

When the exhibition opened, ninety-four painting filled the four north galleries. They were intended “to exemplify, as nearly as possible, the best work of contemporary German painters--particularly those men whose work shows the more modern methods of expression.” The centerpiece of the exhibition was a full length portrait of the German Emperor [Wilhelm I] [Fig.58] by Franz von Lenbach (1836-1904) which had never been publicly shown in Germany. In a lengthy article that appeared in Academy Notes, Kurtz said that Lenbach was “almost universally conceded to have been the greatest portrait painter of Germany and one of the most subtle interpreters of character who has devoted his talents to portraiture.”6³ His efforts to promote the paintings in Buffalo were successful, as eleven of the paintings were purchased before the exhibition moved on to St. Louis, the next venue. There the paintings were hailed as “the most significant exhibition of pictures held in Saint Louis since the World’s Fair,” but the collection was also considered difficult for the average American viewer to appreciate, as the subject matter was sometimes unusual. While acknowledging that “the pictures are not pretty,”

62. Ibid. p. 43.

and noting that "there are some freakish things" in the collection, one critic argued that it was an important exhibition precisely because it made Americans think about the purpose of art and countered the prevailing materialism of the era:

German art is a protest against the crass commercialism of the age. It towers up boldly and forces the visitor in the gallery to realize that there is something else in the world that is of quite as much importance as the making of money. The function of art is not merely to amuse and entertain, to give a momentary sensation of aesthetic pleasure. Its purpose is to reach down and stimulate into life the emotional, spiritual part of our being, which is fast becoming dormant.

The type of picture which fits in unobtrusively with the color scheme of a millionaire's drawing room caters to that spirit of commercialism which is the curse of the Twentieth Century. These German paintings sound a vigorous protest against that art attitude. Many of them are hard, some of them are even harsh, but Dr. Kurtz had a reason for the selection of every one of them.64

Despite touring the exhibition to Saint Louis, Chicago, the John Herron Art Institute in Indianapolis and to the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., the critical interest in the show was generated mostly by local critics, rather than the art or New York press.65 Emily Grant Hutchings, writing for the Saint Louis Mirror suggested one reason for the cool critical reception.

Never in the history of painting has there been displayed such strength, such boldness, such intense feeling for color and form as is exemplified by the modern German painters, those who have thrown off the yoke of tradition and forged a method for themselves. The layman is not likely to understand or be pleased with these pictures at first glance. They are so different from anything he has been accustomed to. They seem to go at nature-interpretation from a radically different viewpoint. Their aim is not the aim of other modern artists. Just what that aim is,

64. *Academy Notes*, "The German Pictures in Saint Louis and Chicago," Vol. II, No. 12, p. 192-96. This article is a compilation of the criticism the exhibition received after it left Buffalo. This quotation is taken from the review by the art critic of the *Saint Louis Globe Democrat*.

65. Ibid. p. 196. Although Kurtz reprinted the text of one *New York Times* article, "Modern German Art in America," which was generally complimentary, that paper's *Index* as well as the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*, 1905-1909 do not list any other articles specifically on the Albright Art Gallery exhibition. There are, however, a number of articles dealing with the increasing interest in art by Germans, e.g.*New York Times*, "German Art Expansion," July 3, 1905, p.6.
must be felt by the beholder. No tirade of wordy argument could ever adequately convey it to the layman who is incapable of grasping it himself.\(^{66}\)

In Chicago, where Kurtz himself presented a lecture on “Contemporary German Painting,”\(^ {67}\) while the exhibition was on view, Isabel Mc Dougall, a local critic, said that “It will be long before so important a show of pictures is brought to Chicago again.” She also chastised her readers for failing to buy any of the pictures. Striking a note of urban chauvinism, she regretted that “Buffalo, a city that does not approach us for population or wealth, has purchased eleven.”\(^ {68}\)

Of the eleven paintings purchased, several were added to the collection of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy. They were Max Clarenbach’s (1880-?) “Winter on the Erft,” Heinrich Zugel’s (1850-1941) “On the Highway,” and Carl Kustner’s (?-?) “The Poplars” which was featured on the cover of *Academy Notes* for February of 1907. Isabel McDougall wrote the following description of that painting when it was on view in Chicago.

>A really majestic landscape is “The Poplars,” by Carl Kustner, a Munich man, who has won many medals. He shows us a clump of somber trees that tower against a spacious sky with the dignity of noble architecture; some slighter, lighter trees stand between us and them, and quite in front, reflecting the regal trees and the splendid blue and white heavens, a placid shallow pool extends.\(^ {69}\)

In the February issue of *Academy Notes*, Kurtz also announced four special exhibitions that had as their subjects drawings of the French countryside by the St. Louis born artist, Jules Guérin (1866-1946), scenes of Mt. Vesuvius by Charles Caryl Coleman (1840-1928) (a former Buffalo resident and American expatriate), works by Buffalo artist, [---]

---

\(^ {66}\) Ibid. p. 193.

\(^ {67}\) Kurtz spoke at the Art Institute of Chicago on March 12, 1907.

\(^ {68}\) Ibid. p. 195. Quotation is taken from a review by Isabel McDougall in the Chicago paper, the *Record-Herald*.

\(^ {69}\) Ibid. p. 195.
Frank C. Penfold (1849-1921) which were done while he was abroad and a collection of watercolors by Genjiro Yeto\textsuperscript{70} (1867-1924), a Japanese artist who studied and worked in America from 1890 through 1904. 1907's exhibition schedule also included a loan exhibition of *Paintings by the French Impressionists*, from the dealer, George Durand-Ruel [Fig. 59] of the Paris firm of Durand-Ruel and Sons\textsuperscript{71}. The latter two exhibitions, with their foreign bent, were of particular interest to Kurtz, as this excerpt from lecture notes indicates:

At the present time France generally is regarded as the leading art country of the world. After the Japanese, the French people, as a race, are more thoroughly imbued with the art spirit perhaps than any other people. The reason for this is not difficult to ascertain. From the time of Francis I (1515-1547) until the present day the French government has exercised oversight over the fine arts and the art industries.\textsuperscript{72}

Kurtz knew Durand-Ruel personally through his work on the Chicago World's Fair.\textsuperscript{73} As a result of this earlier contact, he was allowed to select eighty-five paintings from the Durand-Ruel collection, including works such as Claude Monet's *Charing Cross Bridge, Evening* (1904) and Edgar Degas' *The Orchestra*. In spite of the fact that the exhibition was a popular success among its Buffalo audience, Kurtz was disappointed that

\textsuperscript{70} Kurtz wrote an appreciation of Yeto's work in *Academy Notes*, "Coming Exhibitions," Vol. II, No. 9, February, 1907, p. 138. This travelling exhibition of his watercolors was not organized by Kurtz. It was first on view in New York and then Boston before it was on view in Buffalo.

\textsuperscript{71} The Durand-Ruel Gallery is credited with introducing Americans to Impressionism in 1886 in New York. Though organized by the Parisian dealers, the exhibition was arranged by James F. Sutton and opened in the galleries of the American Art Association on April 10. Because of its popularity, the show later moved to the National Academy of Design.

\textsuperscript{72} AAA, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, #4822 (645), "The French Pictures," fragment of a lecture in notebook, written on Columbian Exposition letterhead, c. 1893.

\textsuperscript{73} Charles Kurtz Papers, #4812 (263), Kurtz to Julia S. Kurtz, October 8, 1892. In the letter, Kurtz mentions a lunch meeting with Joseph Durand-Ruel and reminds Julia that they had visited Durand-Ruel's in New York and had also been to an unspecified American exhibition at the Paris house.
only one painting by Maxime Maufra (1813-1918)\textsuperscript{74} was sold. He attributed the lack of sales to the fact that the offering prices for paintings by Edouard Manet, Claude Monet and Auguste Renoir were a non-negotiable $20,000 each, and others were “in the thousands,” considerably more than usual.\textsuperscript{75} His disappointment was mitigated by George Durand-Ruel’s gift of two paintings in the impressionist style to the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy, Gustave Loiseau’s \textsuperscript{76}(1865-1935) \textit{The House at Vaudreuil} [Fig.60] and Maxime Maufra’s (1833-1918) \textit{Transport Vessel Leaving Havre} [Fig.61]. Kurtz described Maufra as “the first of the younger Impressionistic painters of landscape and sea effects.” \textsuperscript{77}

He prepared his Buffalo audience for the exhibitions by publishing a series of articles on Yeto and on French Impressionism\textsuperscript{78}. In his efforts to promote foreign art, he also enthusiastically endorsed the New York based art publication, \textit{International Studio}, (which reviewed a number of Albright Gallery exhibitions) rating its coverage of European

\textsuperscript{74} Although Kurtz called Maufra an impressionist, in 1889 he went to Pont-Aven and associated with Paul Gaugin, with whom he became friendly. By 1898, his style began to depart from impressionism. After 1903 he travelled to Scotland, Algeria and Belgium.


\textsuperscript{76} Gustave Loiseau painted in an impressionistic manner, and is remembered for his scenes of the Seine, although he was influenced by the Nabis.

\textsuperscript{77} Charles M. Kurtz, \textit{Academy Notes}, “Vol. III, No.9, February, 1908, p. 146. The painting that was sold to a “citizen of Buffalo,” was Maufra’s \textit{Moonlight in the Bay of Douarnenez}. Kurtz himself did not buy an works from the exhibition, as none appear in the estate sale catalogue or inventory lists.

and American art events "by far the best art periodical published in the English language at the present time." 79 Through his exhibition schedule and his writings in Academy Notes, Kurtz, during the last four years of his career, by clearly focusing his attention and that of his audience on work by American artists of both national and local stature and contemporary foreign art, provides evidence of his increasingly cosmopolitan rather than exclusively American art concerns. 80

79. Charles M. Kurtz, Academy Notes, Vol. III, No. 4, September, 1907, p. 64.

80. The Collection of Pictures by Jules Guérin was on view in February, 1907, along with the works by Charles C. Coleman. The Frank C. Penfold exhibition was held in March of 1907.
CHAPTER 10
The Lights and Shadows of Life

The menu for March [1908] at the Albright Art Gallery will be unusually important, varied and attractive. It will consist of a special exhibition of water colors by J. James Tissot, illustrating the Old Testament; a collection of photographs by Edward S. Curtis, illustrating the life, character and environment of the contemporary North American Indian; an exhibit of recent water colors by F. Hopkinson Smith, and a collection of landscapes and marine pictures particularly illustrative of California coast scenery, by Howard Russell Butler.

Charles M. Kurtz, Academy Notes, March, 1908

As Charles Kurtz began what would be his final full year as Director of the Albright Gallery, his exhibition agenda continued to expand. In addition to the usual shows of works by contemporary foreign and American artists, he also scheduled an exhibition of work by two leading women artists from Buffalo, Annie I. Crawford (b. Buffalo?-?) and Emma Kaan1 (b. Boston?-?), and an

1. Annie Crawford was a student of a founder of the Buffalo Academy, Lars G. Sellstedt and specialized in portraits. Emma Kaan, a landscape painter, studied in Paris. This attention to women artists was not a new interest. While writing for The Star, Kurtz contributed a series of four articles entitled “Women in Art,” (October 6, 13, 20, 27, 1889 in AAA Kurtz Papers, #4823 (493-577) scrapbook of articles from The Star.) In his articles, he wrote biographical sketches of many of the leading women artists, both American and European, living and dead, including Angelica Kauffman, Marie Vigee Le Brun Rosa Bonheur, Elizabeth Gardner, Anna Lea Merritt, Fidelia Bridges, Vinnie Ream Hoxie, Harriet Hosmer and Emma Stebbins, American women in Paris and artists’ wives who paint. He did not discount women as serious artists and contributors to the field, although he clearly separated the intellect and abilities of the single, career oriented woman from those of the homemaker or socialite patron of the arts. Throughout his career, he maintained a friendship with the still life painter, Patty Thum. He also included complimentary comments on established women painters like Mary Cassatt and Cecilia Beaux in his exhibition reviews. The fact that he did not routinely dismiss women as artists may partly be due to the fact that Kurtz’s sister, Emily, was a very serious but independent woman who studied art in New York and Paris and kept him informed about her studies abroad during her student days. After becoming involved with a radical cause, she severed her ties with her family.
exhibition based on the quintessential American subject, the Native American, presented in the still nascent medium of photography. It was an art form in which Kurtz himself not only had a professional interest but also dabbled from time to time.² Kurtz’s interest in the medium first surfaced publicly at the Albright Gallery with an exhibition of photographs by the Photo-Pictorialists of Buffalo in October of 1907. Kurtz, again in an effort to educate his audience, wrote an article about the group and said that the ninety prints were “organized primarily with the idea of impressing upon the lay mind the fact that photography fairly is entitled to be considered an art when it expresses the feeling and handiwork of an artist.”³ This initial exhibition was followed by a larger one-man show of selections from Edward S. Curtis’ 2,220 photographs [Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.] that documented Native American tribes⁴ which Kurtz considered “certainly one of the most fascinating exhibitions ever held at the Albright Art Gallery.”⁵ As with painting, Kurtz’s interests in photography broadened and became more cosmopolitan as time went by and his knowledge increased. At the time of his death in March of 1909, he was in the process of organizing another major exhibition of pictorial photographs on an international scale. Working with H. Snowden Ward, the English editor of *The Photographic Monthly* and *Photograms of the Year*, Kurtz intended to organize his exhibition with two guiding principles that had their roots in his Exposition exhibitions: only invited, known prints would be

---

² The Charles M. Kurtz Papers at the Archives of American Art contain a number of letters in which Kurtz describes photographing family and friends and developing the photographs that he took. Despite the proximity of Buffalo to Rochester, the home of George Eastman and the Kodak camera industry, an inquiry to the Eastman House Archives produced nothing to document any contact between the two men, nor is there anything in the Kurtz Papers or the Albright-Knox library.


⁴ The Edward S. Curtis photographs of Native American Indians are now in the collection of the Library of Congress.

included, and there would be no domination by any school or section of pictorialists. Ward wrote
to the Directors of the Albright Gallery after Kurtz's death, saying that it was “doubtful whether
anyone else can carry out such an exhibition on the lines proposed by Dr. Kurtz.” He also pointed
out the potential importance of such an exhibition, stating that “No exhibition of pictorial
photography has ever been attempted on such lines; if one could be carried out it would have an
immediate influence, not only on photography. . .6

Alfred Stieglitz, who had also been working with Kurtz on obtaining prints by members of the
Photo-Secession for the exhibition, wrote to Cornelia B. Sage and described the progress of the
exhibition, whose opening was delayed several months due to Kurtz's death:

Everything had been thoroughly discussed and everything virtually arranged to insure
Buffalo of a really worthwhile, fine and thoroughly representative exhibition next
February. With the hope that the Albright Gallery will eventually find some one worthy to
carry on Mr. Kurtz's work, 7

However, the final exhibition that Kurtz installed at the Albright Gallery, just four days before his
sudden illness and death, was not one dealing with American art. Nor did it introduce a new
medium or highlight works borrowed from local collections. Like the exhibition of French
Impressionist paintings, it was a show that was organized elsewhere and first opened in New
York City. The exhibition of paintings by Joaquin Sorolla-y-Bastida (1863-1923) that was
scheduled to open on March 20, 1909 had been organized by Archer M. Huntington, the
President of the Hispanic Society in New York City. Sorolla, a Spanish artist who worked in a
style that the Madrid artist and critic Pedro de Madrazo called “modern academicism,” a sun-

6. Albright-Knox Gallery Archives, “International Exhibition of Pictorial

   The First International Exhibition of Pictorial Photography in the United States was arranged by
   Alfred Stieglitz and included master works from the Photo-Secession Gallery. It was on view
   from November through December, 1909.
dappled form of realism, was familiar to Kurtz, for he had won a first place medal at the 1904 St. Louis Fair with his painting, *Another Margarita* [Fig.54]. It was a Goethe inspired figure study of a fallen young woman about to be taken into police custody. Seeking to pique interest in the exhibition, Kurtz described it as “the most interesting special exhibition held thus far at the Albright Art Gallery. By many persons of competent judgment, Sorolla is considered in some respects the greatest of living painters.” During the installation of the exhibition, Kurtz took time to pose in a doorway of the Albright Gallery for a final portrait by the artist, [Fig.2] who inscribed it “To my friend Kurtz.” The exhibition was overshadowed by Kurtz’s collapse, which was attributed to overwork, and subsequent hospitalization which indicated that emergency surgery was necessary. Although Kurtz seemed to rally after the operation, he took a sudden turn for the worse and died, apparently of heart failure, on March 21, 1909. Joaquin Sorolla attended Kurtz’s funeral instead of the festive celebration that was planned for his exhibition’s opening and then returned to New York City, where his paintings were sent for another exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in mid-April.

Charles M. Kurtz was fifty-four years old when he died and had been Director of the Albright Art Gallery for less than four years, a relatively short time in which to develop a professional legacy. His papers reveal a life that was filled with both lights and shadows, a

8. Priscilla E. Muller, *Sorolla & Zuloaga, Dos Visiones para un cambio de siglo* (Bilbao: Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao, 1998). This is the most complete study of the relationship between the Spanish artists, Sorolla and Zuloaga and American artists. There are references to Kurtz on p. 53 and in notes 11, 13, 27, 28, 76. The Sorolla exhibition was also on view in Boston. Dr. Muller has also contributed an article on “Sorolla and America,” to *The Painter Joaquin Sorolla* (Edmund Peel, ed. London: Philip Wilson Publishers Ltd, 1989), 55, 61, 64, 65-68.


metaphor that he had once used to describe the journalist’s task of description. Of the many obituaries that appeared, both in the United States and abroad, the most detailed appeared in, The Washington Observer, the local paper for his Alma Mater, Washington and Jefferson College. The headline of the obituary clearly defines the area for which he is usually remembered, his "worldwide fame as an art critic." But it also credits him with having a much broader influence because of his various experiences in the art world of his day.

Kurtz’s liberally illustrated journal, Academy Notes, was a publication that could be used today as a text for the contemporary art, both European and American, of the period. It not only promoted the art that he installed in Buffalo, but discussed current issues that engaged the art world, reviewed and recommended articles in other art journals, and attempted to educate the general public in matters of art appreciation. His role as the founding director of the Albright Art Gallery allowed him to define the direction that eminent institution would take throughout the twentieth century so that it is today considered one of the most distinguished museums of modern art in America. A review of the literature of the period just before and after his death confirms that his intuitive response to the art world of his day was indeed prescient. While he may not have been directly responsible for it, The Metropolitan Museum of Art mounted an exhibition of contemporary German art in 1908 and eventually accepted the resignation of its esteemed but

11. AAA, Charles M Kurtz Papers, #4822 (5-8) miscellaneous note in Kurtz’s hand: “I do not believe there is any class of people having the same opportunity for seeing the lights and shadows of life, for studying human nature high and low, in all of its different phases; for observing the customs the feelings and learning the very thoughts and passions of the people as the reporters for the Metropolitan newspapers.”

flawed curator, Roger Fry in 1910. The *New York Times* reported that the sale of Munich school paintings to America doubled in 1908, which supports Kurtz’s confidence in the appeal of German painting. Photography emerged as a major art form and his interest in international art anticipated the politically correct “multiculturalism” of the late twentieth century. Although he did not live to see it reformed, the tariff, to which he devoted much attention throughout his career, was reformed by the Payne-Aldrich bill in September of 1909, which brought a flood of new European art to this country.14 Unlike most other figures in the art world of his day, Charles Kurtz was not solely an artist, art critic, promoter, dealer or administrator who only occasionally stepped outside of his area, he was in fact able to do many of these things simultaneously, and do them well. Perhaps his most lasting legacy is again one with which he had no direct involvement but may be credited with nonetheless. As he circulated and publicized art outside of the main metropolitan centers, and later brought significant art exhibitions that had originated elsewhere to Buffalo, he not only succeeded in interesting the general public in art but also in raising awareness about the value and expediency of circulating art exhibitions. In September of 1909, the American Federation of Arts, a non-profit travelling exhibition organization which still exists, was formed to “bring art to the hinterlands.”15 His role as a catalyst in all of these issues was crucial, and so it is with some justification that his home town paper could assert that “He is conceded to have done more than any other one man for the advancement of fine art in the United States.”16


Fig. 1  Charles McMeen Kurtz (1855-1909), circa early 1900s
Photograph: Lawrence County Historical Society, New Castle, Pa.

