

Introduction: The Studio, the Domestic Interior, and the Ideology of Separate Spheres

Both feminist and non-feminist scholars alike have maintained a view of gender in late nineteenth-century paintings that claims women painted interiors and families while downplaying their own professional aspirations, and men painted their activities in the broader world around them. Although each camp views (and values) this dichotomy quite differently, both groups maintain it firmly. However, two significant American paintings from the late nineteenth century defy this dichotomy: *A Friendly Call* (1895, National Gallery of Art, Washington DC) by William Merritt Chase (Plate 1), and *Dans la Nursery (Painting Atelier at Giverny)* (1896–97, Daniel J. Terra Collection), by Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low (Plate 2). The Chase painting lacks the most overt studio symbols and seems merely to represent two women conversing in a parlor. Nonetheless, critical explorations of the work usually minimize the image's domestic associations and consider it primarily a depiction of Chase's Shinnecock Hills studio. The Fairchild¹ painting is more evidently a merging of studio and domestic spaces, depicting a baby in a high chair, two servants, and an easel holding a work in progress.

These paintings refute a simplistic, bifurcated reading of gender in late nineteenth-century art and raise new questions about the role of art and the artist in America. How did artists portray the confluence of work and home lives in an age of dichotomized class and gender constructs? Why did nineteenth-century professional women artists generally fail to paint their own studios? A re-examination of the interpretive significance of the artist's studio in light of gender construction theories nuances our understanding of the art world of the late nineteenth century and illuminates how artists fitted into that world and perceived themselves within it. Although the situation of the artist is in many ways unique, if we can rethink their negotiation of societal roles and norms, we can also rethink the more simplistic representations of gender in nineteenth-century culture more generally.

In this book, I explore the relationships among gender, the studio, and the domestic interior. I use Chase's and Fairchild's paintings as springboards to a discussion that transcends simple distinctions between the work of male and female artists. Fairchild's and Chase's paintings show the artists uniting studio and domestic spaces in a deliberate manner, and thereby problematizing the social dicta of separate spheres. Their paintings are simultaneously reflective and subversive of bourgeois nineteenth-century ideals.

Perhaps because these paintings do not have the clear didacticism of more traditional studio representations, they remain relatively uncharted territories among art historians. In fact, it may be the very ambiguity present in these images that has kept art historians from thoroughly analyzing them from a gender perspective. Why would Chase want to emphasize his studio's domesticity? Why would he highlight his wife's presence in this workspace and downplay his own? Why would Fairchild place equal emphasis on her domestic and professional lives if doing so would call her femininity into question? These questions need to be answered by an analysis that considers such depictions suggestive of deeper meanings rather than simply anomalous to the otherwise clear trajectory of our current understanding of nineteenth-century art. I believe that this book will thus explicate a range of issues central not only to art history but also to broader historical and gender studies.

I intend to prove the value of an interpretation that takes into account the variations *within* gender and class groups rather than corralling them into inflexible and definitive categories. This approach will prove particularly valuable in understanding the identity of artists, whose practices often put them in the unique position of being able to cross over and convolute such categories. The studio was a site wherein male and female models from the lowest classes, in various states of undress, mingled with wealthy patrons, including 'respectable' upper- and middle-class women who would ordinarily eschew such company. Artists were at the center of this otherwise unusual potential for deviation from societal norms.

This project will redress the marginalization of the female artist in at least one case, that of Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low. Her current obscurity reveals all-too-familiar sexist, nationalist, and formalist biases in art history.² Fairchild was a well-known and respected artist at the turn of the century, winning accolades at major national and international competitions in which men predominated. Her marriages to two prominent male artists, Frederick MacMonnies and Will Hicok Low, allowed her to live as a 'proper' bourgeois woman within the art milieu – a relatively uncommon role. Despite these accomplishments, Fairchild's wall painting for the Women's Pavilion at the 1893 World Columbian Exposition is her only work that receives any significant scholarly attention today, and inevitably it is discussed parenthetically in comparison to its pendant painting by Mary Cassatt. In fact, only thirteen scholarly works address Fairchild's work for more than a sentence or two, and