Fig. 2  Portrait of Charles M. Kurtz, 1909 by Joaquin Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923)
Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.
Fig. 3  Davis B. Kurtz House, Washington Street, New Castle, Pa. (demolished 1963)  
Photograph: Lawrence County Historical Society, New Castle, Pa.

Fig. 4  Interior, Davis B. Kurtz House, Music Room, after 1887  
Photograph: Lawrence County Historical Society, New Castle, Pa.
Fig. 5 Julia Stephenson Kurtz (1861-1931), 1884
glass photographic transparency, Charles M. Kurtz Collection,
Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
Fig. 6 *Left In Charge*, Lemuel E. Wilmarth (1835-1918)
The National Academy of Design, New York

Fig. 7 *William Morgan*, (1826-1900) *Self-Portrait*
The National Academy of Design, New York
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Fig. 8  *Voices From the Past or Here Lies the Past*, 1878
Charles M. Kurtz (1855-1909)
Burchfield Art Center, Buffalo, N.Y.
Fig. 9 The William H. Vanderbilt Art Gallery, Press Reception. December 21, 1884
Illustration: Frank Leslie's January 5, 1885.
Fig. 10  The American Art Association Galleries, Six East Twenty-Third Street, N.Y.  
Pen and Ink sketch by Charles M. Kurtz  
Charles M. Kurtz Collection, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution

Fig. 11  Edward P. Moran (1829-1901)  
*Liberty Enlightening the World*, 1886  
Museum of the City of New York

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Fig. 12. Southern Exposition Main Building and Art Gallery, Louisville, Kentucky, 1885. Illustration from *Catalogue of the Southern Exposition*, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution.

Fig. 13 *Near the Coast*, 1885 R. Swain Gifford, (1840-1905) print from the Southern Exposition catalogue, Metropolitan Museum of Art, N.Y.
Fig. 14  *A Rough Day, Entrance to the Harbor at Honfleur*, 1885
Frank M. Boggs, (1855-1926) print from the Southern Exposition catalogue
Boston Museum of Fine Arts

Fig. 15  *The Last Sacraments*, 1885  Henry Mosler, (1841-1920) print from the Southern Exposition catalogue painting awarded to Kentucky Polytechnic Society, Louisville, (now Louisville Public Library)
Fig. 16  *Le Crepuscule*, 1885
Alexander Harrison, (1853-1930) print from the Southern Exposition catalogue
painting awarded to the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts, Mo.

Fig 17  Portrait of Halsey C. Ives, 1894-5
Anders Zorn (1860-1920), The St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts, Mo.
Fig. 18 Self Portrait of Mihaly Munkácsy (1844 -1900)
Deri Museum, Debrecen, Hungary

Fig. 19 Christ Before Pilate, 1881 Mihaly Munkácsy, (1844 - 1900)
on loan to Deri Museum, Debrecen, Hungary
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Fig. 20 *Christ On Calvary*, 1884  Mihaly Munkacsy,

Fig. 21 *Ecce Homo*, 1896  Mihaly Munkacsy
Fig. 22  *The Angelus*, 1857-9, The Louvre, Jean-Francois Millet (1814-1875)

Fig. 23  *Portrait of Kate Field*, 1887, Boston Public Library
Francis Davis Millet (1846-1912)
Fig. 24  Dubois Fenelon Hasbrouck (1860-1917) Photograph from clipping of newspaper article by Charles M. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz Papers, scrapbook, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution

Fig. 25  Autumn Landscape, 1888, Dubois Fenelon Hasbrouck, National Museum of American Art/Smithsonian Institution
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Fig. 26  *Girl in Japanese Costume*, c. 1888, William Merritt Chase (1849-1916)
The Brooklyn Museum, ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz

Fig. 27  *Sheep on the Dunes*, Anton Mauve (1838-1891)
ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz
Fig. 28 Portrait of Mrs. L. A. Coonley Ward, ca.1905
Harrington Mann (1864-1937) photo: Academy Notes

Fig. 29 Study in Gray and Green (Sleeping Child), ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz
Thedor Hummell (1864-1939)
Fig. 30  *Ruth*, n.d. ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz, Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo
Eastman Johnson (1824-1906)

Fig. 31  *Landscape*, n.d. ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz,
Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo
Georges Michel (1763-1843)
Fig. 32  *Peasant Mother and Child*, ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz, Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo  
Mary Cassatt (1844-1926), color print
AS I WAS GOING TO ST. IVES
I MET A MAN WHO HAD TWO WIVES
(OLD POEM.)

Fig. 33  *The Belles of St. Ives,* pen and ink sketch, 1895, probably by Charles M. Kurtz from catalogue, *First Exhibition of Expressionistic Paintings by the Deiphosopists,* Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution
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Fig. 34  Photograph: Charles M. Kurtz and Halsey C. Ives, c.1893
Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution

Fig. 35  The Art Building, The World's Columbian Exposition, 1893
Photo: Illustrated Handbook, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago
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Fig. 36  The Art Palace, The Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904
Photo: Official Handbook, The Art Department Illustrated

Fig. 37  Bulgarian Cross, pen and ink sketch by Charles M. Kurtz, c.1905
Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution
Fig. 38  Installation of Glasgow School exhibition, St. Louis Annual Exposition, 1895
pen and ink diagram by Charles M. Kurtz
Charles M. Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian Institution

Fig. 39  William York MacGregor (1855-1923), Shoreham, England, pastel, c. 1895
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz
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Fig. 40  James Paterson (1854-1932) *Castle Fairn*, c. 1895  
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz

Fig. 41  James Guthrie (1859-1930) *Street In Oban, Night*, 1895  
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection, Charles M. Kurtz
Fig. 42  David Gauld (1865-1936) *The Haunted Chateau, Grez*, 1886
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection Charles M. Kurtz

Fig. 43  Edward Atkinson Hornel (1864-1933), *Balcony, Yokohama, Japan*, 1894
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection Charles M. Kurtz
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Fig. 44  Robert Macauley Stevenson (1854-1952) *Rhapsody*, c.1895
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection Charles M. Kurtz

Fig. 45  James Whitelaw Hamilton (1860-1932) *Ebbing Tide*, 1896
Yale Center for British Art, ex-collection Charles M. Kurtz

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Fig. 46  *Portrait of John Joseph Albright* (1848-1931)
by Edmund C. Tarbel (1862-1938)
Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.

Fig. 47  *Portrait of Edward B. Green* (1855-1950), William M. Hekking (1885-?),
Albright-Knox Gallery; Hekking was director of Albright Gallery 1924-1931
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Fig. 48  The Albright Gallery, 1905  Photo: *Academy Notes*, 1905

Fig. 49  Caryatids symbolizing Art by Augustus Saint-Gaudens (1848-1907)  Albright Gallery, Photo: The Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society
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Fig. 50 Thomas Le Clear (1818-1882), *Buffalo News Boy*, 1853
Albright-Knox Gallery

Fig. 51 Cornelia Bentley Sage (1876-1936), Second Director of the Albright Gallery
Photo: *The Buffalo Express*, December 3, 1910
Fig. 52 Julia S. Kurtz with her eldest daughter, Julia and Isabel c. 1905
Photo: Lawrence County Historical Society, New Castle, Pa.

Fig. 53 George Bogert (1864-1944), *A Cloudy Day, Katwyk, Holland* c. 1905
Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.
Fig. 54 Joaquin Sorolla y Bastida (1863-1923), Another Margarite! 1892
Washington University Art Gallery, St. Louis

Fig. 55 Whistler Room at Albright Gallery, Inaugural Exhibition, June, 1905
Photo: Albright Gallery Archives
Fig. 56 Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) The Holy Family with Saints Francis and Anne and John the Baptist, c. 1630s, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Fig. 57 Edouard Manet (1832-1883) The Boy With a Sword, 1861
    The Metropolitan Museum of Art
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Fig. 58  Franz von Lenbach (1836-1904), *Portait of German Emperor [Wilhelm I]*, c.1886
Installation photo: *Academy Notes*, January, 1907

Fig. 59  August Renoir (1841-1919), *Portrait of Charles and Georges Durand-Ruel*, 1882, Collection of Durand-Ruel Galleries, Paris
Fig. 60 Gustave Loiseau (1865-1935), *House at Vaudreuil*, c. 1907
Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.

Fig. 61 Maxime Maufra (1833-1918), *Transport Vessel Leaving Havre*, 1905
Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.
Appendix I

Charles M. Kurtz Chronology

1855 Charles McMeen Kurtz born to Davis Brook Kurtz and his wife, Julia Maria Wilder, in New Castle, Pennsylvania on March 20th.


1876-78 becomes the local editor of *The Guardian*, New Castle, Pennsylvania

1879 publishes *The Daily Reporter*.

1881-82 prepares *Illustrated Notes* for Metropolitan Museum of Art exhibition.


1882-83 writes for *Music and Drama*, a new daily publication.

1883 becomes the general manager of the American Art Union.

exhibits a large collection of Art Union paintings in Buffalo, New York and Louisville, Kentucky, where they become part of the Southern Exposition's first great art display.

1883-86 accepts offer to become Director of the Art Department, Southern Exposition, Louisville, Kentucky.

1884 edits *Art Union* magazine until December; in September, applies for position to head the Art Department of the New Orleans World’s Fair (The World’s Exposition).

1884-86 holds management position with the American Art Association

1885 writes catalogues for the sale of the George Seney Collection and for the Watts exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

1885 marries Julia Stephenson (1861-1931), daughter of Dr. A. T. Stephenson of Harrodsburg, Kentucky on October 1; two
daughters survived them: Julia Wilder Kurtz (1889-1977) and Isabella Starkweather Kurtz (1901-1991) and another predeceased them, Elizabeth Stephenson Kurtz (1886-1897).

1886 terminates employment with the Art Association; daughter, Elizabeth born.

1886-87 manages the circulation of Mihaly Munkácsy’s Christ Before Pilot for Charles Sedelmeyer to American venues: New York, Boston, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Saint Paul, Nashville, Philadelphia, Indianapolis; tour generates $90,000 in ticket receipts.

1888 repeats tour for Munkácsy’s companion picture Christ on Calvery, also purchased by John Wanamaker, throughout the country.

1889-91 appointed art critic (“Art Notes”) and book reviewer for the New York Daily Star, and later literary and art editor of the Sunday Star, which changes management and becomes known as The Daily Continent.


1891-93 contributes to Chicago Evening Post; writes artists’ biographies for The Chicago Graphic, a regional magazine.

1891-93 appointed Assistant Chief of the Department of Fine Arts of the World’s Columbian Exposition.

1894 contributes a column, “Art at the Exposition” to publication, St. Louis Life.

1895 tours Denmark, Scotland and France during the summer on behalf of the St. Louis Exposition.

1894-99 appointed Director of the Art Department of the St.Louis Annual Exposition.

1896 elected member of The Japan Society, London.

1897 daughter, Elizabeth (Daisy) dies.
1898 receives a diploma and medal "in recognition of valuable services in connection with the Fine Arts Exhibit" from the directors of the Trans-Mississippi International Exposition, Omaha.

1899 appointed Assistant Director of Fine Arts for the United States Commission to the Paris Exposition of 1900; resigns in July due to serious health problems.

1901-04 appointed Assistant Chief of the Department of Art of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

1902 receives honorary Ph.D. from Washington and Jefferson College "in recognition of distinguished ability and services as an art critic and writer."

1905 receives the cross of the Order of Merit from Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria for his work at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

1905 appointed Director, The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York.

1906 writes and edits Academy Notes, a bulletin published by the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and the Albright Art Gallery; D.B. Kurtz, his father, dies, leaving substantial financial legacy.

1907 accused of importing German pictures free of duty for exhibition purposes and then selling some for profit.


1910 Sale of the private collection of Charles M. Kurtz at auction, Fifth Avenue Art Galleries, New York on February 24 and 25.

1991 Upon Isabel S. Kurtz's death, the remaining Charles M. Kurtz estate bequeathed to the Smithsonian Institution/Archives of American Art, the National Academy of Design, New York, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven and the Lawrence County Historical Society, New Castle, Pennsylvania.
Appendix II

Series I: Biographical Information

Reel 4804

Biographical information, undated and 1856-1981, divided into subseries of resumes and reminiscences by and about Charles M. Kurtz, obituaries of Kurtz and other family members, and miscellaneous biographical information. The types of records included are newspaper clippings, handwritten and typed manuscripts and drafts and other printed matter.

Reel 4804

Frames

Resumes and Reminiscences, undated

3-8 press release/resume by Charles M. Kurtz, "A New Appointment" on his appointment as Assistant Director of the U. S. Exposition, 1900 Paris World's Fair

9-11 biography of Charles M. Kurtz

12-13 reminiscence by his daughter, Isabella Starkweather Kurtz

Obituaries

19-42 of Charles M. Kurtz (1855-1909)

44-52 of relatives: his father, D. B. Kurtz (1826-1906);
65-69 his mother-in-law, Elizabeth A. Stephenson (1830-1906);
      his wife, Julia Stephenson Kurtz (1861-1931)

Miscellaneous Biographical Information

2 Wedding invitation, 1885

53-63 Certificates of Commendation, Awards

64 Passport, Charles M. Kurtz, 1906

Reel 4818

1236-1239 letter from Mary T. Martin, a relative who details Kurtz genealogy
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Charles M. Kurtz had a wide circle of friends and acquaintances that often overlapped his personal friends and professional colleagues with his career activities. Certain individuals whose names may not be particularly well known, such as the artists, D.F. Hasbrouck, William Morgan and Patty Thum, for example, were both personal and professional friends. Their letters, often seeking Kurtz's help, are informative about their own and Kurtz's careers. Kurtz's close friends, the Starkweathers, his own relatives, and his wife's family, the Stephensons, were particularly interested in Kurtz's professional activities and also kept him informed. His sister, Emily "Clootie" Kurtz, for example, also studied art in New York under H. Siddons Mowbray and her letters, especially those written while she was in Europe in 1891, occasionally commented on the art world of the day. His father, D.B. Kurtz, an important attorney for railroad and banking concerns in western Pennsylvania, details many of his legal activities in his letters to his son. His letters have been highlighted because of his own prominence and their references to his son's collecting activities, for which he often advanced funds. There is also the occasional letter from the distinguished New York photographer, William Kurtz, who was not related to Charles M. Kurtz. His letters have been indicated by the inclusion of his first name so as to distinguish him from the Kurtz family.

Many of the names noted in the description of Kurtz's personal and professional correspondence represent individuals of interest to art historians and those studying American social history. Although some merely record a brief professional contact with Kurtz (e.g. Stanford White sending regrets), they do place the individual at a certain place in time. Several correspondents who contacted Kurtz throughout his career solely on behalf of personal concerns (e.g. his college fraternity) have not been noted. In the case of a letter written on behalf of a well known individual or organization by someone whose name may not be immediately recognizable, the appropriate identification has been indicated in brackets the first time it appears, e.g. James Grant [for John Wanamaker].

The correspondence between Kurtz and his wife is among the richest in the collection and most interesting for its descriptive commentaries on late 19th century life. Consequently the most successful method of using the Kurtz papers is for the researcher to identify a date and/or event for which information is needed (e.g. the blizzard of 1888,) and then read their correspondence for that period. Another approach for arriving at useful information (e.g. a description of the Baltimore collector, Benjamin Walters' house) is to consult the chronology and ascertain Kurtz's itinerary during a given period. He invariably comments on notable people, places and the ambiance in the cities that he visited while managing various
expositions and exhibitions. Gaps in the correspondence between husband and wife usually correspond to periods when they were living or travelling together.

Many letters are illustrated (see Appendix B), usually by Kurtz himself. The majority of these are to his wife. Some may be difficult to decipher because a fire scorched some of the letters while they were in the possession of the Kurtz family.

**Correspondence, 1843-1940 and undated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reel 4804</th>
<th>Frames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-92</td>
<td>undated letters, unidentified writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-136</td>
<td>partially dated letters, identified by first names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-183</td>
<td>undated letters, identified by first names [mainly to Julia from Nina [Starkweather?]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184-215</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, A [mainly from Letty H. Alexander, also S.P. Avery]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216-296</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, B, C J. Jay Barber, Fred E. Bartlett, Geo. F. Brownell, Geo. H. Bogert, W. Gedney Bunce, Howard Russell Butler, F.S. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-327</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, D, E Louis P. Dessar, Thos. W. Dewing, Walter McEwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328-377</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, F, G Ben Foster, Sara Hallowell, D. F. Hasbrouck, Childe Hassam, Albert Herter, Alfred C. Howland, Henry S. Hubbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378-395</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, I, J, K Halsey C. Ives, Hugh Bolton Jones, Ed. G. Kennedy, Chas. M. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396-461</td>
<td>Correspondence, undated, Kurtz Kurtz family and some &quot;L&quot; correspondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Correspondence, undated, M
Macaulay Stevenson, Cornelia F. Maury,
Jervis McEntee, Gari Melchers, Wm. Morgan, H. Mowbray,
Hermann Dudley Murphy, [E.?] Muybridge

Correspondence, undated, N, O
Theodore C. No,, [?] Ogden,

Correspondence, undated, P
David C. Preyer

Correspondence, undated, R
F.K.M. Rehn, Robert Reid, Chas. Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, undated, Sa-Sm
Augusta St. Gaudens, Semple family,
F. Hopkinson Smith

Correspondence, undated, Sn-Sz
Otto Stark, Starkweather family, Edward J. Steichen,
Jean Stevenson [Mrs.Macauley Stevenson], Stephenson family

Correspondence, undated, T-V
Grosvenor Thomas, Patty Thum

Correspondence, undated, Wa
[Henry] Watrous

Correspondence, undated, We-Z
Lyman H. Weeks, Irving B. Wiles, Wallace Wood, G.J. Zolnay

Correspondence, undated, 1848-1869
arranged chronologically, Kurtz family

Correspondence, 1870-1879
Kurtz family

Correspondence, 188(?)
Kurtz family, A. D. Smith

Correspondence, Jan.-Dec. 1880
Kurtz family
Correspondence, 1881, undated
(many notes from artists explaining the iconography etc. of their pictures for representation in Academy Notes)
Harry Chase, Henry Farrar, George Fuller, R. S. Gifford, T. Hovenden, F. K. M. Rehn, H. W. Robbins, J. H. Witt

Correspondence, Feb. 1-5, (sic) [Feb. 1- March 10] 1881

Correspondence, March 11-31 (sic) [March 11-April 5], 1881

Correspondence, April 1-30, 1881
Stephen Parrish, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, May-Dec., 1881
Eastman Johnson, C. C. Starkweather

Correspondence, Jan.-Dec., 1882
Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, Jan.-April, 1883
Rosina Emmet, Jervis McEntee, F. A. Bridgman, Charles Sprague Pearce, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, May-July, (sic) [May-Aug. 8], 1883
William Sartain, L. P. Cesnola, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, Aug.-Sept., 1883
Charles M. Kurtz, Geo. I. Seney, Jervis McEntee, Ed. H. Blashfield, Julia Stephenson

Correspondence, Nov. 1883
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, telegrams from artists authorizing sales of their pictures at Louisville Exposition

Correspondence, Dec. 1883
Charles M. Kurtz, James D. Smillie, Julia Stephenson, Thomas B. Clarke, A. Parton
Correspondence, Jan. 1884
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson

Correspondence, Feb. 1884

Correspondence, Mar. 1884
Clara McChesney, J. Jay Barber, Chas. Lanman

Correspondence, April, 1884
J. Jay Barber, Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, D. Huntington

Reel 4805
Letters primarily from artists and art committee members concerning loans for the Southern Exposition, Louisville, Kentucky (Aug. 16-Oct. 25, 1884) and related details. Frequent correspondence to and from Charles Kurtz to his fiance, Julia Stephenson is regularly interspersed beginning in September, 1884. Many of the letters from E. Wood Perry refer to the Art Union; others from Kurtz refer to the Art Association. Some of the artists represented include:

Frames 1-16
May 11-15, 1884
Frank Waller, F. K. M. Rehn, A.T. Bricher, A.P. Ryder, Carleton Wiggs

16-87
May 16-20, 1884 (sic) [May 16-31, 1884]
A.T. Bricher, Jervis McEntee, Arthur Parton

88-103
June 1-5, 1884
A.H. Wyant

104-127
June 6-10, 1884
Percival DeLuce, Frank Waller, Wm. L. Sonntag, W.S. Macy, Arthur Parton, Thomas B. Clarke

128-146
June 10-15, 1884
Thos. Hovenden

147-181
June 16-20, 1884
Herter Brothers

182-275
June 21-30, 1884 (sic) [June 21- July 10, 1884]
Thomas B. Clarke, Bruce Crane, Julia Stephenson, A.T. Bricher, S. R. Koehler, D. Huntington
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July 11-15, 1884
Eastman Johnson, A.T. Bricher, H. Bolton Jones

July 16-20, 1884
Wm. T. Richards, Thomas B. Clarke, T. Moran, L.E. Wilmarth, Julia Stephenson, Eastman Johnson, Wm. T. Richards

July 21-25, 1884
Bertha von Hillern, Maria J. C. Becket, E. L. Henry

July 26-31, 1884
Wm. T. Richards

Aug. 1-5, 1884
A. D. Vorce & Co. Fine Arts, Jasper T. Cropsey

August 6-15, 1884
(Charles Warren Eaton, E. Wood Perry, Julia Stephenson)

September 1-10, 1884
E. Wood Perry, Julia Stephenson, Bertha von Hillern, S. R. Koehler

September 11-20, 1884
Julia Stephenson, Edward Gay

September 21-30, 1884
(September 21-October 10, 1884)
Francis A. Silva, E. Wood Perry, Julia Stephenson, Thomas B. Clark

October 11-15, 1884
(July 21-October 10, 1884)
Julia Stephenson, Arthur Parton, Patty Thum, F.A. Silva, Thomas B. Clarke, A.T. Bricher

October 23-25, 1884
D. B. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson

October 26-28, 1884
Julia Stephenson, S. R. Koehler

October 28-31, 1884
Julia Stephenson, J. Jay Barber

November 1-2, 1884
Julia Stephenson, J. Jay Barber
November 3-5, 1884
Julia Stephenson, Thomas B. Clarke

November 6-16, 1884
Julia Stephenson, Geo. Pullman, E. Wood Perry

November 11-15, 1884
Julia Stephenson

November 16-17, 1884
Julia Stephenson

November 21-23, 1884 (sic) [November 21- December 22, 1884]
F. E. Bartlett, Julia Stephenson

December 21-25, 1884
Julia Stephenson

December 26-28, 1884 (sic) [December 26-31, 1884

Reel 4806
Correspondence, undated and 1843-1940 arranged chronologically

Correspondence 1885, undated
William Morgan, E. Wood Perry, Alf Trumble

January 1-5, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz

January 6-10, 1885 (sic) [Jan. 6-14] 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson, Wm. Semple

January 16-20, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson

January 21-31, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Alf. Trumble, Wm. Semple, Geo. McKinstry, Frederick J. Waugh

February 1-10, (sic) [Feb. 1-28] 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, C. C. Starkweather, Bruce Crane, Walter Shirlaw, Patty Thum
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March 1-5, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson, G. H. McCord

March 6-15, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick Keppel

March 16-31, 1885

April 1-10, 1885
Charles M. Kutz, Julia Stephenson

April 11-20, 1885
Wm. Henry Goodyear (Metropolitan Museum), Edwin Linton [Washington & Jefferson College College], Julia Stephenson

April 21-30, 1885
Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, James D. Smillie, Wm. Semple, Julia Stephenson

May 1-10, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Henry Goodyear, Metropolitan Museum (L.P.DiCesnola), Julia Stephenson, Patty Thum, Wm. Semple, James D. Smillie

May 11-20, (sic) [May 11-31, 1885]

June 1-20, 1885
James D. Smillie, Charles Melville Dewey, Julia Stephenson, Metropolitan Museum (W. Forman), Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson

June 21-30, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson, Wm. Semple, Cecilia Beaux, J. & R. Lamb, Patty Thum, S. R. Koehler

July 1-5, 1885
Wm. Semple, Julia Stephenson
July 6-10, 1885
W. C. Bauer, Geo. C. Lambdin, Alf Trumble, Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, A. Parton, W. Whittredge, Edward Moran, Bruce Crane, Patty Thum

July 11-20, (sic) [July 11-27, 1885]
James D. Smillie, Charles M. Kurtz, E. H. Blashfield, Max Weyl, J. Alden Weir

July 26-30, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, E. H. Blashfield, C. C. Starkweather, Alf Trumble, J. Jay Barber

August 1-5, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz

August 1-10, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, Metropolitan Museum of Art (Wm. Henry Goodyear), S. R. Koehler

August 11-15, 1885
Julia Stephenson, United States Indian Service (Geo. A. McKinstry)

August 16-20, 1885
Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, J. H. Dolph

August 20-24, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson, Wm. Semple

August 25-31, 1885
Julia Stephenson, J. Francis Murphy, Alf Trumble, Mrs. J. F. Cropsey, Nina Batchelor, Patty Thum, Alf Trumble

September 1-3, 1885
Henry Mosler, Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, Harry Chase

September 4-5, 1885
Alfred Fredericks, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson, J. H. Dolph

September 6-8, 1885
Wm. Bliss Baker, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Stephenson

September 9-10, 1885
Julia Stephenson, E. Wood Perry, J. Jay Barber
September 11-12, 1885
F.K.M. Rehn, Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz

September 13-14, 1885
Charles M. Kurtz, American Art Association (Thomas Ellis Kirby).
Julia Stephenson

September 15-17, 1885
Alfred Trumble, Alfred Fredericks, Charles M. Kurtz,
Julia Stephenson

September 18-20 (sic) [September 18-25, 1885]
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Goodyear), Julia Stephenson,
Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Morgan, C. C. Starkweather,
Geo. A. McKinstry

September 26-30 (sic) [September 26- October 6, 1885]
J. B. Bristol, Julia Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, E. Wood Perry,
W. R. Forman, E.H. Blashfield, Charles Melville Dewey,
J. Francis Murphy, J. H. Dolph, American Art Association

October 11-20, 1885
American Art Association (K. Timpson), D.B. Kurtz, J. Jay Barber,
J. H. Dolph, E. Wood Perry, Thos. Ellis Kirby,
J. B. Bristol, Mrs. J. F. Cropsey

October 21-31, 1885
Mrs. J. F. Cropsey, American Art Association (K. Timpson),
E. Wood Perry, C. Harry Eaton, Francis Hopkinson Smith,
Alfred Kappes, John A. Elder, Harry Chase

November 1-15, 1885
Julia Stephenson Kurtz, J. B. Bristol, M.F.H. DeHaas,
Wm. Semple, S. R. Koehler, D. B. Kurtz

November 16-30, 1885
Carlton T. Chapman, American Art Association (Katharine Timpson),
Patty Thum, D. W. Tryon, F.A. Silva, Wm. Semple, Henry A. Ferguson,
Charles Melville Dewey, Charles M. Kurtz

December 1-15, 1885
Patty Thum, Henry A. Ferguson, F. K. M.
Rehn, J. Francis Murphy, Wm. Semple, American Art Association,
(Katharine Timpson)
1455-1477  
Dec. 16-31, 1885  

Reel 4807  
Correspondence 1886, undated  
2-10  
Alice Barber, Elliott Daingerfield, F. S. Lamb

11-48  
Jan. 1-12, 1886  
Charles M. Kurtz, American Art Association (Katharine Timpson, Thos. El. Kirby), Patty Thum

49-68  
Jan. 17-29, 1886  
Charles M. Kurtz, Patty Thum, Wm. Semple

69-111  
February 1-12, 1886  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Kurtz

112-153  
February 13-16, 1886  
Charles M. Kurtz, D. B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

154-165  
February 17-26, 1886  
Louis Richard, J. N. Marble, Wm. R. Warner & Bro., Medals & Badges

166-209  
March 6-31, 1886  

210-248  
April 1-15, 1886  
Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, Carl Brenner, Southern Exposition (J. M. Wright)

249-283  
April 15-30, 1886  

284-319  
May 1-22, 1886  
Wm. Semple, Southern Exposition at Louisville (Maj. Wright)
May 24-30, 1886
L. S. Silva, Wm. Semple, Clootie [Kate Kurtz?], Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts (Geo. Corliss), G. W. Conant, D. B. Kurtz

June 1-8, 1886
Wm. Semple, Cassell & Co., Ltd, Charles M. Kurtz

June 9-10, 1886
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, S. R. Koehler

June 11-14, 1886
Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, Louis Kurtz, F. S. Church, Julia S. Kurtz

June 15-16, [June 15-17] 1886
Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Julia S. Kurtz

June 19-23, 1886
Julia S. Kurtz, Irving R. Wiles, Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

June 22-28, 1886
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

June 29-July 5, 1886
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Kate Kurtz, Wm. Semple

July 6-10, 1886
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D. B. Kurtz, Mary E. Williams

July 11-14, 1886
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, D. B. Kurtz

July 15-20, 1886
Charles M. Kurtz, Elizabeth Coffin, Julia S. Kurtz

July 21-27, 1886
P. Thum, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, J. F. Weir

July 28-31, 1886
E. L. Henry, D.B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz

August 1-6, 1886
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B.Kurtz, Wm. Semple
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 7-9, 1886</strong></td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, American Art Association (Katharine Timpson), Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, A. H. Wyant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 10-21, 1886</strong></td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick J. Waugh, Julia S. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 22-25 [August 22-Sept.7], 1886</strong></td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Alice Barber, Wm. St. J. Harper, Mary E. Williams, Thos. A. Wilmurt, D.F. Hasbrouck, Wm. Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept. 20-24, 1886</strong></td>
<td>D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, S.R. Koehler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept. 25-30, 1886</strong></td>
<td>Julia S. Kurtz, Emil Carlsen, Edward Gay, S.P. Avery, A. A. Willits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 8-15, 1886</strong></td>
<td>J.H. Dolph, Frederick W. Freer, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Herbert A. Levy, Wm. Morgan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1232-1271

November 13-22, 1886

1272-1302

November 23-30, 1886
Wm. Semple, D. B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

1303-1325

December 2-13, 1886

1326-1344

December 14-29, 1886
Earle's Galleries, W. T. Walters

1345-1374

January 1-10, 1887
Wm. Semple, D. B. Kurtz, J. Francis Murphy, Stephenson family members

Reel 4808

1-33

January 11-31, 1887
Wm. Stephenson, Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

34-69

February 1-28, 1887
Halsey C. Ives, Patty Thum, D. B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Robert Ogden [office of John Wanamaker]

70-100

March 1-10, 1887
Patty Thum, Robert Ogden, D. B. Kurtz, Carl Brenner, L. P. de Cesnola, Stephenson family members

101-124

March 11-31, 1887
J. M. Wright [for Southern Exposition], M. Knoedler, Wm. Semple, Chas. Sedelmeyer, John Wanamaker, A. Fischhof, D. B. Kurtz

125-144

April 1-15, 1887
Chas. Sedelmeyer, Wm. Semple, J. M. Wright, Eliz. R. Coffin, James B. Townsend, [The World]

145-167

April 16-30, 1887
Wm. Semple, R. J. Menefee

168-194

May 1-7, 1887
D. B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz
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May 8-10, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert Ogden [for John Wanamaker]

May 11-25, 1887
Robert Ogden, Mrs. D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, R.J. Menefee, Edw. Stratton Holloway, D. F. Hasbrouck

May 26-31, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, J. M. Wright

June 1-5, 1887
Wm. Semple, Andrew Cowan, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert Ogden

June 6-10, 1887
D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

June 11-15, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

June 16-20, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

June 21-31, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

July 1-5, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Francis Richards, Charles M. Kurtz

July 6-10, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. M. Brown, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

July 11-30, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, Andrew Redheffer, Charles M. Kurtz, W.W. Thum, S. Wilder

August 1-31, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], D.B. Kurtz

September 1-5, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, EugŠne Fischhof [for firm of Chas. Sedelmeyer]
September 6-10, 1887
Louis Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

September 11-15, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

September 16-30, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Wm. Semple

October 1-10, 1887
Wm. Semple, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Louis Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

October 11-15, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Eugène Fischhof, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Wm. Thum

October 16-20, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick Dielman, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

October 21-31, 1887
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Cassel & Co.,

November 1-5, 1887
G. Klackner, M. H. Wyatt [for Chas. Sedelmeyer], Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Julia S. Kurtz

November 6-10, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Fred. P. Kaiser

November 11-20, 1887
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Louis Kurtz

November 21-30, 1887
Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

December 1-15, 1887
Stephenson family, Louis Kurtz

December 16-31, 1887
Stephenson family, Kurtz family, C. C. Ripley
January 1-10, 1888
Julia S. Kurtz, T. Addison Richards, Stephenson family, D. B. Kurtz, Louis Kurtz

January 11-20, 1888
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson family, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz

January 21-31, 1888
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant [for John Wanamaker]

February 1-10, 1888
Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Walter L. Palmer, R.M. Shurtleff, Eugène Fischhof [for Chas. Sedelmeyer], Chas. Sedelmeyer, James G. Tyler, C.Y. Turner

February 11-15, 1888
James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, J.F. Cropsey

February 16-20, 1888
F. E. Bartlett, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple

February 21-29, 1888
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

March 1-10, 1888

March 11-15, 1888
D. B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, A.P. Ryder, N.H. Carpenter [for The Art Institute of Chicago], Charles M. Kurtz

March 16-20, 1888
Thomas B. Clarke, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, S. Wilder, F.S. Church

March 21-31, 1888
Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz

April 1-5, 1888
Julia S. Kurtz, S. Wilder, Charles M. Kurtz
1400-1420  
**April 6-10, 1888**  
T.W. Wood, D.B. Kurtz, Charles, M. Kurtz

1421-1458  
**April 11-20, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Louis P. Dessar, Julia S. Kurtz

1459-1483  
**April 21-30, 1888**  
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], D.B. Kurtz

**Reel 4809**

1-34  
**May 1-10, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family

Lakey

35-65  
**May 11-24, 1888**  
Thomas Carter, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson family, D. B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family

66-99  
**May 25-31, 1888**  
Robert C. Ogden, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

100-125  
**June 1-10, 1888**  
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

126-146  
**June 11-17, 1888**  
Kurtz family, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson family, Irving R. Wiles, Charles M. Kurtz

147-174  
**June 18-30, 1888**  
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

175-210  
**July 1-10, 1888**  
J.B. Bristol, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Kurtz family members, Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], James Grant [for John Wanamaker]
211-245  
**July 11-20, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Kurtz family, Chas. G. Loring

246-272  
**July 21-25, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], James Grant [for John Wanamaker]

273-290  
**July 26-31, 1888**  
Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], D.B. Kurtz, Chas. Sedelmeyer

291-314  
**August 1-5, 1888**  
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

315-334  
**August 6-19, 1888**  
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

335-375  
**August 20-31, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], H.W. Robbins

376-407  
**September 1-10, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker]

408-451  
**September 11-20, 1888**  
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Alfred C. Howland

452-482  
**Sept. 21-30, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

483-509  
**October 1-5, 1888**  
Julia S. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

510-539  
**October 6-10, 1888**  
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, E. H. Blashfield, James Grant, Kurtz family

540-578  
**October 11-20, 1888**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz
October 21-31, 1888
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B.Kurtz

November 1-15, 1888
Julia S. Kurtz, Stephenson family, James Grant, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], J. D. Woodward

November 16-30, 1888
James Grant, D. B. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz

December 1-10, 1888
James Grant, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

December 11-15, 1888
Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], James Grant, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

December 16-20, 1888
James Grant, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

December 21-31, 1888
Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], James Grant, Patty Thum, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

January 1-4, 1889
James Grant, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

January 5-10, 1889
James Grant, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C.Ogden [for John Wanamaker]

January 11-16, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant, Kurtz family

January 17-22, 1889
James Grant, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson family

January 24-30, 1889
J. G. Craig, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2-11, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, D.B. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12-19, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20-28, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, W. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2-9, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, James Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11-19, 1889</td>
<td>Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Doll and Richards, J.B. Botto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20-25, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Herbert A. Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1-10, 1889</td>
<td>Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant, Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, J. C. Nicoll, Patty Thum, Wm. Semple, Laura Sedgwick Collins, Stephenson family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11-26, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, M.De Forest Bolmar, D. B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Kurtz family, Patty Thum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3-16, 1889</td>
<td>John R. Tait, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17-25, 1889</td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], C.E. Haynes [Minneapolis publisher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25-31, 1889</td>
<td>Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Patty Thum, William Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1-7, 1889</td>
<td>Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Geo. H. Smillie, Halsey C. Ives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 8-17, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz

June 18-30, 1889
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, C.E. Haynes [Minneapolis publisher], D.B. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Wm. Semple

July 9-25, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. S. Botelieller [Acting Secretary of the Treasury], D. F. Hasbrouck

July 12-18, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Collector's Office, Custom-House, New York City

July 19-21, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

July 26-31, 1889
Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Wm. Semple, Charles M. Kurtz

August 1-9, 1889
George M. Ciprico, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Laura Sedgwick Collins, Stephenson family, J. H. Dolph

August 10-18, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family

August 19-25, 1889
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Charles Barnard

August 26-31, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, G.A. McKinstry, Kurtz family

September 1-9, 1889
D.B. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Wm. Semple, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

September 10-15, 1889
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

September 16-25, 1889
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, C. E. Haynes, D.B. Kurtz
September 26-31, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Thomas Carter, Julia S. Kurtz

October 1-26, 1889
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D B. Kurtz, M. Knoedler & Co., Kurtz family, William Schaus, Patty Thum

November 1-19, 1884
C.W. Conant, Margaret Lackland Ives, Stephenson family, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, George W. Chambers, Patty Thum

November 20-30, 1889
Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, T. Addison Richards [National Academy of Design]

December 1-26, 1889
Stephenson family, Patty Thum, D.F. Hasbrouck, Sam. P. Avery, James Grant [for John Wanamaker], D. B. Kurtz

Correspondence, undated, 1890s

Correspondence, Jan., 1890
D.F. Hasbrouck, Stephenson family, Kurtz family, Laura Sedgwick Collins, Patty Thum, Thos. W. Wood

Correspondence, February, 1890
D.B. Kurtz, F.E. Bartlett, Halsey C. Ives, Kurtz family, Wallace Wood

Correspondence, March, 1890
H.C. Ives, Harry Ruseland, E.L. Henry, Patty Thum, Stephenson family

Correspondence, April, 1890
J.G. Craig, Chas. Sedelmeyer, Laura Sedgwick Collins, H.C. Ives, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, May, 1890
J. Douglas Moultray [New Zealand artist], H.C. Ives, Albert Bierstadt, Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, A.T. Birch, Kurtz family, Robert C. Ogden [for firm of John Wanamaker], Charles Sedelmeyer, Laura Sedgwick Collins
Correspondence, June, 1890
Charles M. Kurtz [for The Tabard Club], D.B. Kurtz, Geo. A. McKinstry, F.E. Bartlett, Kurtz family, Thomas Brower Peacock, Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, July 4-16, 1890
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.F. Hasbrouck, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, July 17-29, 1890
Laura Sedgwich Collins, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, H.C. Ives

Correspondence, August 1-20, 1890

Correspondence, August 24-31, 1890
Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Wm. Morgan, Kurtz family, Charles Barnard

Correspondence, September, 1890
Julia S. Kurtz, H.C. Ives, Kurtz family, Charles Barnard, W.P. Hanna [on behalf of New Zealand artist, J. Douglas Moultray]

Correspondence, October, 1890
Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, Lita Rice, A.G. Bullock, Oscar Hammerstein

Correspondence, November 1890
Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Barnard, D.B. Kurtz, H.C. Ives, H.W. Ranger, Kurtz family