all but seven (an unpublished master's thesis monograph, a six-page article in the *Woman's Art Journal*, an article by Judy Sund on the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, an essay by Derrick Cartwright for an exhibition catalogue, an essay by Kathleen Pyne for an exhibition catalogue, my PhD dissertation, and an article I wrote for *Prospects: An Annual of American Cultural Studies*) refer to her as the minor player in each of these pairs of artists (Fairchild and MacMonnies, Fairchild and Cassatt, Fairchild and Low).³ My book will be the first to discuss Fairchild's work in depth and on its own merits without focusing on a purely or largely biographical perspective. As the focus of my thesis is a rethinking of the paintings of late nineteenth-century artists from a less gender-dichotomized perspective, I will attempt to rescue Fairchild not only from obscurity, but also from simplistic categorization as a marginalized American Impressionist female artist. Only by re-evaluating her painting can we understand the gender complexities negotiated by male and female artists of the time who worked to define and redefine the gender associations of the spaces in which they created their art. Studying Fairchild is thus vital to understanding the impact of gender on late nineteenth-century American art.

The careful reader already may have noticed that the cover image and plate provided in this book give Fairchild's *Dans la nursery* a different title and attribution – to her first husband, Frederick MacMonnies. Unfortunately, as this book was going to press, the Terra Foundation for American Art decided to re-attribute this painting and Fairchild's *C'est la fête à bébé* (*Baby's Birthday*) (Plate 3) to her husband. Both of these images had been sold to the Terra in 1987 as the work of MacMonnies, who was of course at that time (and today) much more well-known than Fairchild. But this attribution was successfully challenged in the late 1980s by Mary Smart and supported in the early 1990s by William Gerdts (the two most prominent scholars to have studied these works at the time). The Terra accepted the reattribution, and you will see evidence of this in every publication and exhibition of the painting after 1988, including an exhibition organized by the Terra itself in 2008 ('Impressionist Giverny: American Painters in France, 1885–1913; Selections from the Terra Foundation for American Art') and its accompanying publications.⁴ In the summer of 2009, as I was gathering together images and permissions for my August 2009 editorial deadline, I contracted with Art Resource, the licensing body for works owned by the Terra Foundation. They had *Dans la nursery* in their databases, listed as such and attributed to Fairchild. I purchased the right to publish the work as well as a digital image of it. I also asked the staff of Art Resource if they could do the same for me with *C'est la fête à bébé* (*Baby's Birthday*), which did not appear in their database. In the later process of securing the permissions for the cover (which naturally required a submitted layout proof, as is often the case) and the second image, I was told by Art Resource staff that the Terra was changing the attributions listed with these

images and, furthermore, had new requirements for licensing – *all* images used would now have to be mocked up in a proof and submitted before the Terra would give permission, even if these works were for interior, black-and white use (something no other organization required for this publication). It is clear that the Terra is extremely concerned about this new/old reattribution, since such complications delay or dissuade the scholar who might work on their collection, and obviously it is my professional duty to follow their demand for captioning the works, even if that demand was made after I purchased *Dans la nursery* publication rights as a work by Fairchild. Nonetheless, I disagree with their attribution, and I will provide my arguments for my belief in Chapter 3, both in the text and in the endnotes. I would like to point out that, as of this writing, the Terra's staff have not contributed one new piece of evidence to support their attribution; in fact, the support their website provides is either cited incorrectly, edited to a point which challenges the source's accuracy in this context, or inconclusive at best.⁵ I am eager to hear a scholarly argument that proves the re-reattribution conclusively – in some ways it might actually make my thesis in this book stronger, because it would take away the one exception that proves the rule, Fairchild's depiction of her studio, and leave us only with the rule (Impressionist women artists did not depict their studios). Or perhaps, given there is no conclusive proof either way, the Terra could attribute the work to *either* Fairchild or MacMonnies – although they are suggesting some ambiguity by requiring that the caption for the image read 'Attributed to' rather than just giving MacMonnies's name. However, I can be forgiven my concern that this sudden, unsupported move merely fits in with a long historical trend this book aims to challenge: when in doubt about a high-quality work of art's authorship, assume a man.