Correspondence, December, 1890
D.B. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Patty Thum, B. Wells Champney

Correspondence, Jan. 1-31, 1891
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, A. Dolph, Stephenson family, Charles Barnard, D. de Vivo, Clara McChesney, D.B. Kurtz, Countess Ella Norraikoff, Wm. Semple, Alice Lakey

Correspondence, Feb. 1-27, 1891
1124-1159  Correspondence, March 1-31, 1891  
D.B. Kurtz, Kurtz family, S.P. Avery, H.C. Ives, F. Rondel, C. de Vivo, T.W. Wood

1160-1196  Correspondence, April 1-12, 1891  
H. C. Ives, Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, Frederick Keppel, Horace R. Johnson, Marcus Benjamin

1197-1240  Correspondence, April 15-27, 1891  
H.C. Ives, J. M. Bowles, Charles M. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Wm. Semple, Julia S. Kurtz, Frederick Keppel

1241-1263  Correspondence, May 1-18, 1891  
Wm. Semple, Stephenson family, H. C. Ives, D.B. Kurtz, D.F. Hasbrouck, Kurtz family

1264-1288  Correspondence, May 19-30, 1891  

1289-1327  Correspondence, June 1-11, 1891  
D.B. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, H.C. Ives, Kurtz family, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker]

1328-1351  Correspondence, June 13-30, 1891  
Horace Seeley, Patty Thum, Sam. P. Avery, H. C. Ives, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

1352-1388  Correspondence, July 5-17, 1891  
D.B. Kurtz, Stephenson family, J. H. Dolph, Patty Thum

1389-1408  Correspondence, July 22-31, 1891  
Stephenson family, Patty Thum, H.C. Ives, Elliott Daingerfield

1409-1440  Correspondence, August 2-17, 1891  
Marcus Benjamin, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, H.C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Marie Waloh

1441-1470  Correspondence, August 22-31, 1891  
Charles M. Kurtz, H. W. Ranger, Stephenson family, J.H. Dolph
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1-31  Correspondence, September 1-19, 1891
      Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, C.S. Howell, Julia S. Kurtz,
      Charles M. Kurtz

32-84  Correspondence, September 20-31, 1891
      Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Alf. Trumble [The
      Collector], C.C. Starkweathe (Tock)

85-133 Correspondence, October 2-12, 1891
       James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Chas. P. Tower, J.H. Lewis,
       Mrs. H.C. Ives, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz,
       D.B. Kurtz, W.M.R. French [The Art Institute of Chicago], C. C.
       Starkweather

134-160 Correspondence, October 14-18, 1891
       Sam. P. Avery, Rev.J.D. Spriggs, Chas. P. Tower, Julia S. Kurtz,
       A. McKinstry

161-192 Correspondence, October 19-29, 1891
       F. E. Bartlett, C. C. Starkweather, Charles M. Kurtz, Montague
       Marks [The Art Amateur], Marcus Benjamin [D. Appleton & Co.],
       C. de Vivo, Robert C. Ogden [for John Wanamaker], Stephenson
       family, G. Forbes Kelly, firm of Chas. Sedelmeyer, Rev. J.D.
       Spriggs

193-222 Correspondence, November 1-14, 1891
       Frederick Keppel, Geo. Forbes Kelly [Current Art], C.C.
       Starkweather, Marcus Benjamin, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

223-250 Correspondence, November 15-19, 1891
       D.F. Hasbrouck, Marcus Benjamin, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S.
       Kurtz, Sam. P. Avery

251-289 Correspondence, November 20-23, 1891
       Marcus Benjamin, Julia S. Kurtz, W.T. Price, Morton Casseday,
       Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Antoinette Van Huesen Wakeman,
       T.C. No1 [firm of S.P. Avery]

290-376 Correspondence, November 25-30, [November 25-December 6] 1891
       Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, J. Douglas
       Moultray, George M. Ciprico, D.B. Kurtz
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Correspondence, December 7-11, 1891
Julia S. Kurtz, H.W. Ranger, Charles M. Kurtz, Holmes Smith
[Assistant to Director of St. Louis Museum School of Fine Arts],
Tock [C.C. Starkweather], Kurtz family, Mrs.H.C. Ives

Correspondence, December 12-19, 1891
C.C. Starkweather, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Clara
McChesney

Correspondence, December 21-22, 1891
Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, Marcus
Benjamin [editor, D. Appleton & Co.], Montague Marks [editor,
The Art Amateur]

Correspondence, December 29-31, 1891
J. Douglas Moultray, Kurtz family, Marcus Benjamin, Sam. P.
Avery

Correspondence, December 23-28, 1891
E. Fischhof [for firm of Chas. Sedelmeyer], Charles M. Kurtz, J.H.
Dolph, Geo. McKinstry, D.F. Hasbrouck, F. Hopkinson Smith

Correspondence, probably 1892
H.C. Ives

Correspondence, January 6-10, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, J. H. Dolph

Correspondence, January 11-15, 1892
Kurtz family, F.Y.M. Rehn, C.C. Starkweather, Charles M. Kurtz,
Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, January 1-5, 1892
Herbert A. Levy, Wm. Semple, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, R.C.
McLean [editor, The Inland Architect], Julia S. Kurtz, Chas. P.
Tower, A.L. Wyant, Holmes Smith, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, January 16-20, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, January 21-25, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, R. Swain Gifford, Thos. W.
Wood, Marcus Benjamin
Correspondence, January 26-31, 1892

Correspondence, February 1-5, 1892

Correspondence, February 6-15, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, J.R. Murphy [Dept. of Fine Arts, World's Fair], Laura Sedgwick Collins

Correspondence, February 16-20, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, J.R. Murphy [Dept. of Fine Arts, World's Fair], F.E. Bartlett, James W. Ellsworth, Laura Daintry, H.C. Ives

Correspondence, February 21-25, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Marcus Benjamin, D.B. Kurtz, J. Douglas Moultray, Tok [C.C. Starkweather], Wm. Semple

Correspondence, February 26-29, 1892
E. Frischhof [for Chas. Sedelmeyer], Julia S. Kurtz, Mrs. A.L. Campbell, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 1-10, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, R. Swain Gifford, C. de Vivo, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 11-20, 1892
Kurtz family, Sam. P. Avery, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Emery H. Barton, D. B. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 21-25, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, J.R. Murphy [Dept. of Art, World's Fair], F.D. Millet, Philo A. Otis

Correspondence, March 26-31, 1892
Clara T. McChesney, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, M. Louise McLaughlin, C. Durand Chapman, H.C. Ives

Correspondence, April 1-10, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, H. C. Ives, D.B. Kurtz, George H. Galt
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1058-1104

Correspondence, April 11-20, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, H. C. Ives, D.B. Kurtz

1105-1142

Correspondence, April 21-30, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, C.S. Harrington [National Academy of Design], Walter Gay, Marcus Benjamin

1143-1179

Correspondence, May 1-10, 1892

1180-1209

Correspondence, May 11-15, 1892
H.C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Marcus Benjamin

1210-1234

Correspondence, May 16-20, 1892
W. Lewis Fraser, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Chas. T. Yerkes, J.P. Davis, C.C. Starkweather, Stanford W. White

1235-1278

Correspondence, May 21-30, 1892

1279-1310

Correspondence, June 1-15, 1892
Jas. R. Ortgies, Geo. R. Davis, Irving R. Wiles, Kurtz family, George F. Foster [Sec. Frederick A. Stokes Co.], Tock [C.C. Starkweather], E.A. Engler [Washington University], Marcus Benjamin, R.J. Menefee, Starkweather family, Stephenson family, John Tracey

1311-1331

Correspondence, June 16-30, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, H.C. Ives, Kurtz family, Marcus Benjamin, Charles A. Platt, Clarence E. Young [World's Congress Auxiliary of Columbian Exposition], Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz

1332-1353

Correspondence, July 1-10, 1892
B.B. Vallentine [Evening Telegram], J. Douglas Moultray, D.F. Hasbrouck, Starkweather family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

1354-1380

Correspondence, July 11-15, 1892
D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, Charles M. Kurtz, Clarence E. Young, Kurtz family
Correspondence, July 16-20, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, Starkweather family

Correspondence, July 21-25, 1892
D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Dr. John Dickey, Starkweather family

Correspondence, July 26-31, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, Sam. Coleman
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Correspondence, August 1-5, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Marcus Benjamin, H.W. Mesdag, Charles Geron (translation by Kurtz on frame 33)

Correspondence, August 6-15, 1892

Correspondence, August 16-25, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, C.C. Starkweather, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, August 26-31, 1892

Correspondence, September 1-10, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, C.C. Starkweather, Halsey C. Ives

Correspondence, September 11-15, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, D.F. Hasbrouck, Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, September 16-20, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives

Correspondence, September 21-30, 1892
Halsey C. Ives, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, T.L. Flood [The Chautauquan]
231-267 Correspondence, October 2-10, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, D.B. Kurtz

268-290 Correspondence, October 11-20, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Emily J. Lakey, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

291-321 Correspondence, October 21-31, 1892
Henry Baldwin [for Montague Marks, Ed., The Art Amateur],
Halsey C. Ives, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family

322-359 Correspondence, November 1-5, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Henry Blackborn (?), Halsey C. Ives,
R.F. Knoedler, Charles M. Kurtz

360-393 Correspondence, November 6-10, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Halsey
C. Ives, D.B. Kurtz

394-419 Correspondence, November 11-20, 1892
Halsey C. Ives, H.W. Mesdag, Morton M. Casseday, [Kentucky
Agent for National Life Insurance Company of Vermont], John J.
Enneking, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

420-457 Correspondence, November 21-30, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, R.C. McLean
[Editor, Inland Architect]

458-507 Correspondence, December 1-10, 1892
Julia S. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Kurtz family, Starkweather family,
Charles M. Kurtz, John J. Enneking, G.P. Engelhard [Pres., The
Graphic]

508-549 Correspondence, December 11-15, 1892
Charles M. Kurtz, Edward Gay, Julia S. Kurtz, Marcus Benjamin,
James Grant [for John Wanamaker], Montague Marks [The Art
Amateur]

550-581 Correspondence, December 16-20, 1892
C.C. Ripley [Pres., Kansas City Art Assoc.], Charles M. Kurtz, A.L.
Wyant, Hubert Vos, Julia S. Kurtz, Frances R. King-Hall [for
Seabrooke Comic Opera Company], Halsey C. Ives,
D.F. Hasbrouck, Montague Marks
Correspondence, December 21-25, 1892
Clara McChesney, Halsey C. Ives, Sam. P. Avery, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. McKinstry, D.W. Tryon, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, December 26-31, 1892

Correspondence, Miscellaneous Letters, 1893?
F.E. Bartlett, Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Starkweather family

Correspondence, January 1-5, 1893

Correspondence, January 6-10, 1893

Correspondence, January 11-15, 1893
D. F. Hasbrouck, Geo. Inness, Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Reichard & Co, Sara Hallowell, Wm. T. Evans

Correspondence, January 16-20, 1893

Correspondence, January 21-25, 1893
F. L. Hiffinson, Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, George Barrie

Correspondence, January 26-28, 1893
H. Bolton Jones, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, John F. Weir

Correspondence, January 29-31, 1893
Halsey C. Ives, Julia S. Kurtz, H. Siddons Mowbray, Hawthorne Hill [The Engineering Magazine], Wm. Tuthill
Correspondence, February 1-5, 1893

Correspondence, February 6-10, 1893
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. B. Tuthill, Halsey C. Ives, [H. Bolton Jones], Wm. Kurtz

Correspondence, February 11-15, 1893
C. Harry Eaton, [H. Bolton Jones], Charles M. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Julia S. Kurtz, John J. Enneking

Correspondence, February 16-20, 1893
R. Bartholemy, Halsey C. Ives, H. Thompson, Julia S. Kurtz, J. H. Twachtman, Starkweather family, Charles M. Kurtz, Walter Shirlaw, Stephenson family

Correspondence, February 21-28, 1893

Correspondence, March 1-5, 1893
Christine S. Breelin [?], Julia S. Kurtz, Starkweather family, James W. Ellsworth, Edward Moran, H. Bolton Jones, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 6-10, 1893

Correspondence, March 11-15, 1893
D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, James William Pattison, Ellis Wainwright

Correspondence, March 15-20, 1893

Correspondence, March 21-31, 1893
J. S. Dickinson, Thomas Hovenden, Julia S. Kurtz, Ellis Wainwright, Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family, H. Bolton Jones
Correspondence, April 1-10, 1893

Correspondence, April 11-20, 1893
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family, J. M. Bowles, Robert C. Ogden, Kurtz family, Douglas Volk, E. Frischhof, Durand-Ruel, Wm. McKinstry

Correspondence, April 21-30, 1893
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, J. C. DeLeon, R.J. Mcmenefee

Correspondence, May 1-10, 1893
J. M. Bowles, Rhoda Holmes Nicholls, Mary M. Bartlett, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D. W. Tryon, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, May 11-20, 1893
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Starkweather family, Robert C. Ogden, Kurtz family, Henry Blackburn, Howard Seeley

Correspondence, May 21-31, 1893
J. S. Dickerson, D.B. Kurtz, Sam. P. Avery, Ellis Wainwright

Correspondence, June 1-10, 1893
Eastman Johnson, Ellis Wainwright, Walter MacEwen, Charles M. Kurtz, Marcus Benjamin, Stephenson family, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. McKinstry

Correspondence, June 11-20, 1893
Geo. H. Bogert, Eastman Johnson, F. E. Bartlett, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family, Stephenson family, Geo. H. Bogert, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, June 21-30, 1893
(Wm. H.?) Howe, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. McKinstry
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Correspondence, July 1-10, 1893
Correspondence, July 11-15, 1893
Charles M. Kurtz, T. W. Dewing, Julia S. Kurtz, W.H. Howe, Harrison S. Morris, Kurtz family

Correspondence, July 16-20, 1893
Starkweather family, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Ellis Wainwright, W. H. Howe

Correspondence, July 21-25, 1893
Charles M. Kurtz, Fred. Wood, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, July 26-31, 1893
R. Swain Gifford, Ch. Sedelmeyer, Eastman Johnson

Correspondence, August 1-10, 1893
D.B. Kurtz, W.H. Howe, Chas. Nagel, Ellis Wainwright, Charles M. Kurtz, [Charles Ward Rhodes], Robert C. Ogden, Stephenson family

Correspondence, August 11-20, 1893

Correspondence, August 21-25, 1893
Mary G. Bartlett, J. Francis Murphy, Charles Ward Rhodes, Stephenson family, A. B. Farquhar [Ex. Commissioner. World's Fair Board], John J. Boyle, Starkweather

Correspondence, August 26-30, 1893
Charles Sedelmeyer, W. E. Safford, Emery H. Barton, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, September 1-10, 1893
Stephenson family, Clara T. McClesney, D.B. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, September 11-30, 1893
Charles Ward Rhodes, Charles Sedelmeyer, Douglas Volk, Starkweather family, Stephenson family, Howard Seeley

Correspondence, October 1-5, 1893
309-333  Correspondence, October 6-10, 1893

334-363  Correspondence, October 11-20, 1893
Emery H. Barton, Morton M. Casseday, W. Schuyler, Starkweather family, Stephenson family, Charles Ward Rhodes, Holmes Smith (St. Louis School and Museum of Fine Arts), Douglas Volk

364-393  Correspondence, October 21-31, 1893
Marcus Benjamin, Charles Ward Rhodes, Stephenson family, Douglas Volk, Chas. G. Loring, Montague Marks, Mary G. Bartlett, D.B. Kurtz

394-419  Correspondence, November 1-10, 1893
Charles Ward Rhodes, Stephenson family, Mary G. Bartlett, Julia S. Kurtz, Holmes Smith, Edwin H. Blashfield

420-448  Correspondence, November 11-20, 1893

449-462  Correspondence, November 21-30, 1893
Chas. G. Loring, Stephenson family, D.F. Hasbrouck, Chas. G. Loring, l.M. Gaugengigl

463-481  Correspondence, December 1-10, 1893
N. Yamataka, (The Imperial Japanese Commissioner for the World's Columbian Exposition), Stephenson family, Mary G. Bartlett, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz

482-498  Correspondence, December 11-20, 1893
Geo. Barrie, Irving R. Wiles, L.A. Coonley, Stephenson family

499-531  Correspondence, December 21-31, 1893
William T. Evans, Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, P.A. Gross, Geo. H. Story, N. Yamataka, Benoni Irwin, John D. Pierce, W.M.R. French, Charles M. Kurtz [letter partially undated (30 December), probably should be 1892], D.B. Kurtz

532-550  Correspondence, Letters, 1894? [some incomplete]
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family
Correspondence
J. Spencer Dickenson, Frank Gaiennie, Stephenson family, Geo. Barrie, Ellis Wainwright, D.B. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, Jan. 16-31, 1894

Correspondence, February 1-10, 1894
D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, The Southern Magazine, Stephenson family, Morton M. Casseday, Wm. Semple

Correspondence, February 11-20, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Stephenson family, Charles Ward Rhodes, J. Harrison Mills, Wm. Semple

Correspondence, February 21-28, 1894
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Clara T. McChesney, John D. Pierce, Stephenson family, A. Guinchard & F. Fourniret [Export firm]

Correspondence, March 1-5, 1894
St. Louis Exposition, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. H. Howe, Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, T. Vernette Morse [The Arts magazine], J. C. Nicoll, D.W. Tryon

Correspondence, March 6-7, 1894

Correspondence, March 8-10, 1894
Frederick Dielman, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, William Merrit Chase, R. Swain Gifford, Eastman Johnson, Geo. W. Maynard, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, March 11-20, 1894
Julia S. Kurtz, Holmes Smith, Harrison A. Morris [Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts], Charles M. Kurtz, A. Guinchard & F. Fourniret

Correspondence, March 21-31, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, John D. Pierce [for Harrison S. Morris]
Correspondence, April 1-10, 1894
Kurtz family, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, April 11-20, 1894
Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Kurtz family, Stephenson family, firm of A. Guinchar & F. Fourniret

Correspondence, April 21-30, 1894

Correspondence, May 1-10, 1893
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, St. Louis Exposition, Stephenson family

Correspondence, May 11-20, 1894
Kurtz family, Stephenson family, A.B. Stanton, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Metropolitan Museum of Art, [Charles Ward Rhodes], Marcus Benjamin

Correspondence, May 21-25, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Julia S. Kurtz, Morton M. Casseday

Correspondence, May 26-31, 1894
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, A. Bartholemy, Walter McEwen, Stephenson family

Correspondence, June 1-5, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, A. Bartholemy

Correspondence, June 6-10, 1894

Correspondence, June 11-20, 1894

Correspondence, June 21-30, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, D.B. Kurtz, P.A. Gross, A. Guinchar & F. Fourniret
1204-1232  Correspondence, July 1-5, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Morton Casseday,
Julia S. Kurtz, Carl Marr, Ellis Wainwright, Hamilton Hamilton

1233-1257  Correspondence, July 6-20, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, F. Hopkinson Smith, Kurtz family, Charles Ward
Rhodes, Mary MacMonnies

1258-1273  Correspondence, July 21-31, 1894
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, Chas. Sedelmeyer,
Marcus Benjamin, Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz

1274-1290  Correspondence, August 1-5, 1894
Wm. H. Howe, Kurtz family, Charles Ward Rhodes, WM. H.
Howe, D.B. Kurtz, V. Raffaëlli, Halsey C. Ives

1291-1328  Correspondence, August 6-10, 1894
Arthur Parton, John P. Davis, Charles Ward Rhodes, D.F.
Hasbrouck, D. B. Kurtz, Clara McChesney, Starkweather family,
Frederick Dielman, E.G. Kennedy, Robert C. Ogden, Morton M.
Casseday, Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz

1329-1367  Correspondence, August 11-15, 1894
Benoni Irwin, Charles M. Kurtz, W. Scott Thurber, Irving R. Wiles,
D.W. Tryon, Halsey C. Ives, Charles Ward Rhodes, W. Scott
Thurber, Geo. F. Brownell, Durand-Ruel, Charles L. Freer,
Howard Mansfield, Boussod Valadon & Co., Ellis Wainwright,
Starkweather family, A. Bartholemy, W.T. Bishop

1368-1381  Correspondence, August 16-20, 1894
Charles Ward Rhodes, Ellis Wainwright, Patty Thum, Frederick
Dielman

1382-1398  Correspondence, August 21-31, 1894
[?] Bill, H.W. Mills, Julia S. Kurtz, R. Swain Gifford, Emma
Schuchman (?), A. Bartholemy

1399-1418  Correspondence, September 1-10, 1894
Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Geo. H. Story, William Schaus,
Oscar Mattiegen, (Commissioner of Fine Arts for Denmark)

1419-1436  Correspondence, September 11-15, 1894
D.B. Kurtz, Harrison B. Morris, H. W. Mills, Halsey C. Ives, M.
De Forest Bolmer, J. H. Gest (Cincinnati Museum Assoc.),
Reichard & Co., Wm. Macbeth, A. Preyer & Co., Julia S. Kurtz,
Cornelia F. Maury, T. S. Noble
1437-1454  Correspondence, September 16-20, 1894
J.B. Bristol, E.G. Kennedy, J. Francis Murphy, Maria Brooks, J.G. Brown, Benoni Irwin, P.B. Gross, Elizabeth R. Coffin, L. P. di Cesnola

1455-1470  Correspondence, September 21-30, 1894
Stephenson family, [A.J.?] Conant, Cornelia F. Maury, P.A. Gross, A. Bartholemy, Mary Greton Bartlett, H. H. Moore

Reel 4814

1-22  Correspondence, October 1-10, 1894
P.A. Gross, Botto, Emery H. Barton Helene (Trotz?), Patty Thum, Kurtz family, M. De Forest Bolmer, D.B. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, J.G. Brown, Geo. H. Holt

23-37  Correspondence, October 11-20, 1894
Kurtz family, F. de Vuillefroy, Reid Bishop, Maria Brooks, J.H. Gest, Emil K. Kegel (for L. Crist Delmonico), D.B. Kurtz

38-52  Correspondence, October 21-31, 1894

53-71  Correspondence, November 1-5, 1894

72-99  Correspondence, November 21-30, 1894

100-119  Correspondence, November 6-15, 1894 [sic]
Kurtz family, H.S. Stevenson, A. McKinstry, Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes],

120-135  Correspondence, November 16-20, 1894
Julia S. Kurtz, Patty Thum, Charles Ward Rhodes, D.F. Hasbrouck, Chas. Sedelmeyer
Correspondence, December 1-10, 1894
Starkweather family, Brimmer & Kalb, Printers and Photographers.
J.H. (Tiotz?), R.D. Bristol for The Bancroft Company, St. Louis
Artists's Guild, D.B. Kurtz, Mrs. L.A. Coonley

Correspondence, December 11-31, 1894
Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, Geo. F. Root, Art Committee of
Union League Club (Chicago), Morton Casseday, Charles M.
Kurtz, Ellis Wainwright, A. Barthelemy, Patty Thum, F.W. Gookin

Correspondence, Letters, 1895?
Kurtz family, E.A. Hornel, Louis p. Dessar, Armand di (Forasd?),
P.A. Gross, Benoni Irwin, E.G. Kennedy, Mrs. Newman, Ogden
Wood

Correspondence, January 1-15, 1895
D.B. Kurtz, Patty Thum, G.A. McKinstry, Julia S. Kurtz,
Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, January 15-25, 1895
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives,
Alexander Reid, Stephenson family, F.W. Gookin

Correspondence, January 26-31, 1895
C. de Vivo, D.B. Kurtz, Stephenson family

Correspondence, February 1-15, 1895
D.F. Hasbrouck, Stephenson family, firm of A. Guinchard & F.
Fourniret, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, February 16-28, 1895
Stephenson family, Morton Casseday, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 1-10, 1895
Alexander Reid, James Paterson [letter dated March 5, 1896],

Correspondence, March 11-20, 1895
Ellis Wainwright, Henry Romeike, Frederick Keppel, Stephenson
family, F.W. Gookin, D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, March 21-30, 1895
Stephenson family, Starkweather family

Correspondence, April 1-10, 1895
L. Frolich, Harrison S. Morris, D.B. Kurtz, Holmes Smith, Geo. H.
Story, Stephenson family, Patty Thum, B.W. Woodward, J.
Harrison Mills for Artists' Packing & Shipping Co., Geo. H. Story

406-432  
**Correspondence, April 11-20, 1895**  

433-445  
**Correspondence, April 21-30, 1895**  
Starkweather family, Charles Sprague Pearce, D.B. Kurtz, Elizabeth R. Coffin

446-457  
**Correspondence, May 1-10, 1895**  
Alexander Reid, Charles M. Kurtz, Wm. B. Paterson, Elizabeth R. Coffin, L. Frolich

458-496  
**Correspondence, May 11-20, 1895**  
James Paterson, Stephenson family, D.B. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, William Grant, Durand-Ruel, Alexander Reid

497-523  
**Correspondence, May 21-30, 1895**  
Charles Ward Rhodes, John M. Beatty, Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family, L. Frolich, F. Hopkinson Smith, D.B. Kurtz, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family

524-553  
**Correspondence, June 1-10, 1895**  
Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Alexander Reid, Stephenson family, H.? Hollins, James Guthrie

554-594  
**Correspondence, June 11-20, 1895**  

595-634  
**Correspondence, June 21-30, 1895**  

635-660  
**Correspondence, July 1-10, 1895**  
R. Macaulay Stevenson, Stephenson family, Louis P. Dessar, John Bishop & Co. [shipping agents], Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family

661-684  
**Correspondence, July 11-20, 1895**
Correspondence, July 21-31, 1895
Wm. B. Paterson, Alexander Reid, Charles M. Kurtz, D.B. Kurtz, Kurtz family, Starkweather family, Edmond Bruwaert (French Consul General), Wordsworth Thompson

Correspondence, August 1-10, 1895
M. Kurtz, James Grant, J.D. Pierce (Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts), J.H. Gest (Assistant Director, Cincinnati Museum Association), Starkweather family, Harrison S. Morris, J. M. Bowles (Modern Art), D.B. Kurtz, Stephenson family

Correspondence, August 11-20, 1895

Correspondence, August 21-30, 1895

Correspondence, September 1-19, 1895
Julia S. Kurtz, Alexander Reid, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family, Edmond Bruwaert

Correspondence, September 20-30, 1895

Correspondence, October 1-10, 1895

Correspondence, October 11-20, 1895
Harrison S. Morris, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Wm. B. Paterson, Stephenson family, Georgie L. Horton (Cleveland School of Art), T. Vernette Morse (Central Art Association), D.B. Kurtz

Correspondence, October 20-25, 1895
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Julia S. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Eanger I. Couse, Alexander Reid, Art Association of Indianapolis, Charles M. Kurtz, H.L. Newmann, George Wetherbee

**Correspondence, October 26-31, 1895**

**933-965**

**Correspondence, November 1-5, 1895**
Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, Wm. B. Paterson, Stephenson family, Charles Sprague Pearce, Alexander Reid

**966-983**

**Correspondence, November 6-10, 1895**
Art Association of Indianapolis, J. Whitelaw Hamilton, Julia S. Kurtz, James Paterson, Wm. B. Paterson, R. Macaulay Stevenson, Stephenson family, Charles Ward Rhodes, The Cleveland School of Art, John M. Beatty, Charles M. Kurtz

**984-1014**

**Correspondence, November 11-15, 1895**
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family

**1015-1038**

**Correspondence, November 16-20, 1895**
Charles M. Kurtz, R. Macauley Stevenson, Robert Koehler (for Minneapolis Studio Club), Wm. C. Cornwell (for Buffalo Society of Artists)

**1039-1049**

**Correspondence, November 20-30, 1895**

**1050-1084**

**Correspondence, December 1-10, 1895**
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Charles Ward Rhodes, Halsey C. Ives, W.M.R. French, Central Art Association

**1085-1103**

**Correspondence, December 11-20, 1895**
Jean Stevenson [Mrs. R. Macauley], John Lavery, R. McCauley Stevenson, Daniel Catlin, Stephenson family, Halsey C. Ives, A.H. Griffith (Detroit Museum of Art)

**1104-1123**

**Correspondence, December 21-31, 1895**
Stephenson family, Geo. F. Brownell (The Buffalo Club), L. A. Coonley, Alexander Reid, Halsey C. Ives
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1145-1178 Correspondence, Charles M. Kurtz 1896 (?)  

1179-1207 Correspondence, January 1-15, 1896  

1208-1229 Correspondence, January 16-31, 1896  

1230-1247 Correspondence, February 1-15, 1896  
James Fairsman, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family, Howard Mansfield, Alexander Reid, R. Macauley Stevenson

1248-1277 Correspondence, February 16-29, 1896  

1278-1301 Correspondence, March 1-10, 1896  
Alexander Reid, Halsey C. Ives, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family, Charles Ward Rhodes, D.B. Kurtz

1302-1325 Correspondence, March 11-20, 1896  
R. Macaulay Stevenson, Stephenson family, Harrison S. Morris, D.B. Kurtz

1326-1342 Correspondence, March 21-31, 1896  

1343-1374 April 1-10, 1896  

1375-1390 Correspondence, April 11-20, 1896
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Charles M. Kurtz, John W. Beatty, Harrison S. Morris, Alexander Reid, Shirley Moore, N.H. Carpenter (The Art Institute of Chicago), Stephenson family, T. Vernette Morse (Central Art Association), Wm. Victor Wallace, S.M.D. Woodman

1391-1414

Correspondence, April 21-31, 1896
William T. Evans, Harrison S. Morris, T.S. Noble, (Cincinnati Museum Association), Charles M. Kurtz, Mary E. Hurst, Stephenson family, Edward Penfield (Harper & Brothers), Reginald H. Mardon, Kenyon Cox, Emma E. Lampert

Reel 4815

1-29

Correspondence, May 1-10, 1896
Colin C. Cooper, Charles M. Kurtz, John W. Beatty, Emery H. Barton, Sarah B. Menefee, Stephenson family

30-97

Correspondence, May 11-30, [sic] May 11-June 15, 1896

98-214

Correspondence, June 16-30, [sic] June 16- July 31, 1896

215-277

Correspondence, August 1-15, 1896
Frank Russell Green, Halsey C. Ives, H.W. Mills, Wm. Macbeth, James Paterson, Maria Brooks, Frank Gaiennie, H.W. Mills, Stuart
Correspondence, August 16-30, 1896
Cooley (Chief, Tennessee Centennial)

Correspondence, September 1-15, 1896
Morton Casseday, F.W. Gookin, W.M.R. French, Geo. Barrie, T.
Vernette Morse, D.B. Kurtz, Edward Penfield (Harper & Bros.)

Correspondence, September 16-30, 1896
Theo. Cooley, Frank Reaugh, Charles M. Kurtz, R. Spaulding
(Durand-Ruel), C.S. Farrington (National Academy of Design)
Henry Mosler, F.W. Gookin, A.W. Shields, Harry Watrous, D.B.
Kurtz, Mrs. Macaulay Stevenson, Marcus Benjamin (United States
National Museum), J. Whitelaw Hamilton, Alexander Reid, James
Paterson, E.A. Walton, Emery H. Barton, J. Frank Currier,
William T. Evans

Correspondence, October 1-15 [sic], October 1-31, 1896
Emil K. Kegel (L. Crist Delmonico), Adolf Paulus ((Münchens
"Secession"), Irving R. Wiles, Stuart Park, W.H. Coffin, D.B.
Kurtz, Louis Paul Dessar, R. Macaulay Stevenson, J. Francis
Murphy, Charles M. Kurtz, Morton Casseday, Halsey C. Ives,
B.B. Vallentine, Sarah B. Menefee, B.W. Woodward, United
States Consulate at Munich, C. Klackner, Starkweather family,
George Henry, Alexander Reid, Sara Hallowell, S.P. Avery,
F.J.M. Rehn

Correspondence, November 1-15, 1896
W.G. Fischel, Charles M. Kurtz, T. Vernette Morse (Central Art
Association), Charles Ward Rhodes, John M. Beatty,
P.A. Gross, B.W. Woodward, Maria Brooks, Demeten (H.L.
Neumann, Kunsthandlung, München), Adolf Paulus, Wm. H. Howe,
Mrs. Adela Irwin, L.H. Meakin, John Lavery

Correspondence, November 16-31, 1896
Wm. H. Howe, Charles Ward Rhodes, Stephenson family, Carl
Gutherz, Halsey C. Ives, John W. Beatty, J.H. Dolph,
Theo. Cooley, Wm. B. Paterson, Chas H. Ault (The Picture
Exhibition Company of Cleveland), D.B. Kurtz, Ludwig Dill, Geo. F. Brownell, William Hall

502-543

**Correspondence, December 1-15, 1896**

544-637

**Correspondence, December 16-31 [sic] December 16- January 15, 1896**

638-691

**Correspondence, January 16-31 [sic] January 16- February 13, 1897**

692-711

**Correspondence, February 16-28, 1897**

712-778

**Correspondence, March 1-10, 1897**
includes numerous condolence telegrams from family, friends and colleagues W. McEwan, Stuart Park, Frederick Keppel & Co., Stephenson family, Theo. Cooley, Charles Ward Rhodes, Montague Marks, Starkweather family, Cornelia F. Maury, Kurtz family

779-816

**Correspondence, March 15-16, 1897**
all of the letters in this group express condolences on death of Kurtz’s daughter

817-837

**Correspondence, March 17-20, 1897**
mostly family sympathy letters Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz

838-859

**Correspondence, March 21-25, 1897**
Julia S. Kurtz, John Terris, Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Geo. H. Story (Metropolitan Museum of Art), J. Whitelaw Hamilton, Adolf Paulus, see also: frames 1134-1170 for C.M.Kurtz letter of March 21, 1897 filmed with November 16-30, 1897 letters

860-918

Correspondence, March 26-31, 1897

919-941

Correspondence, May 1-31, 1897

942-977

Correspondence, June-July, 1897

978-1010

Correspondence, August 1-31, 1897

1011-1040

Correspondence, September 1-30, 1897
Maria Brooks, Thos. Royall, Sara Hallowell, Patty Thum, Emil Carlsen, Wm. Victor Wallace, Henry Farrer, Charlton Swope (The Louisville Art League), Robert C. Ogden

1041-1059

Correspondence, October 1-15, 1897
Jean Stevenson [Mrs. Macaulay], Starkweather family, Edwin Lord Weeks, J.G. Brown, Charlton Swope, Frank Brangwyn, J.B. Bristol

1060-1079

Correspondence, October 16-25, 1897
Emil K. Kegel, J.H. Dolph, Robert C.Ogden, Marvin Eddy, Charlton Swope, Sara Hallowell, G. Edwin Shiras, Patty Thum, Avery Coonley

1080-1096

Correspondence, October 26-31, 1897
Frank Gaiennie, Carle J. Blenner, G.S. Truesdell, Ogden Wood, Emil K. Kegel, Harrison S. Morris, Sara Hallowell, Patty Thum
1097-1133  
**Correspondence, November 1-15, 1897**  

1134-1170  
**Correspondence, November 16-30, 1897**  
Stephenson family, A.H. Griffith, Charlton A. Swope, Patty Thum, Charles M.Kurtz [date of letter is March 21, 1897], Charlton A. Swope, P.A. Gross, Alexander Reid, Harrison S. Morris, S. Seymour Thomas, Stephenson family, L.A. Coonley Ward

1171-1198  
**Correspondence, December 1-19, 1897**  

1199-1218  
**Correspondence, December 20-31, 1897**  

1219-1258  
**Correspondence, January 1-15, 1898**  
Alumnae Club, Louisville High School, Cecilia Beaux, Charles Ward Rhodes, Halsey C. Ives, Louis Paul Dessar, Sam. P. Avery, Charles M. Kurtz, W.M.R. French, A.D. Cooper, Charles F. Catlin (Trans Mississippi Exposition), Office of the Surveyor of Customs, St. Louis, Mary A. Sharpe, Sam. P. Avery, Chas. H. Wyman & Co. (Custom House Brokers), Harrison S. Morris, Samuel Isham

1259-1288  
**Correspondence, January 16-31, 1898**  

1289-1306  
**Correspondence, February 1-15, 1898**  

1307-1329  
**Correspondence, February 16-28, 1898**
Halsey C. Ives, W.M.R. French, Ellis Wainwright, F. Edwin Elwell, Alexander Reid, Charles Ward Rhodes, Geo. F. Brownell

Reel 4816

1-28
Correspondence, March 1-31, 1898

29-54
Correspondence, April 1-30, 1898

55-77
Correspondence, May 1-15, 1898
Halsey C. Ives, Starkweather family, Frank W. Benson, Carle J. Blumner, J.H. Dolph, Mrs. C.B. Coman, Wm. Morgan, Stephenson family

78-99
Correspondence, May 16-31, 1898
Jules Guérin, Frederick B. Williams, Halsey C. Ives, H.O. Walker, Samuel P. Avery, Mrs. L.A. Coonley Ward, Paul Charlton (Chair, Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition), J. Alden Weir, Zachary T. Lindsey (Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition), Chas. W. Eaton

100-131
Correspondence, June 1-15, 1898
Will H. Low, Wm. H. Howe, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, J. H. Gest, E. Frischhof

132-176
Correspondence, June 16-30, 1898
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Cecilia Beaux, Harrison S. Morris, Henry Farrer, Wm. H. Howe

177-214
Correspondence, July 1-15, 1898
J.H. Gest, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles S. Kurtz, A.T. Bricher, Mrs. Bertha Lea Low, Robert W. Vonnoh

215-256
Correspondence, July 16-31, 1898
Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, J.B. Bristol, Charles Graflly, Harrison S. Morris, Stephenson family
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Correspondence, August 1-10, 1898
Henry C. Lee, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Stu. Laurence,
Francis Wheaton, Roswell S. Hill, Henry C. Lee, Starkweathers family, W. W. Thum

Correspondence, August 11-15, 1898
E. A. Anderson (Louisville Art League), E.L. Henry, Edmund C.
Tarbell, Stephenson family, M. Knoedler & Co., Charles M.
Kurtz, F.W. Stokes, Fred. W. [illegible], St. Louis Exposition and
Music Hall Association, Henry Mosley

Correspondence, August 16-31, 1898
Edmund Tarbell, J.H. Gest (Cincinnati Museum Association),
Charles Ward Rhodes, H. Siddons Mowbray, Patty Thum,
Mrs. L. A. Coonley Ward, Sam. P. Avery, Charles Melville Dewey,
Edmonia A. Anderson (Louisville Art League), Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, September 1-10, 1898
[Horatio S. Stevenson], Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Halsey C.
Ives, L.H.Meakin (The Society of Western Artists)

Correspondence, September 11-30, 1898
Julia S. Kurtz, Alexander Reid, Will H. Low, Cornelia F. Maury,
Henry R. Poore, A.H.Griffith, Isabel Macdougall (The
Chicago Evening Post), Harrison S. Morris, Orrin S. Parsons,
Charles Francis Browne (Brush and Pencif), Geo. F.
Brownell, James D. Spriggs, Theo. Cooley, James Paterson

Correspondence, October 1-31, 1898
Sam. P. Avery, Wm. Verplanck Birney, B. W. Woodward, F. S.
Church, Alex. Reid, Irving R. Wiles, Sam. P. Avery, Chas. B.
McCormack, Charles M. Kurtz, Chas. Sedelmeyer, James D.
Spriggs, Geo. F. Brownell

Correspondence, November 1-20, 1898
American Water Color Society, Patty Thum, The Lotos Club,
Charles Sedelmeyer, Sam. P. Avery, Walter C. Hartson, J. Francis
Murphy, Wm. H. Howe, F. S. Church, J. C. Sherlock, E. Fischhof.
“Steve” [brother of R. Macauley Stevenson],James D. Spriggs