Throughout the pages that follow, I will make comparisons between Chase's and Fairchild's paintings and other contemporary works of art, literature, and criticism in order to show how these paintings fit into their historical context. My goal is to provide a more nuanced and historically accurate interpretation of these paintings, and hence a more complex and accurate view of the artist in society at the time. I will show the artist not as a victim of social norms but as a sometimes-resistant actor within them.

The Studio

Nikolai Cikovsky, in the exhibition catalogue *The Artist's Studio in American Painting*, states that 'the artist's studio is a special subject, quite unlike any other. Most of all, it is special because it is a depiction of that personal, usually private place where art is made, a subject that allows a privileged experience of where artistic creativity occurs.'⁶ Nonetheless, the majority of books that address the studio as a theme in painted representations are exhibition

catalogues rather than independent scholarly texts.⁷ Studio representations can be found throughout art history, but the popularity of the subject grew tremendously in the aftermath of Giorgio Vasari's sixteenth-century emphasis on the artist as a figure of singular importance.⁸ The nineteenth century signaled a particularly dramatic increase in such images, as the exhibition catalogues invariably show.⁹ Most significant to this study is the concomitant codification of such images into nearly standardized rhetorical categories (the garret, the show studio, and the representation of the artist's ideological and artistic influences) that can then be used to interpret the artist's self-image.

Studios occupied an interesting place in the French Impressionist movement, which followed the Barbizon School in its eschewing of rigorously controlled environments in which to produce art. Emphasizing instead the importance of painting what the artist encountered as s/he saw it, Impressionists were less likely than other artists to work solely from a studio. Thus, their studios have not been the focus of art-historical interest in the era. However, Robert Herbert and others have long since given the lie to the notion that Impressionists such as Claude Monet always worked immediately and only outdoors, with none of the careful reworking of canvases and use of studios of more academic artists.¹⁰ So it would appear that art historians have neglected Impressionist studios more than did the Impressionists themselves. Although the relative paucity of studio images by these artists accounts for the limited number of French Impressionist canvases fitting the parameters of my study, it does not explain how these artists might have perceived the studio as a site of self-representation. Certainly we know that setting and subject were important to the Impressionists, both French and American; Edmond Duranty, one of the critics whose defense of French Impressionism in the nineteenth century framed our understanding of it, spoke more than once of the necessity of the environment of the subject to a more accurate presentation of the person within it:

An atmosphere is created thus in each interior, likewise as a certain personal resemblance develops among the objects that fill it. The frequency, massing, and arrangement of mirrors that decorate the apartments, the number of objects that are hung on the walls, all these things have brought something to our homes ... And since we are closely observing nature, we will not separate the person from the background either of the apartment or the street. Never in life do we see him appear against backgrounds that are neutral, empty, and vague. But surrounding him and behind him are the furniture, the fireplaces, the hangings, a wall that expresses his fortune, his class, his profession.¹¹

If the painter were to notice and remark upon his/her human subjects' surroundings as contributory to constructing or revealing their identity, surely a consideration of the painter's own surroundings and how they defined the artist would be a part of that process.

In considering any topic that subsumes both France and America as loci of Impressionist art, one encounters the tradition of viewing the latter as necessarily inferior to the former. Yet Impressionism encompassed a broad number of artists and styles, even in France and even within each exhibition by the Société Anonyme.¹² The majority of successful American artists of the nineteenth century were trained in France, including Chase and Fairchild.¹³ This would suggest a greater continuity between the subject matter of American and French Impressionists. Yet American Impressionists regularly painted images of their studios, while the French did not. Hence, although I will discuss the studio paintings of French artists in Chapter 1 and documentation of French women's studios in Chapter 3, my study will focus on American artists and their images. I will suggest some reasons for the greater number of such paintings by American artists, but I will not focus on this national difference.