Correspondence, November 21-30, 1898
Harrison S. Morris, Alex. Reid, Sam. P. Avery, James D. Spriggs,
Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, Robert Walker (The
Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts), F.W.Gookin, A.H
Griffith
Correspondence, December 1-10, 1898
Sam. P. Avery, Sara Hallowell, Nina G. Batchelor, Chas. H. Wyman & Co (Custom House Brokers), A.H. Griffith, Ellis Wainwright, Marcus Benjamin (U.S. National Museum)

Correspondence, December 11-31, 1898

Correspondence, 1899?
Geo. K. Andrews, Charles M. Kurtz, John B. Cauldwell

Correspondence, January 1-10, 1899
Geo. A. McKinstry, Marcus Benjamin, R. Swain Gifford, Halsey C. Ives, T. Addison Richards

Correspondence, January 11-31, 1899
Emil Loir, A.H. Griffith, Elizabeth Menefee, Halsey C. Ives, American Art Association (J. Ortgres), J. C. Sherlock, John B. Cauldwell

Correspondence, February 1-15, 1899
Reid Northrop, Halsey C. Ives, Harrison S. Morris, J. H. Gest, Sam. P. Avery, William T. Evans

Correspondence, February 16-28, 1899
R. Swain Gifford, Dudley Smith (Greater America Exposition, Omaha), John B. Cauldwell, Charles Ward Rhodes, J.C. Sherlock, Lyman H. Weeks, General Manager, St. Louis Exposition and Musical Hall Association

Correspondence, March 1-5, 1899
John B. Cauldwell (United States Commission to the Paris Exposition of 1900), Marcus Benjamin, Letitia B. Hart, Cornelia Fellaway, Charles H. Pepper

Correspondence, March 6-20, 1899
Halsey C. Ives, Frank Gaiennie, John B. Cauldwell, B.W. Woodward, William Bailey Faxon, Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes]

Correspondence, March 21-31, 1899
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Correspondence, April 1-15, 1899
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, A.L. Bridgeman
(Secretary, Peary Arctic Club), Mary Bacon Ford, Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes], Marcus Benjamin

Correspondence, April 16-30, 1899
Cooley, F. Hopkinson Smith, Clark Sampson (St. Louis
Exposition and Music Hall Association), Fred. W. Kost, Will S.
Robinson, Thomas W. Wood, Harrison S. Morris

Correspondence, May 1-8, 1899
Enid Yandell, Maria Brooks, J.C. Nicoll, [Charles Ward Rhodes],
W. Elmer Schofield, R. Swain Gifford, P.A. Gross, Louis Paul
Dessar, Georgia W. Fraser (art editor, Art Education), Charles
Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, May 11-20, 1899
Cornelia Fellaway, B.D. Woodward, John B.Cauldwell, Mary
Graton Bartlett, Geo. Barrie, Geo. H. Smillie, Maria Brooks,
Walter Shirlaw

Correspondence, May 21-31, 1899
John B. Cauldwell, Halsey C. Ives

Correspondence, June 1-30, 1899
Charles Ward Rhodes, John B. Cauldwell, Chas. P. Gruppe,
Charles Sprague Pearce, Charles M. Kurtz, Tocky [Starkweather]

Correspondence, July 1-31, 1899
Kurtz family, Starkweather family, Fritz Thaulow, Georgia Gross,
Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick Dielman, John B. Cauldwell,
Stephenson family, Geo. Barrie, Charles Ward Rhodes, Geo. H.
Story, P.A. Gross

Correspondence, August 1-31, 1899
Frank Russell Green, Sybil Rinehart, Geo. F. Brownell, Ikey
[Charles Ward Rhodes], J. H. Gest, John H. McGibbons (United
States Commission) Sam. P. Avery

Correspondence, September 1-30, 1899
Charles M. Kurtz, Frank Gaiennie, Charles Ward Rhodes, Marcus
Benjamin, J.H.Fry, B.W. Woodward, John B. Cauldwell, Halsey
C. Ives, Frederick W. Gardner
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Correspondence, Month and Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>935-955</td>
<td>October 1-31, 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, Edmund H. Murphy, Halsey C. Ives, Marcus Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956-987</td>
<td>November 1-30, 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison S. Morris, Charles M. Kurtz, Cornelia F. Maury, Charles M. Dewey, C. de Vivo (for Eugene Fischhof)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988-1028</td>
<td>December 1-31, 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Ward Rhodes, Steve (? Stevenson), Frederick E. Bartlett, Kurtz family, Charles M. Kurtz, Starkweather family, Lyman H. Weeks, B.W. Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029-1081</td>
<td>January 1-31, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz [undated letters, probably from early summer of 1899], C. de Vivo, Reid Northrop, Halsey C. Ives, Charles Ward Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082-1113</td>
<td>February 1-28, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114-1133</td>
<td>March 1-31, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134-1147</td>
<td>April 1-10, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyman H. Weeks, Halsey C. Ives, T. C. Noé (firm of S. P. Avery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148-1158</td>
<td>April 11-30, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.V. Birney, Charles Ward Rhodes, Harrison S. Morris, C. de Vivo (for firm of Eugene Fischhof)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159-1185</td>
<td>May 1-31, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes], Morton M. Casseday, J. B. Bristol, John. B. Cauldwell, Stephenson family, Henry S. Hubbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1186-1197</td>
<td>June 10-20, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horace Porter (United States Ambassador to France), H.O. Tanner, Harrison S. Morris, Marcus Benjamin, A. Bartholemy, Richard Lloyd Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198-1228</td>
<td>June 21-30, 1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1229-1235

**Correspondence, July 1-31, 1900**
John B. Cauldwell, Geo. Barrie, Morton Casseday

1236-1260

**Correspondence, August 1-30, 1900**

1261-1285

**Correspondence, September 1-31, 1900**
Julia S. Kurtz, Kurtz family, B.W. Woodward, Charles Ward Rhodes, Rodman Wanamaker, A. Barthelemy, Cornelia F. Maury

1286-1308

**Correspondence, October 1-31, 1900**

1309-1338

**Correspondence, November 1-20, 1900**
Halsey C. Ives, St. Nicholas magazine, thank you notes for photographs from ship board companions

1339-1352

**Correspondence, November 21-31, 1900**
notes from ship board companions, Augustus Franzein, H.K. Bush-Brown, R.J. Haight (publisher, The Monumental News), Mrs. [Lydia] Coonley Ward

1353-1370

**Correspondence, December 1-15, 1900**

1371-1384

**Correspondence, December 16-31, 1900**

**Reel 4917**

1-6

**Correspondence, Letters, 1901, undated**
Roger Riordan (Pan-American Exposition 1901), copy of preliminary announcement of artists participating in the Pan-American Exposition, Halsey C. Ives

**Correspondence, January 1-31, 1901**
F.C. Howe, Halsey C. Ives, Emery H. Barton, Charles M. Kurtz, Alfred V. Churchill, Steve [Horatio S. Stevenson], Ogden Wood, Frederick E. Bartlett

**Correspondence, February 1-28, 1901**

**Correspondence, March 1-31, 1901**
J.B. Botto, Starkweather family, Halsey C. Ives, Charles Ward Rhodes, Frederick E. Bartlett, Geo. McKinstry

**Correspondence, April 1-15, 1901**

**Correspondence, April 16-30, 1901**

**Correspondence, May 1-15, 1901**
Burton Thompson (for Missouri Society), Wm. A. Coffin, Emery Pottle, Charles Ward Rhodes, Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes], Marcus Benjamin

**Correspondence, May 16-31, 1901**
John J. Emery, J.N. Marble, Reid Northrop

**Correspondence, June 1-15, 1901**

**Correspondence, June 16-30, 1901**

**Correspondence, July 1-30, 1901**

258-291 Correspondence, August 1-15, 1901
Doubleday, Page & Co., Charles M. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Charles Ward Rhodes, Ogden Wood

292-325 Correspondence, August 16-31, 1901

326-344 Correspondence, September 1-10, 1901
J.E. Elwell, Kurtz family, J.B. Botto, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. F. Brownell

345-367 Correspondence, September 11-30, 1901
Morton M. Casseday, Charles de Kay (for The National Arts Club), Victor J. Brenner, Tock [C.C. Starkweather], Ikey A. Barthélemy, Wm. Victor Wallace, Cornelia F. Maury

368-392 Correspondence, October 1-15, 1901
Philip R. Sawyer, J.H. Gest, Harrison S. Morris, Roger Riordan, Emery H. Barton, F.E.A. Curley

393-413 Correspondence, October 16-31, 1901
Charles M. Kurtz, Henry Romeike, Harrison S. Morris, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo. F. Brownell

414-443 Correspondence, November 1-30, 1901
Mrs. Morton M. Casseday, Philip R. Sawyer, Constantino de Vivo, Charles M. Kurtz, S.P. Annan, Harrison S. Morris, Ikey [Constantino de Vivo]

444-469 Correspondence, December 1-10, 1901
Tock [C.C. Starkweather], Charles M. Kurtz, Ikey [Constantino de Vivo], A. Barthélemy, Ogden Wood

470-493 Correspondence, December 11-25, 1901
B.B. Vallentine, J. H. Dolph, Marcus Benjamin, ? Cuiley, Ikey [Constantino de Vivo], Eugène Fischhof, W.L. Sheldon

494-515 Correspondence, December 26-31, 1901
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Clara McChesney, Curator of Paintings, St. Louis Museum
[Charles Ward Rhodes], Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick W. Gookin,
Eugène Fischhof, Constantino de Vivo, William Victor Wallace

516-524

**Correspondence, 1901?**
L. P. di Cesnola, Edith H. Ogden

525-550

**Correspondence, January 1-15, 1902**
Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes, J.B. Botto, C. Brunner
[for Chas. Sedelmeyer], Geo. F. Brownell, Frederick E. Bartlett,
Geo. McKinstry, W.B. Stevens [St. Louis World’s Fair]

551-570

**Correspondence, January 16-22, 1902**
J. Whitelaw Hamilton, Reid Northrop, Kurtz family, Charles Ward
Rhodes, F. Miranda, A Barthélemy, American Art Association,
Geo. F. Brownell, Julia S. Kurtz

571-596

**Correspondence, January 23-31, 1902**
Starkweather family, Reid Northrop, F. Edwin Elwell (for The
Metropolitan Museum of Art), Halsey C. Ives, Charles Ward
Rhodes, Laura Sedgwick Collins, Julia S. Kurtz, John La Farge,
Theo. Hausen [Consulate of Sweden and Norway], Wilfred H.
Schoff (for The Philadelphia Commercial Museum)

597-620

**Correspondence, February 1-15, 1902**
Morton M. Casseday, A. Barthélemy, Julia S. Kurtz, René Ferry
[for Minerva], Frederick E. Bartlett, Alexander Roche, Morton M.
Casseday, Halsey C. Ives, Theodore C. Noé (for Sam. P. Avery)

621-655

**Correspondence, February 16-28, 1902**
Theodore C. Noé, Frederick Dielman, Julia S. Kurtz, Geo.
McKinstry, Mercantile Library of St. Louis, Charles Ward
Rhodes, Theodore C. Noé, Frederick E. Bartlett

656-678

**Correspondence, March 1-15, 1902**
Charles M. Kurtz, James Paterson, Philip B. Sawyer, Carnegie
Institute

679-693

**Correspondence, March 16-31, 1902**
Charles M. Kurtz, Henry S. Hubbell, A. Barthélemy, H. S. Morris,
Reid Northrop

694-717

**Correspondence, April 1-30, 1902**
Halsey C. Ives, Ikey [Charles Ward Rhodes], W.S. Chaplin
[Washington University], Julia S. Kurtz, Starkweather
family, Nina [Starkweather?], Charles M. Kurtz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, May 1-31, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>718-737</td>
<td>Holmes Smith [The Society of Western Artists], A. Barthélemy, Ogden Wood, J. William Fosdick [The National Society of Mural Painters], Charles Boulet de Mondel, Victor Brenner, James Paterson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, June 1-30, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, July 1-15, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>762-777</td>
<td>St. Louis Club, A. Barthélemy, Geo. N. Andre, Edwin H. Wuerpel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, July 16-25, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, July 26-31, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>802-827</td>
<td>Alexander Reid, George F. Parker (U.K. Representative to the Universal Exposition, St. Louis, 1904), J. Whitelaw Hamilton, Starkweather family, T. Corsan Morton, James Paterson, George Pirie, Harry Spence, Chas. S. Hamblin (Art Dept., St. Louis World’s Fair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, August 1-31, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, September 1-30, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>862-868</td>
<td>[?] Curley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, October 1-31, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>869-888</td>
<td>[Charles M. Kurtz], W. Victor Wallace, Stephenson family, Marcus Benjamin, Halsey C. Ives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, November 1-10, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Correspondence, November 11-20, 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>914-950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

951-970  
**Correspondence, November 21-25, 1902**  

971-986  
**Correspondence, November 26-30, 1902**  
Starkweather family, Charles M. Kurtz, Ernst Kegel

987-1001  
**Correspondence, December 1-31, 1902**  
Charles M. Kurtz, The Japan Society, Chas. H. Ault, Isaac S. Taylor (St. Louis World’s Fair), Alexander Reid [letter dated 1901], Michel de Carnowsky, George F. Kunz

1002-1010  
**Correspondence: Charles M. Kurtz 1903 (?) [incomplete]**  
Charles M. Kurtz, Edwin H. Wuerpel

1011-1026  
**Correspondence: January 1-5, 1903**  

1027-1038  
**Correspondence, January 6-10, 1903**  
Laura Sedgwick Collins, C.S. Hamblin, The Camera Club of New York, Charles M. Kurtz

1039-1064  
**Correspondence, January 11-31, 1903**  
John Getz, [Charles M. Kurtz], Harrison S. Morris, A. Barthélemy, Geo. H. Story

1065-1079  
**Correspondence, February 1-20, 1903**  
Starkweather family, W.M.R. French (The Art Institute of Chicago), Eugene Fischhof, D.C. Ball, Stephenson family, Kurtz family, Emery Pottle (for *The Criterion*)

1080-1094  
**Correspondence, February 21-28, 1903**  

1095-1115  
**Correspondence, March 1-31, 1903**
Frederick J.V. Skiff (St. Louis World's Fair), J.H. Kingwill, Merry
delle Hoyt, Charles de Kay, The Missouri Society, Zorlah M.
Burroughs, Starkweather family, The Strobridge Lithography Co,
Paul Jones, F.S. Lamb, Harrison S. Morris

1116-1135  
Correspondence, April 1-10, 1903
Maria Brooks, J. H. Kingwill, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz,
Halsey C. Ives, C.S. Hamblin

1136-1157  
Correspondence, April 11-20, 1903
E.E. Seavy, Thomas Allen, Gari Melchers, Julia S. Kurtz, C.S
Hamblin, Strobridge Lithography Co., Chas. H. Ault, Alexander
Roche, Gottschalk Printing Co., Starkweather family

1158-1170  
Correspondence, April 21-30, 1903
Emery Pottle (for The Criterion), Julia S. Kurtz, Florence N. Levy
(for the American Art Annual), Dr. Skiff, Emery Pottle, Rhode C.
Chase, Emery H. Barton

1171-1195  
Correspondence, May 1-30, 1903
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, F. Edwin Elwell, W.A.
Brearley, Halsey C. Ives, George J. Zolnay, Morton M. Casseday,
M. Knoedler & Co.

1196-1237  
Correspondence, June 1-30, 1903
St. Louis School of Fine Arts, Morton Casseday, Tock
[Starkweather], Charles M. Kurtz, E.H. Wuerpel, Henry Wolf,
James D. Smillie, Frederick Deilman, Washington and Jefferson
College (The Pandora), J.B. Botto

1238-1258  
Correspondence, July 1-31, 1903
C.E. Hutchings, Cornelia F. Maury, D.C. Ball, Stephenson family,
[Frank V.?] Dudley, Tock [Starkweather],

1259-1279  
Correspondence, August 1-31, 1903
Edna Fischel, Metropolitan Museum of Art, W. M. R. French,
Stephenson family, Marcus Benjamin

1280-1293  
Correspondence, September 1-30, 1903
William A. Coffin, E.H. Wuerpel, Marcus Benjamin, [Frank V.?]
Dudley, J.B. Botto, A.. Shugio [on behalf of Y. Otsuka],
Rodman Wanamaker

1294-1318  
Correspondence, October-December, 1903
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Morton Casseday, Starkweather family, C.S. Hamblin, D.B.K. [Davis B. Kurtz], Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz, Collier's Weekly, George F. Brownell, F.O. Sylvester (Society of Western Artists)

1319-1337

Letters, 1904, undated

1338-1358

Correspondence, January-March, 1904
Executive Commissioner for Russia at St. Louis Exposition, Kentucky Commission, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Julia S. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

1359-1380

Correspondence, April - May, 1904
Joseph C. Spriggs, Leonard Alimon?, Jeanne C. Martin, Curtis Bell (for Metropolitan Camera Club), Holmes Smith, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

1381-1394

Correspondence, June 1-30, 1904
Charles M. Kurtz, Ralph H. Plumb

1395-1411

Correspondence, July 1-30, 1904
Ralph H. Plumb, Charles Ward Rhodes, Robert C. Ogden, Charles M. Kurtz

1412-1437

Correspondence, August-September, 1904
James D. Spriggs, Henry Wolf, Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, A. Barthélemy, J.B. Botto, Charles Ward Rhodes [dated August 23, 1900], Robert Vonnoh, Marion Eddy, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

1438-1451

Correspondence, October 1-15, 1904
Edward R. Rice, John Getz, James D. Spriggs, J.C. Strauss, United States Government Board (Louisiana Purchase Exposition), Carl Hirschberg

1452-1479

Correspondence, October 16-25, 1904
Correspondence, October 26-31, 1904
The Imperial Japanese Commission, Mary May Blanc, Charles Ward Rhodes, Kurtz family, William L. Marcy, Cornelia Bentley Sage, Mary Henry Mosler

Reel 4818

Correspondence, November 1-10, 1904
E. Burgess Warren, W. L. Lathrop, Charles Ward Rhodes, Robert W. Vonnah, [Charles M. Kurtz], Charles Ward Rhodes, W. W. Thum

Correspondence, November 11-15, 1904
[Charles M. Kurtz], Maria Brooks, J. Craig Annan, Edmund Hayes, Arthur Hoeber, C. F. von Saltza, Emery H. Barton, Ralph H. Plumb

Correspondence, November 16-20, 1904
Edmund Hayes, [Charles M. Kurtz], Fred F. Gottschalk, Edward B. Green, Wm. H. Coffin, J. A. Holmes [Universal Exposition Chair], Patty Thum

Correspondence, November 21-26, 1904

Correspondence, December 1-5, 1904
Edmund Hayes (The Buffalo Fine Arts Academy), William H. Goodyear (Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences), Henry Wolf, Mark Bennitt (for Louisiana Purchase Exposition), Carl Hirschberg, A.H. Griffith (Detroit Museum of Art), Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, December 6-10, 1904
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Correspondence, December 11-15, 1904

Correspondence, December 16-20, 1904

Correspondence, December 21-31, 1904
H. S. Hubbell, F. Morton, E.B. Green, Edmund Hayes, Albert E. Tansing, Edmund Hayes, [Charles M. Kurtz], Henrich F. Albert (Assistant Imperial German Commissioner General), Geo. F. Brownell, M. Cassiday, [Charles M. Kurtz]

Correspondence, January 1-31, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Kurtz family, E.B. Green, Charles A. Ball (Louisiana Purchase Exposition Secretary), Emil Kegel, J. B. Bristol

Correspondence, February 1-28, 1905
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, George H. Storey, Henry Wolf, Chas. H. Wyman (Custom House Brokers)

Correspondence, March 1-31, 1905

Correspondence, April 1-20, 1905
Edward B. Green, Cornelia Bentley Sage, Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, April 21-30, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Myron E. Pierce, Henry Wolf, Charles Ward Rhodes

Correspondence, May 1-10, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Chas. H. Wyman (Custom House Brokers)

Correspondence, May 11-15, 1905
Frederick E. Bartlett, A. H. Griffith, Charles M. Kurtz, H. Skiff (Field Columbian Museum), John B. Cauldwell, Rev. J. B.
McCormick (Western University of Pennsylvania), Robert C. Ogden, Will H. Low, Marcus Benjamin, Geo. McKinstry, Mrs. A.M.G. Patterson, J.N. Marble