Recent re-evaluations of the art of the American Impressionists and Tonalists have also begun to redress longtime disinterest in images such as these, showing that they are not merely derivative of European art (which was seen as more progressive and intellectual). European artists rarely merged studio and domestic spaces in quite the same manner as these and other American artists did.¹⁴ Instead, European studio images follow a more codified standard in which the space is defined as either a struggling worker's garret, a gathering for like-minded aesthetes, or a glittering showplace for the grandeur of Great Art. Because European artists did not emphasize studio domesticity, this subject matter reveals a uniquely American vision. Russell Lynes, Neil Harris, and others long ago established that the relative recentness of an organized and accepted American art world created an important distinction between the self-images of American and European artists and how they presented themselves to society.¹⁵ The Chase and Fairchild paintings offer an opportunity to understand the particularity of the American artists and their work without subsuming them under the influence of European practices and iconographies.

The Domestic Interior and the Ideology of Separate Spheres

Another important site of self-representation in the late nineteenth century for artists and non-artists alike was the domestic interior. A number of primary and secondary sources inform us that among the changes wrought by urbanization and industrialization was a stricter division between the home and the place of work, at least for men.¹⁶ Particularly in the ever-growing middle and upper-middle classes, this relegation of men's work outside of the home and women's work within the home defined the family's class status and success. In 1899, Thorstein Veblen traced the connection

between economic theory and social constructs of gender and class in his *Theory of the Leisure Class*. Veblen pointed out that to raise or maintain their standing in the middle and upper-middle classes, families had to display their acquired wealth in both material possessions and apparent leisure time. Giving the appearance of leisure became the role of the increasingly homebound woman, while her husband put in a stressful day at the office earning that wealth. The domestic interior had become a space that was both public and private, functioning as the inevitably male breadwinner's safe haven from the harrying world of business and industry and as the family display case of both material goods and leisure, created by and forming a backdrop for the female. This study questions what occurs when these two significant spaces, the artist's studio and the domestic interior, are combined.

The ever-expanding reach of gender studies has allowed a more thorough understanding of the way in which public and private spaces are gendered, and particular attention has been paid to this issue in the nineteenth century. The accepted but increasingly embattled stance of the moment is that private spaces were largely gendered feminine and public spaces were largely gendered masculine, at least in the middle and upper classes. Chapter 1 outlines the normative social constructs that led to the general acceptance of this dichotomized gendering of the middle classes, both in the late nineteenth century and in most scholarship on the time period.

The home-based art studio, which is both a professional workspace and a domestic room, inhabits both of the gendered worlds typically discussed, thereby complicating this polarized view. According to the traditional understanding of late nineteenth-century social norms, a man does hard work outside the home and a woman decorates that home using his income. What happens when, as in the case of Chase, a man does his own decorating, and has a 'feminine' parlor for a workspace? What happens when a female artist like Fairchild earns her living as a professional and runs an apparently bourgeois home from the same room?

William Merritt Chase and the Masculine Ideal

William Merritt Chase was born on 1 November 1849 in Nineveh, Indiana.¹⁷ The descendant of prosperous general store owners and farmers, Chase moved with his family to Indianapolis in 1861, where he worked for his father as a shoe salesman. As a teenager, Chase exhibited an unflagging interest in art that led to his enrollment in a small art school, interrupted in 1867 by a brief stint in the Navy. In 1869, Chase left Indianapolis for the National Academy of Design in New York. By 1870, his father's business had failed and Chase rejoined his family in St. Louis, where he opened a studio and

took commissions for paintings. After numerous small prizes proved Chase's talent, several local businessmen paid for him to travel to study in Europe in return for both original paintings and help with European art acquisitions.

Chase arrived in Munich in 1872, after brief trips to London and Paris. There he studied at the Royal Academy with Wilhelm Diez and Karl von Piloty, learning the dark palette, historical subject matter, and bold realism popular there while developing his signature bravura brushstroke. In 1878, Chase returned to the US to take a teaching position at the Art Students League; his fame had begun to grow even before his arrival, due to several popular submissions to both the National Academy of Design's exhibitions and those of its new splinter organization, the Society of American Artists. In 1886, Chase married 20-year-old Alice Gerson, with whom he later had eight children, living with them primarily in New York at a number of addresses until his death in 1916.

Chase's role as a teacher was one he would continue throughout his life, and it gained him as much fame and success as his painting. He taught at every major art school on the east coast, sometimes simultaneously. For example, in the 1890s he taught at his own Chase School (later the New York School of Art), the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, and the Shinnecock summer art school, commuting to each in turn. He also led classes in various locations in Europe, returning there regularly throughout his life.

One result of Chase's teaching was that he became proficient and enthusiastic in his use of a wide variety of media in addition to oil, particularly pastel and watercolor. By founding or joining in organizations such as the Tile Club and Painters in Pastel, Chase lent his considerable social and artistic cachet to media that had previously been considered the province of amateur and women artists. Similarly, he did not restrict himself in terms of subject matter, painting portraits, still lifes, interiors, and landscapes at all points in his career. Some time after his departure from Munich and possibly in response to criticism of his 'muddy' canvases, Chase began to lighten his palette to a more Impressionistic emphasis on light and bright colors, although he never totally gave up the darker tones of his youth when the painting's subject seemed to demand them.¹⁸ Chase's versatility and skill garnered him the status of a master technician, able to paint a beautiful image quickly and to general satisfaction. This quality was occasionally used against him, however, as he was sometimes criticized for being merely an exceptional manual worker of sorts with little in the way of deep thinking to recommend his paintings – a criticism often directed at women artists by critics from the Renaissance to the present.¹⁹

Viewing Europe as the center of the artistic world, Chase appointed himself a sort of cultural ambassador for Americans, insisting that his students travel to Europe if at all possible. Chase was particularly enamored of European openness to all things aesthetic as well as European artists' more bohemian

way of life, and he did his best to represent these perspectives when at home. Notorious for his omnivorous collecting mania, Chase brought back as many European souvenirs as he could manage, including paintings by contemporary artists as well as the bric-a-brac he felt should fill his studios with the correct atmosphere for making and showing his art.

Fortunately, Chase had plenty of studios to fill. Gallati points out that one can follow Chase's fortunes by the number of studios he kept at any given time: in 1909, for example, she notes three.²⁰ Chase's studios, particularly the Tenth Street studio, served not merely as workspaces but as showplaces where he could promote both his own art and art in general to an increasingly enthusiastic American audience.²¹ Filled with every kind of decorative object imaginable, as well as visitors of divergent origins, Chase's studios were a significant part of his self-construction as an artist.

A Friendly Call (Plate 1), painted in 1896 and now hanging in the National Gallery in Washington DC, depicts two women sitting on a banquette, engaged in conversation. They are in a room that appears to be a parlor decorated in a typical, late nineteenth-century style. A study of Chase's other works of this period reveals that the setting is actually specific: Chase's studio in his summer home in Shinnecock, Long Island. How Chase, as a man, could negotiate such 'feminine' territory – the domestic interior, women's lives, their etiquette and conversation, the purportedly superficial attractiveness of Chase's depiction – without losing his masculinity and that of his workspace, is the subject of Chapter 2. I begin with the case study of a male artist because, although few scholars have noted the potential for a feminized reading of his studio images, the images themselves have been rather thoroughly discussed, providing a way to see how such images were framed (both at the time and now). I will follow with a case study of a female artist who has, perhaps unsurprisingly, received almost no scholarly notice for her studio image. This comparison might begin to balance such a one-sided view of the history of late nineteenth-century studio paintings, one that gives preference to both male artists and masculinity. I am most interested throughout the book in the tricky positioning of gender characteristics associated with the feminine (for both men and women) in a field (art making) and spaces (the studio and domestic interior) whose makeup was largely determined and delimited by men with a stake in maintaining their own definitions of both sex and gender, however much those might shift. The art world, both in the nineteenth century and today, is dominated by a patriarchal canon and patriarchal perspectives that are thoroughly documented and form the basis of much of the discipline of art history, and my desire is to challenge rather than reify these. For those wishing an even greater emphasis on masculinity than that presented here, excellent work on the masculinity of the late nineteenth-century male American artist exists in the work of Sarah Burns, Martin Berger, and James C. Boyles. I take the stance here and in general