458-478
Correspondence, May 16-25, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Philip B. Sawyer, Sam. P. Avery, W.J.L. Eurmont, Alaée Hortier, Frederick Dielman

479-498
Correspondence, May 26-31, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Frederick W. Gookin, Will H. Low, Zelma Baylos, B.D. Woodward, Walter B. Stevens, Thomas Reid (The Glasgow Herald)

499-514
Correspondence, June 1-10, 1905
Charles M. Kurtz, Charles Sprague Pearce

515-535
Correspondence, June 11-30, 1905
George H. Storey (Metropolitan Museum of Art), George K. Andrews, Edmund Hayes, Charles M. Kurtz, J.B. Botto, E.L. Van Pelt, Emery H. Barton

536-564
Correspondence, July-August, 1905
Holmes Smith, Marcus Benjamin, Charles Ward Rhodes, Frederick G. Gray, R. Macaulay Stevenson, Maria Riker, Alice R. Glenny, [?] Curley, Alex Reid, C.J. Zolnay, Starkweather family, G.P. Sawyer. Charles M. Kurtz

565-598
Correspondence, September-October, 1905

599-618
Correspondence, November 1-30, 1905
Dudley W. Rhodes, W. Gardner, J.B.Botto, Stephenson family, Alexander Roche, Peter A. Schemm, Hermon A. Kelley (Cleveland Museum of Art), James D. Spriggs

619-643
Correspondence, December 1-31, 1905
Alexander Roche, Charles, M. Kurtz, John W. Alexander, Grosvenor Thomas, Halsey C. Ives, S. Kellogg, Emery H. Barton, Charles M. Kurtz, Lydia Avery Coonley Ward

644-670
Correspondence, January 1-31, 1906, undated
Charles Caryl Coleman, Geo. E. Matthers, Alexander Roche, Halsey C. Ives, A.W.Mesdag, Stuart Park, Henry Wolf, John
McGibbons (Louisiana Purchase Exposition), J.B. Botto

Correspondence, February 1-28, 1906
Julia S. Kurtz, Henry Wolf, Starkweather family, Halsey C. Ives, Gustave Kobbe, Charles M. Kurtz, Dudley [Frank V. Dudley?], John Stevenson, Jr. (Driggs-Seabury Ordnance Corporation), J. Whitelaw Hamilton

Correspondence, March 1-31, 1906
Charles M. Kurtz, Halsey C. Ives, Kurtz family, J. Carroll Beckwith, James D. Spriggs, Emery H. Barton, Marian De Forest

Correspondence, April 1-10, 1906
sympathy notes on death of Davis B. Kurtz, R. Lesch (Berlin Photographic Company), Geo. F. Brownell, John Stevenson, Jr., Carlton Sprague, Halsey C. Ives, Frances E. A. Curley

Correspondence, April 11-20, 1906
Halsey C. Ives, Carlton Sprague, Henry Wolf, Charles M. Kurtz, Alice R. Glenny, Alexander Roche, Marcus Benjamin

Correspondence, April 21-30, 1906
Halsey C. Ives, Charles M. Kurtz, J.B. Botto

Correspondence, May 1-31, 1906
Mrs. L.A. Coonley Ward, Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, W.Y. Macgregor, Julia S. Kurtz, George Houston

Correspondence, June 1-30, 1906
Marcus Benjamin, Mrs. R. M. Stevenson, Starkweather family, Charles M. Kurtz, George Houston

Correspondence, July 1-30, 1906
Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, August-October, 1906
Carl Marr, Julia S. Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, [Frank V.?] Dudley, Stephenson family, Henry Wolf, J.P.H. Cunningham, Halsey C. Ives
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909-934  Correspondence, November 1-30, 1906
Henry Wolf, F.W. Stokes, Librarian, National Academy of Design,
Charles M. Kurtz, Alexander Roche

935-962  Correspondence, December 1-31, 1906
Henry Wolf, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Stephenson family,
Henry Wolf, George Pirie, E. H. Wuerpel

963-990  Correspondence, Jan.-Feb. 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Chas. S. Weaver, Mrs. L.A. C. Ward

991-1015  Correspondence, March 1-31, 1907
Helen A. Robinson, Mrs. L.A.C. Ward, Charles M. Kurtz,
Augustus Koopman, D. Heinemann, Stephenson family

1016-1029  Correspondence, April 1-10, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

1030-1064  Correspondence, April 11-30, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Frank W. Sweitzer

1065-1091  Correspondence, May 1-15, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

1092-1117  Correspondence, May 16-31, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Mrs. L.A.C. Ward, Stephenson family

1118-1137  Correspondence, June 1-20, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

1138-1157  Correspondence, June 21-30, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

1158-1196  Correspondence, July 1-30, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family, Harry Watrous (National
Academy of Design)

1197-1232  Correspondence, August 1-31, 1907
Charles M. Kurtz, E.H. Wuerpel, Dudley [Ogden Wood]

1233-1269  Correspondence, September 1-30, 1907
Mary T. Martin, Stephenson family, Harry Watrous, Charles M.
Kurtz, Dudley [Ogden Wood]
Correspondence, October-November, 1907
Stephenson family, Robert Barclay, Charles M. Kurtz, Cornelia Bentley Sage

Correspondence, December 1-31, 1907
Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz, Mrs. L.A.C. Ward, Henry Wolf

Reel 4819

Correspondence, January 1-31, 1908
Charles M. Kurtz, Francis Wilson, Stephenson family, Julia S. Kurtz

Correspondence, February-March, 1908
Arthur Stedman, Mrs. L.A.C. Ward, Stephenson family, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, April-May, 1908
Charles M. Kurtz, David Lloyd (John Lane Co., Publishers), Will H. Low, Cornelia Bentley Sage

Correspondence, June-July, 1908
Cornelia Bentley Sage, Charles M. Kurtz, Stephenson family

Correspondence, August 1-31, 1908
Julia Wilder Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Mrs. L. A. C. Ward, Stephenson family

Correspondence, September 1-30, 1908
Julia Wilder Kurtz, Mrs. L.A.C. Ward, Stephenson family

Correspondence, October 1-31, 1908
George F. Kunz, Stephenson family, Julia Wilder Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz

Correspondence, November 1-30, 1908
Julia Wilder Kurtz

Correspondence, December 1-31, 1908
G.L. Berg (Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition), Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Wilder Kurtz, Stephenson family
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>272-291</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence, January 1-31, 1909</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joaquin Sorolla (in French), Julia Wilder Kurtz, Charles M. Kurtz, Cornelia B. Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292-309</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence, February 1-23, 1909</strong>&lt;br&gt;Archer M. Huntington, Charles M. Kurtz, Julia S. Kurtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-331</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence, March 1-10, 1909</strong>&lt;br&gt;Charles M. Kurtz, Julia Wilder Kurtz, Cornelia Bentley Sage, Stephenson family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332-346</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence, March 11-20, 1909</strong>&lt;br&gt;Charles M. Kurtz, Cornelia Bentley Sage, Starkweather family, J. D. Spriggs, E. L. Van Pelt, Halsey C. Ives, Frances R. Wheeler, Ogden Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347-961</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence, March 21, 1909-August 21, 1940</strong>&lt;br&gt;Correspondence in this section is posthumous and consists of many sympathy notes from family and friends on the death of Charles M. Kurtz as well as letters from Cornelia Bentley Sage, acting and later director of the Buffalo Academy of Fine Arts. Also included is correspondence relating to estates in both the Kurtz and Stephenson families and miscellaneous letters to Julia S. Kurtz and her daughters from friends and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965-1007</td>
<td><strong>Correspondence Re: Academy Notes undated and 1843-1940</strong>&lt;br&gt;Otto H. Bacher, Alice Barber, J. Jay Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008-1027</td>
<td><strong>Academy Notes Be-Por (1884)</strong> W. H. Beard&lt;br&gt;J. Carroll Beckwith, Carl C. Breumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028-1060</td>
<td><strong>Academy Notes, Br (con’t.) [sic]</strong>&lt;br&gt;Charles Bridgman, J.B. Bristol, Wm. M. Brown, Jennie Brownscombe, Georgine Campbell, Thomas Carter, J.W. Casilear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061-1072</td>
<td><strong>Academy Notes, CAS (1884)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Cassell &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073-1086</td>
<td><strong>Academy Notes, CH-CO (1884)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Harry Chase, F.S. Church, Thomas B. Clarke, C.W. Conant, Kenyon Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087-1099</td>
<td><strong>Academy Notes, CR (1884)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thomas B. Craig, Bruce Crane, J. F. Cropsey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1100-1116  Academy Notes D-E (1884)  

1117-1134  Academy Notes F (1884)  
Wm. Bailey Faxon, Henry A. Ferguson, Fred. W. Freer

1135-1155  Academy Notes E (1884)  
Edward Gay, Sallie J. Gibbons, W. Hamilton Gibson, R. Swain Gifford, Eliza Greatorex, R.H. Griffin

1156-1169  Academy Notes Ha (1884)  

1170-1187  Academy Notes Hi-Hv (1884)  
Winslow Homer, Thomas Hovenden, Wendell Stanton Howard, Alfred C. Howland, D. Huntington

1188-1199  Academy Notes I,J (1884)  
Benoni Irwin, Eastman Johnson, H. Bolton Jones

1200-1211  Academy Notes K (1884)  
F.L. Kirkpatrick, Mary Kollock

1212-1229  Academy Notes L (1884)  
George C. Lambdin, W.H. Lippincott, Will H. Low, Joseph Lyman

1230-1248  Academy Notes Ma-Mc (1884)  
S.R. MacKnight, Montague Marks, Constant Mayer, Jervis McEntee, C.M. Mcllhenny

1249-1257  Academy Notes Me (1884)  
Geo. A. McKinstry

1258-1266  Academy Notes Me-Mi (1884)  
Gari Melchers, C.H. Miller, Francis Miller

1267-1281  Academy Notes Mo (1884)  
J.A.S. Monks, E. Augustus Moore, Edward Moran, Percy Moran, Peter Moran

1282-1293  Academy Notes N (1884)  
David Neal, B.H. Nicholls, J.C. Nicoll, Stansbury Norse
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Notes Reference</th>
<th>Authors/Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1294-1308</td>
<td>Academy Notes P (1884)</td>
<td>Stephen Parrish, Arthur Parton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327-1342</td>
<td>Academy Notes Sa-Sh (1884)</td>
<td>William Sartain, Walter Satterlee, F. Schnuchardt, R.M. Shurtleff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343-1353</td>
<td>Academy Notes Si-Sp (1884)</td>
<td>Francis A. Silva, Geo. H. Smillie, T.L. Smith, Wm. L. Sonntag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354-1367</td>
<td>Academy Notes St (1884)</td>
<td>H.S. Stevenson, G.H. Story, J.B. Sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368-1389</td>
<td>Academy Notes T (1884)</td>
<td>Wordsworth Thompson, Virgillo Tojetti, J.M. Tracy, N.H. Trotter, James G. Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390-1398</td>
<td>Academy Notes V (1884)</td>
<td>C. F. Ulrich, Charles M. Kurtz, R. W. Van Boskerck, J.C. Van Dyke, K. Van Elton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399-1411</td>
<td>Academy Notes Wa (1884)</td>
<td>Frank Waller, Warren, Fuller &amp; Lange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412-1425</td>
<td>Academy Notes We-Wi (1884)</td>
<td>J. Alden Weir, J. B. Whittaker, W. Whittredge, Carleton Wiggins, Lemuel M. Wiles, John Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437-1453</td>
<td>Academy Notes A-Bi (1886)</td>
<td>J. Jay Barbor, Alban Jasper Conant, Pierre Marie Boyle, Albert Bierstadt, Ernest F. Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454-1467</td>
<td>Academy Notes Bl (1886)</td>
<td>Edwin Howland Blashfield, Carl Bremer, Hugo Breul, J. R. Brevoort, J. S. Bradley, Charles Bridgman, Wm. B. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468-1486</td>
<td>Academy Notes C (1886)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Series 3: Circulars/Requests for Submissions of Works of Art

Reel 4820

This series consists primarily of standardized forms listing the title of the work of art, size, condition of frames, location, catalogue price and insurance value. These were completed by various artists and describe paintings being submitted to exhibitions organized by Charles M. Kurtz. The most extensive group are those that pertain to the 1886 Southern Exposition at Louisville, Kentucky. The Southern Exposition was visited annually by half a million people from all parts of the country. It offered not only an art exhibition, but also general exhibitions of natural and manufactured products as well as musical concerts. In 1886, a dispute between the directors of the Art Department of the Louisville Exposition and the trustees of the American Art Association regarding the Prize Fund exhibition created difficulties in obtaining some of the works specified. Consequently, interspersed among the application forms in this subseries are letters that document this alteration. Application forms for the St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association exhibitions from 1893-1897 and two exhibitions of paintings by the Glasgow School: in 1895 in St. Louis and in 1905 at the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York are also found in this series. Along with these forms are biographical statements from the artists and descriptive information regarding some of the paintings. Occasionally, as in the case of George I. Seney, works owned and loaned by noted collectors are also listed.
Reel 4820

Circulars/Requests for submissions of Works of Art:

Frames

a. Southern Exposition, Louisville, Ky., 1886

Artists' surnames beginning with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>671-718</td>
<td>A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719-753</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754-800</td>
<td>D-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-841</td>
<td>F-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842-909</td>
<td>H-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-964</td>
<td>K-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965-1014</td>
<td>M-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015-1078</td>
<td>P-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079-1165</td>
<td>S-Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circulars/Requests for submissions of Works of Art:

b. St. Louis Exposition, 1893-1897

[St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association]

1168-1178 Miscellaneous

c. Glasgow School Exhibition, St. Louis, 1895

1183-1213 A-K

1214-1235 L-Z

1236-1263 d. Glasgow School Exhibition, Buffalo, Albright Art Gallery, 1905
Legal documents in this series include memoranda of agreements between Charles M. Kurtz and various business firms, deeds and related material regarding real estate owned by the Stephenson family, and last wills and testaments of Stephenson family members.

### Reel 4820

**Legal: 1881-1885**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1268-69</td>
<td>Memorandum of agreement between Charles M. Kurtz and Cassell &amp; Co., for the sale of <em>American Academy Notes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Property Deed, Stephenson family, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271-74</td>
<td>Copyright for <em>Illustrated Art Notes</em>, National Academy of Design, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Codicil to will of A.T.Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276-1280</td>
<td>Memoranda of agreement between Charles M.Kurtz and Moss Engraving Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1281-83 Incorporation agreement, American Art Association, Jan. 2, 1885

1284-1293 Memorandum of agreement between American Art Association and the Southern Exposition, Louisville, KY re: fee for the first Prize Fund Exhibition, 1885

Legal: 1886-1932

1295-97 Announcement of Prize Fund Exhibition by American Art Association, 1886

1298 Minutes, Southern Exposition, 1886

1300-1303 Act of Incorporation, Boussod-Valadon Co., 1875

1304-1305 Memoranda of Agreement between Committee for Danish Art in America and Charles M. Kurtz for the St. Louis Exposition, May, 1895

1306 Memorandum of agreement between Charles M. Kurtz and Eugene Fischof of Paris, May, 1900

1308-11 Deed of Conveyance, Stephenson Family, 1907

1312-14 Last Will and Testament of Mary A. Stephenson, 1920-24
Contract of purchase for Stephenson house, 1928
Series 5: Financial Material

Reel 4821

Financial Material, undated and 1870-1989

Reel 4821

Frames

a. Inventories and price lists of Kurtz's collections, undated and 1870-1989:

000-309 Inventories and price lists of Kurtz's collections

002-48 Account book of coins, July, 1870

049-107 Inventory book, May, 1888

personal possessions, paintings, electroplate designs from 1881-1888 for Academy Notes, library book arrangement

108-131 Inventory book, August, 1888

listing of art owned by Charles M. Kurtz and placement of it within his home, personal possessions contained within trunks and storage boxes, insurance policy

132-231 Inventory book, January 1, 1898
personal possessions of Charles M. Kurtz and storage location, including: paintings, coins and medals, photographs, lantern slides, pottery and porcelain, books by topics, floor plan of Kurtz apartment at 100 W. 78 Street, New York City

232-233 Inventory listing assets of D. B. Kurtz Estate, January 1, 1898

234-242 Appraisal of the Charles M. Kurtz estate, April 7, 1909

243-251 Inventory and valuation of paintings sold at auction, February 24, 1910

252-270 Inventory of the Kurtz Collection
listing by Isabel Kurtz of art purchased between 1904-1908 and place of purchase

271 Inventory of Kurtz Collection, 1902-1910
notes by Isabel Kurtz

272-273 List of paintings owned by Charles M. Kurtz and stored in the St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts, 1900-05

274-276 List of medals and plaques lent by Charles M. Kurtz to the Albright Art Gallery, 1907

277-280 List of paintings actually sold at Charles M. Kurtz estate sale (not bought by Mrs. Kurtz), 1910
List of paintings in the Charles M. Kurtz collection and date acquired

Prices from the Charles M. Kurtz estate sale
[February 24, 1910]

Prices of paintings bought in by Mrs. C.M. Kurtz

Inventory of paintings in Kurtz home, Sept. 27, 1910
[rewritten by Isabel Kurtz, c. 1980s]

Inventory notes by Isabel Kurtz, 1989

Appraisal of paintings in Kurtz collection, 1977

List of paintings in Kurtz house and in storage, 1980-1986 with list of 19 transparencies

b. Ledgers, 1877-1909:

Ledger, 1877-1909
list of paintings offered for sale by Charles M. Kurtz with record of provenance

Financial Ledger, 1884-1909
containing information on paintings by Glasgow School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402-439</td>
<td>Financial Ledger, 1884-1886, &quot;Charles M. Kurtz in Account with Catalogue Sales-Art Gallery&quot; [re: Southern Exposition at Louisville, Ky.] records of receipts from daily admissions, catalogue sales, and pictures sold; record of pictures sold to the Kentucky Polytechnic Society in 1883, and to individuals in 1884, 1885, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-445</td>
<td>Letter from Secretary of American Art Association, Katharine Timpson, October 29, 1885, [re: error in statement of method for Prize Fund picture selection]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Art related expenses, undated and 1884-1919:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446-485</td>
<td>Art related expenses, undated and 1884-1919 miscellaneous receipts for expenses, pictures purchased, insurance values, estimate of repairs for frames and conservation by James Kelly; statement of sales of Glasgow pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486-493</td>
<td>Art related expenses promissary notes, list of miscellaneous pictures and valuations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494-509</td>
<td>Art related expenses, 1890-93 receipts for pictures and purchases of decorative arts objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510-523</td>
<td>Art related expenses, 1894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Art related expenses, 1895
custom receipts, Glasgow and Danish School paintings

Art related expenses, 1896-99
notes on buyers at Stewart sale, 1898 with purchase prices;
amended estimate of account necessary for Department of Fine
Arts, U.S. Commission to Paris Exposition of 1900

Art related expenses, 1900-1905
list of Charles M. Kurtz pictures stored in St. Louis Art Museum
with purchase date and price, insurance valuation and crate location
list

Art related expenses, 1906-1910
insurance policy

d. Miscellaneous expenses, undated and 1880-1948:

Miscellaneous expenses, undated
notebook mislabeled "Private Picture Business" is list of personal
household possessions and supplies

Miscellaneous expenses, undated
travel expense accounts
Miscellaneous expenses, undated
estimates, receipts, lists of books and personal possessions

Miscellaneous expenses, undated
accounts for personal living expenses

Miscellaneous expenses, 1880
invoice statements by Charles M. Kurtz listing articles he wrote for New York Tribune

Miscellaneous expenses, 1881
invoices for engravings for American Academy Notes

Miscellaneous expenses, 1882
invoices for Academy Notes and New York Tribune with clippings of some articles written by Charles M. Kurtz interspersed

Miscellaneous expenses, 1883-1885
invoices for Academy Notes and for miscellaneous items

Miscellaneous expenses, 1886-1890
notebook labeled "Catalogue Sales" and "The Art Gallery, Southern Exposition, Louisville, Ky.", and miscellaneous invoices

Miscellaneous expenses, 1891

Miscellaneous expenses, 1892
963-978  Miscellaneous expenses, 1893

979-1000  Miscellaneous expenses, 1894-1896
financial statement, "Expense of Bringing Foreign Paintings to
Exposition, 1895, and miscellaneous invoices

1000-1029  Miscellaneous expenses, 1897

1030-1041  Miscellaneous expenses, 1898-1899
miscellaneous travel receipts

1042-1075  Miscellaneous expenses, 1900
receipts from Paris trip

1076-1087  Miscellaneous expenses, 1901

1088-1118  Miscellaneous expenses, 1902-1905
expense accounts for travel on behalf of the Louisiana Purchase
Exposition

1119-1134  Miscellaneous expenses, 1906-1909
invoice for cash advanced for the First Annual Exhibition of
American Artists, Buffalo Fine Arts Academy

1135-1173  Miscellaneous expenses, 1908
Miscellaneous expenses, 1909-1948

Annotated checklist and catalogue of estate sale of Charles M. Kurtz collection with some prices
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For an individual as precise and meticulous as Kurtz was, this seems to be an unusually incomplete series. It consists of only five small books that record his activities for parts of only four years: 1894, 1897, 1899, 1901. Kurtz himself gives an explanation for the lack of any diaries that date from before his marriage. In a letter, probably written in October, 1885, to his new bride, Julia Stephenson Kurtz, he writes:"...our trunks have been broken open. My coins are gone. Diaries and memoranda books gone and nearly everything not destroyed seems to be ruined..." (Microfilm reel 4806, frames 1277-1281).