that masculinity is as fully multiple as femininity, and that masculinity and femininity are not tied to specific genders, sexes, or sexualities. In the late nineteenth century, the prevailing cultural view was that men should be masculine and heterosexual and women should be feminine and largely asexual. Throughout this book, I will be focusing on the norms of the time and how these artists negotiated those norms and performed, in their work, the expected identities – and how both male and female artists did in fact need to perform and negotiate those identities (and others), and how the identities they depicted in their works (both of their studios and of domestic interiors more generally) were gendered. However, like Abigail Solomon-Godeau, I worry that certain representations (both visual and textual, including the art-historical scholarship that discusses both) that emphasize the multiplicity of masculinity ‘suggest a colonization of femininity, so that what has been rendered peripheral and marginal in the social and cultural realm, or actively devalued, is effectively incorporated within the compass of masculinity’ and that such colonization/devaluation/incorporation only serves to reaffirm the masculinity of the spectator and my reader (male or female).²² I certainly hope I have not fallen into that trap here by including lengthy discussions of William Merritt Chase’s potentially feminine performance in Chapter 2 and the use of the female body by male artists in Chapter 4.

Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low and the Feminine Ideal

Mary Fairchild was born in 1858 in New Haven, Connecticut.²³ Shortly thereafter, her family moved to St. Louis, Missouri, where Fairchild eventually began a career as a third-grade teacher. Dissatisfied with her vocation, Fairchild began taking classes in 1885 at the St. Louis School of Fine Arts, then under the direction of Halsey C. Ives. There she edited an art journal, *Palette Scrapings*, and petitioned Ives for the right of the women’s classes to draw from the nude. Impressed by her drive, Ives created a scholarship for Fairchild to travel to Paris and study at the Académie Julian for three years. At Julian’s, Fairchild studied under William Bouguereau, Jules Lefebvre, and Tony Robert-Fleury. As soon as 1886, Fairchild was exhibiting in the Paris Salons and finding support for her work among both mentors and peers. In 1887, Fairchild began working with Carolus-Duran, whose technique and palette were more light and loose than those of her previous instructors. That fall, she met Frederick MacMonnies at an expatriate Thanksgiving dinner. They became engaged within months, but were unable to marry until Fairchild’s scholarship (which stipulated that she could not marry during its course) ended in September of 1888. During this time, Fairchild spent some of her scholarship money on a bigger studio that she shared with MacMonnies, who saved money by sleeping there.

Like Chase, Fairchild sent works to the US as well, exhibiting both in St. Louis and at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts and the Art Institute of Chicago. Fairchild painted in a variety of styles during the 1880s and 1890s, producing plein air Impressionist works, decorative panels, neoclassical murals, and copies of Renaissance works at the Louvre. She took commissions for these copies, and combined these with her numerous awards for her original works to support both herself and her husband, whose sculptures were beginning to garner popularity and financial rewards. Their fortunes permanently improved when they both won commissions to create major pieces for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. Fairchild's mural depicting *Primitive Woman* (1892–93, whereabouts unknown), to be placed high above the floor of the Women's Pavilion in one of the two tympana of the main exhibition space, was a great success. Popular magazines lauded the mural's design and content, and Fairchild returned to Paris a celebrity. MacMonnies had received similar praise for his sculptural group in the Great Basin, so the couple was able to invest in more commodious housing, purchasing both a townhouse in Paris at 44, rue des Sèvres and renting, and later purchasing, housing in Giverny. While she continued to exhibit both at the Salon of the Société des Artistes Français and the newer, secessionist Salon of the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts, Fairchild also gave birth to three children: Berthe Hélène in 1895, Marjorie Eudora in 1897, and Ronald, born in 1899 and surviving only for a year.