Diaries, 1894-1901

Reel 4822

Frames

001-034 Diary, March 10 - May 6, 1894
Begins with March 10 entry and contains a daily log of Charles M. Kurtz's trip abroad from March 10 to May 6, 1894. His activities in Gibraltar, Tangier, Cadiz, Seville, Cordova, Grenada, Madrid, Toledo, Barcelona, Naples, and Rome are described in detail. Daily expenses are also recorded.

035-142 Diary, January 1 - December 31, 1897
A daily account of Charles M. Kurtz's family life in New York City including the final illness and death of his eldest daughter and a
chronical of his own health problems. There are also entries
describing their activities on a trip abroad to Scotland, France,
Belgium and Amsterdam.

Diary, February 1-March 24, 1899
In some instances, the entries are labeled with the following
headings:

Century Club, Lotos "Saturday Night"
Private View of T.B. Clarke pictures
Architectural League reception
Water Color Society reception
Whitlaw Reid Dinner at the Lotos Club
Reception at Franzen's to Bessie Potter
T. B. Clarke sale
Architectural League meeting
The Havemeyer Sale
Sons of Revolution Dinner with S.P. Avery
Lotos Club Art Reception

A synopsis of Charles M. Kurtz's account, February, 1899,
with Reid Northrop for expert examination and purchases

Diary, March, 1899
Entries labeled:
Dinner Architectural League and Sculpture Society of Americna
Artists Reception
Diary, January 1-March 10, 1901

functions as daily calendar of activities and expenses, no exposition,
entries labeled:

- Dinner Arts Club
- Water Color "Stag" reception
- Water Color reception Arts Club
- Dinner Architectural League
- Zorn Exhibition, "Tea" Arts Club
- Eastman Johnson Dinner at Lotos Club
Series 7: Notes and Writings

Reels 4822-4823

Perhaps because of his peripatetic lifestyle, Charles Kurtz kept very precise records. Included in this series are various types of lists, both personal and professional, as well as notes to himself. Drafts and fragments of lectures and his play, The Millennium and his two comic operas, The Aldermen of Man-hat-tan and The Cannibals! are also found within this series. Among the most interesting writings pertaining to the art world are the artists' address lists, which are also broken down according to studio buildings (the Tenth Street Studio Building, the Sherwood, the Rembrandt, and the Y.M.C.A.), lists of artists' models, dealers and editors and detailed diagrams for the installation of Glasgow School exhibition.

Reels 4822-4823

Reel 4822

Frames

A. Lists

209-214 Wedding invitation list


218-230 Lists of artists, art administrators, dignitaries and collectors written on Columbian Exposition stationery
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Membership list of the "Tabard"

List of New York Newspapers

Writings: Address Books, n.d. re: Distribution of Catalogues

Distribution list for (the Crabbe ?) catalogue

writings, address books, n.d., artists

New York artists address list

Address books, n.d.: "Book of the Artists" and index of artists and their addresses

Address book, 1873 [and later] with addresses for artists' models and sightseeing list, "New York for Visitors"

Writings: Address books

Address books, 1881 [and later]; artists directory, 1881; personal expenses, Feb.2-Dec. 31, 1883; lists of artists by studio location; circulars sent, 1883; personal expenses [some entries by Mrs. Charles M. Kurtz]; contents of "little Paris trunk" and others; advertising, 1882; copies [of catalogues?] sent, 1881
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Miscellaneous Diary Pages n.d. [after 1893]

424-425 notations regarding Glasgow School artists

Writings: Address books, 1896

427-478 New York addresses of art dealers, art editors

B. Notes and Writings, undated and 1872-1980

483-502 Miscellaneous memo pages containing Glasgow entries [c. 1894-1904/5]

503-520 Note fragments miscellaneous, regarding lectures, short story, medication schedule, theater

521-525 Notes on art exhibition schedules

526-541 Notes on Gallery plans [exhibition installations] for J. G. Brown, Glasgow School, Klackner's Gallery exhibitions; plan for "An Ideal City"; sketch for bookcases

542-567 Notes on Art n.d.
lists of artists and their work; list of works from the Paris Salon desired by the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts; List of drawings not catalogued but for sale with prices; sculptors list; unidentified
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installation diagram and corresponding key to works of art for [1893 Chicago World's Fair]; list of D. F. Hasbrouck paintings

568-587 Notes on Art, n.d.
list of artists, paintings and their addresses;

588-596 Notes on Art, n.d.
draft for biographical sketches of Montesquieu, Massillon, G.W. Morrison, Nicola Masschall

597-606 Notes, 1884-1890
fragments of notes; list of books; list of paintings with prices

607-642 Notebook, 18913
(A draft for "The Cannibals! An Original Comic Opera" written in the second half of this notebook has not been filmed.)
Miscellaneous notes on: characteristics of the French, expenses for the World's Columbian Exposition, 1865 letter to relative, genealogy of Charles M. Kurtz's family, sketches for Prix de Rome competition, diary entry on London trip, draft of poem

643-669 Notes, ca 1893
miscellaneous notations written on World's Columbian Exposition stationery, drafts for lectures or articles

670-676 Notes, ca. 1893
lists of artists names
677-699
Notes, Gallery Lists, Incomplete, Chicago Exposition 1893
notations concerning the size of the main building and space
allotted to various countries

700-702
Notes, Gallery plans, Palace of Fine Arts, Chicago Exposition
1893
floor plans with square footage for Fine Arts Building

703-708
Notes, 1894
weight list for Glasgow and Danish paintings, lists of artists and
works for St. Louis Exposition

709-714
Notes, St. Louis Exposition
Hanging Plans for Art Gallery, 1894
Numbered diagrams for placement of paintings and for The Water
Color Gallery

715-725
Diagram and Exhibition Plans for St. Louis Exposition, 1895
Includes diagrams for placement of paintings including those by the
Glasgow School and American artists

726-730
Notes, 1896
Diagrams for the American and Glasgow paintings exhibited in Art
Gallery at St. Louis Exposition
731-736  
**Notes, Gallery Plans for St. Louis Exposition, 1897**
Diagrams for placement of paintings with identifying numbers but no corresponding key

737-738  
**Shipping and Storage Information, St. Louis Exposition, 1897**

739-748  
**Notes 1898-1899**
Catalogue data, 1898, miscellaneous artists

**Notes, ca. 1900**
list of nations and types of art contributed to 1876 Centennial vs World's Fair, 1900;

753-757  
**Notes, ca. 1901**
proposal for selling picture, ("The Castelane Scheme")

758-763  
**Notes, 1904-ca. 1909**
list of artists and assignments re: Louisiana Purchase Exposition;
list of masterworks; personal medical notations

764-775  
**Notes by Isabel Kurtz, ca. 1980**
List of Glasgow School paintings at St. Louis Exposition, 1895 and subsequent exhibitions thru 1906 with bibliography

793-1337  
**Notes and Writings, undated and 1872**
of coin collecting; "L'Art Nouveau, The Irresponsible in Art;"
"General Art Notes;" "Christ Before Pilot;" "Christ on Calvary;"
"The Collectors Club with the Bric-a-Brac Club;" draft, information
for visitors to the United States section; "The Metropolitan
Museum on the Question of Sunday Opening;" "English Stately
Homes;" miscellaneous notations on foreign paintings with
comments; "Some Art Talk;" "The First Exhibition of the
Society of American Artists;" poem, "L'Envoy;" draft of account
of Kurtz's trip to Italy, 1881; "Kind Words, The American Art
Union;" untitled draft on American architecture and national
characteristics; "Extract from Semple letter on Protective Art
Society;" "What Is Art?;" lecture course for 1892-93, St Louis
Museum of Art; "Art In St. Louis, 1898" (signed Stuart
MacDonald); Art building exhibit space; poem to Zolnay; list of
names of commissioners from foreign countries; "The St. Louis
World's Fair of 1904" (lecture); Department of Art Awards to
Exhibitors; text for informational circulars to artists

1340-

Notes and Writings, miscellaneous, undated and 1872-1908
"My Last Day in Paris;" "Garfield's Assassination;" "The
"Company" in a Clock;" creative writing exercises; "The
Reviewer;" "A Strange Interview;" "Thurlow Weed" editorial;
"The Stone Fort Club;" "The Festive Microbes" (signed Ch. Breve);
"A Brave Little Soldier, A Story of War Time;" "The Chimpanzee
and the Ass, A Fable;" "The Three Blind Mice, A Sermon;" "A
Month in Massachusetts;" "The Artist and the Philanthropists" [a
short story]
Reel 4823  
Miscellaneous writings, undated and 1872-1908  
miscellaneous poems, untitled and "Will H. Low"; "Madame Quarante-neuf"; "Before the Beginning". "The Banker Prince"; "Good News"; "To A Lady Singing in a Church Choir"; "A Greeting"; "War's Newest Terror"; "Trumpet Calls"; (C. A. Price) "An Ode Owed to Mr. C. M. Kurtz" by J. F. Riley; "The Life of Adam" notebook, "Selections from Original Poems, New York, 1877"; list of questions and answers about an impending election and the outlook for the Republican Party in Pennsylvania [undated]; "Prophetic Spirits" [draft of a report on spiritualist meeting]; "New York, 1880"; "The Aldermen of Man-hat-tan. An Original Comic Opera"; "The Cannibals! An Original Comic Opera" (typescript and 1892 Libretto); miscellaneous poems by Charles M. Kurtz

Reel 4810  
Poem [untitled], August 9, 1889  
written in Charles M. Kurtz's hand, possibly a reflection of his personal situation: "I think you're wrong for letters, you're in debt"
**Series 8: SCRAPBOOKS**

**Reels 4823-4824**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reel 4823</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 253-310   | **Scrapbook I**
1878-1879 clippings from The Courant, The Guardian and other regional newspapers, primarily written by Charles M. Kurtz |
| 311-328   | Miscellaneous loose clippings and reviews |
| 329-337   | "Art Notes" in The Tribune by Charles M. Kurtz beginning October 8, 1882 |
| 338-412   | **Scrapbook II, "Southern Expos. 1885-86" [sic, 1885-88]**
clippings and memorabilia relating to the Southern Exposition at Louisville, Kentucky; clippings from various newspapers of Kurtz's art columns; reviews of exhibitions curated by Kurtz; Exposition Advance Book; reviews of "Christ Before Pilot" travelling exhibition |
| 413-492   | **Scrapbook III, "The Star"**
Feb. 24, 1889-May 14, 1889 list of articles contributed to The Star, with publication dates; clippings of articles that appeared in The Star |
| 493-577   | **Scrapbook IV, "The Star"**
August 26, 1889-April 29, 1890 articles contributed to "The Star" |
| 578-611   | **Scrapbook V**
1891 articles contributed to The World; The New York Recorder; New York Truth; The New York Times |
| 612-695   | **Scrapbook VI**
1890-91 articles contributed to The Star |
| 696-723   | **Scrapbook VII**
1891-1893 articles contributed to Chicago Evening Post; 1894 articles for the New York Herald; The New York Times; 1891-1893 articles for The Chicago Graphic |
| 724-739   | **Miscellaneous Loose Artists Biographies Found in Scrapbook**
1894 articles for The Graphic |
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740-771

**Scrapbook VIII**
1893-1894 St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association clippings and memorabilia

772-812

**Scrapbook IX**
1895 St. Louis Exposition and Music Hall Association memorabilia; clippings: Glasgow School, Danish School

813-910

**Scrapbook X**
1905 dedication of The Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York and related clippings and memorabilia, 1905-1906 including accounts of controversies between Charles M. Kurtz and the Carnegie Institute and the Metropolitan Museum of Art; issue of Die Werkstatt der kunst [in German]

913-960

**Scrapbook XI**
1907 clippings: reviews of modern German Art exhibition and subsequent discussions on sales of duty free pictures; issue of Die Werkstatt der kunst [in German]; reviews of work by Genjiro Yeto, F. Hopkinson Smith.

**Reel 4824**

**Scrapbook XI, continued from previous reel**
001-037
1907-08 clippings and reviews relating to exhibitions at the Albright Art Gallery including: French Impressionists, Photo-Pictorialists, Hugh H. Breckinridge, Timothy Cole, Harrington Mann; the controversy on museums functioning as picture dealers

038-103

**Scrapbook XII**
1908-09 clippings and reviews relating to exhibitions and events at the Albright Art Gallery including: Howard Russell Butler, Photographs of Native American Indians by Edward B. Curtis, Antonio Corsi visit, pictures by Buffalo women, Edmund C. Tarbell, Childe Hassam, F. K., M. Rehn, Wm. M. Chase, Ignacio Zuloaga, lectures by Kurtz on Wm. M. Chase, James Whistler, Spanish art; letter [in Spanish] from J. Sorolla y Bastida, obituaries for Charles M. Kurtz
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Series 9: PRINTED MATTER

Reels 4824-4825

Printed Matter, undated and 1882-1990

Reel 4824:

a. Exposition material, undated & 1884-1904 Southern Exposition, 1885 World's Columbian Exposition, 1893 St. Louis Expositions, 1894-1904

Frames:

Southern Exposition
109-115 Miscellaneous printed memorabilia, 1884-1887 Southern Exposition

117-167 Catalogue, Art Gallery, Southern Exposition, 1885

World's Columbian Exposition
171-185 Miscellaneous printed memorabilia, undated and 1893

186-197 "The Chicago World's Fair" by Joel Cook

198-204 Department of Fine Arts, "Circular No. 3", 1892

205-206 "A Leader and Teacher" [Halsey C. Ives], from The Art Folio

207-223 Miscellaneous printed matter

224-228 "The World's Fair and Industrial Art" by Alfred T. Goshorn from The Engineering Magazine, 1893

233-242 "General Art Comments" [on World's Fair at Chicago] from Current Art & Architecture, 1893

243-249 Catalogue, General Information, Department of Fine Arts, 1893

258-306 Catalogue, priced, World's Columbian Exposition, 1893

307-400 Catalogue, illustrated, with corrections, Official World's Columbian Exposition, 1893

401-514 Catalogue, with dedication to [Charles Ward] "Rhodes", World's Columbian Exposition, Revised Catalogue Department of Fine Arts, 1893
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515-528 Catalogue, Loan Collection Foreign Masterpieces Owned in the United States, World's Columbian Exposition, 1893

529-533 Catalogue, annotated, World's Columbian Exposition, Massachusetts Fine Art Exhibit, 1893

534-538 Catalogue, Exhibits of the State of New York at the World's Columbian Exposition, 1893


St. Louis Exposition

558-568 Miscellaneous printed material


573-576 Miscellaneous printed material


581-583 Magazine article from, St. Louis Life [Glasgow School] Sept., 1895

584-587 Miscellaneous printed matter

588 Magazine article from St. Louis Life, Oct., 1895

589-590 Promotional brochure, St. Louis Exposition

591-604 Printed Exposition material and applications
Catalogue of the Art Department, Saint Louis Exposition, 1894 [annotated with prices and purchasers of pictures; diagram of installation]

Catalogue of the Art Department, Saint Louis Exposition, 1895 [annotated with prices]

Art Department Catalogue, Saint Louis Exposition, 1896 [annotated]

Catalogue, Art Department, Saint Louis Exposition, 1897 [annotated with prices]

Catalogue, Art Department, Saint Louis Exposition, 1898

Catalogue, Art Department, Saint Louis Exposition, 1899

Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904

Brochure on conditions governing the design of an official emblem for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition

Map and related information on Louisiana Purchase Exposition

Duplicate of brochure on conditions governing the design of an official emblem

Circulars of Information Including the Classification and Rules and Regulations of the Department of Art

Miscellaneous printed matter

Circular No. 2 to Artists Eligible to Exhibit in The United States Section

Miscellaneous printed matter

Illustrated handbook, Universal Exposition
Reel 4825

001-79  Handbooks: Regulations Governing the Division of Exhibits of the Universal Exposition, St. Louis. 1904 Universal Exposition, Saint Louis. 1904. General Regulations; Rules and Regulations; Rules and Regulations Governing the System of Awards; Information Concerning Admission of Duty Free Exhibits. Quartine of Animalo, Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights

b. Printed Material, undated & 1883-1990

83-396  Miscellaneous exhibition catalogues: also includes checklists of shows of individual artists, museums, clubs including exhibitions of Charles M. Kurtz's personal collection

397-516  Annotated checklist and catalogue of Charles M. Kurtz estate sale

517-537  Miscellaneous catalogues

c. Printed Material, undated & 1873-1990

540-978  Miscellaneous printed material: artwork for Academy Notes [NAD]; announcements, invitations, promotional material for M. de Munkacsy's Christ Before Pilot; articles on St. Louis School and Museum of Fine Arts; Ladies Art Association; The American Art Association; annual reports; programs; invitations (e.g. Art Institute of Chicago, Saint Louis Museum, The Japan Society, London); circulars, Paris Exposition of 1900; Academy Notes, 1909, [Buffalo Fine Arts Academy]

979-992  posthumous printed tributes to and biographical sketches of the life of Charles M. Kurtz from Academy Notes, The Washington-Jeffersonian and Yale Center for British Art, 1990 ["Charles M. Kurtz and the Glasgow School"]

d. Printed Material, clippings, undated & 1882-1931

995-1075  Clippings include: biographical sketches of Charles M. Kurtz; articles on duty on art; biographical sketches and reviews of Joaquin Sorolla; pages from unidentified French Salon catalogue; reviews of American Academy Notes and The Art Union; press notices from "The Prize Fund Exhibition"; reviews of art exhibitions and related events at the Columbian exposition; St. Louis Exposition; Glasgow exhibitions; opening of Albright Gallery.
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e. Printed Material, calling cards, undated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1078-1133</td>
<td>Calling cards: friends, family, associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136-1147</td>
<td>Calling cards: artists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Series 10: Photographs

Reels 4825-4826

Reel 4825  Photographs, undated

a.  Of Charles Kurtz, family, friends, artists and professional colleagues

Frames

1152-1247

includes photographs of: Wm. Bouguereau, Halsey C. Ives, Chas. H. Miller, Henry W. Ranger, F. K. M. Rehn, Chas. W. Rhodes, [Harry W.?] Watrous, Charles Morris Young (some identifications and other annotations are included with the photographs)

Reel 4826

01-342  b.  Of paintings in the Kurtz collection, undated

Photographs arranged alphabetically by artist

352-405  c.  Of architecture and exhibitions/expositions

Scotland, St. Louis: Louisiana Purchase Exposition grounds and art gallery installation


412-414  miscellaneous installation photographs of exhibitions, NAD [?] and Charles A. Green Gallery
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