While rearing her children, Fairchild served as president of the American Woman's Art Association of Paris from 1900 to 1903. During those years, Fairchild was particularly successful, winning a gold medal at the Exposition Universelle in Paris in 1900 for *Roses and Lilies* (*Roses et lys*) (1897, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen) (Fig. I.1); garnering praise as one of the finest contributors to the Chicago Art Institute's fourteenth annual exhibition; capturing the bronze medal at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York; earning the gold medal at Dresden's International Exhibition in 1901; and winning the Julia A. Shaw prize for the most meritorious work by an American woman artist at the annual exhibition of the Society of American Artists in 1902.

In 1909, Fairchild's husband Frederick sued for divorce in a provincial French court, winning custody of the children, but allowing Fairchild to take them with her to a new apartment in Paris. Less than a year later, Fairchild remarried the recently widowed artist and writer Will Hicok Low. They left France with Fairchild's daughters and moved to Lawrence Park (a suburb of Bronxville), New York, where they lived for the rest of Fairchild's life. Fairchild continued to exhibit, albeit almost exclusively in the US, until shortly before her death. The majority of her works after about 1915 were portraits and, with the exception of a few works (primarily landscapes) Fairchild's palette and style became gradually less Impressionistic and more



I.1 Mary L. Fairchild MacMonnies (later Low) (American, 1858–1946), *Roses and Lilies (Roses et Lys)*, 1897. Oil on canvas, 52 $\frac{3}{8}$ " H \times 69 $\frac{1}{4}$ " W (133 \times 176 cm). Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen, France. Photo: Erich Lessing/Art Resource, New York

Academic. She died in 1946 in Bronxville, considerably less famous than she had been at the peak of her career, from 1886 to 1915.

Chapter 3 begins with an analysis of Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low's *Dans la nursery*, painted in 1896–97 (Terra Foundation for American Art, Daniel J. Terra Collection) (Plate 2). This image shares with Chase's *A Friendly Call* the conjoining of studio and domestic spaces. The title, given by Fairchild when she exhibited the painting at the Salon National des Beaux Arts in 1899, seems to emphasize the domestic aspects of the image, much like Chase's painting. However, despite the title, Fairchild seems to have given equal emphasis within the scene to the domestic and studio aspects of the setting. By 'failing' to disguise her own professional status in the image, Fairchild makes a radical move – creating the only painting of a female artist's studio as a site of artistic creation by a prominent woman artist of the late nineteenth century.

Fairchild and Chase share some obvious similarities. Both studied and worked in both the US and Europe, showing their paintings with equal regularity at European salons and American exhibitions. Hence they were

active in the international art scene and represented the transcontinental nature of the Western art world in the late nineteenth century. Yet neither artist relinquished his or her deepest ties to the US, through either citizenship or artistic style, as many other Americans did. Additionally, both artists were actively involved in their family lives and used their children as models in a majority of their paintings; both also actively labored to maintain a certain status in society through their appearance and acquaintances.²⁴ Thus, both artists reflect the bourgeois family life that appears to fit the normative standards of their time and class.

Gendering Artists and Their Subjects

Previously, art historians have articulated a gendered division of subject matter between male and female artists. Griselda Pollock's landmark essay, 'Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity,' serves as both the first and fullest discussion of this issue from a feminist perspective. Pollock argues that instead of viewing women Impressionists as outside the development and rhetoric of modernity because of their failure to depict its most representative sites (cafés, bars, and other 'public' spaces where bourgeois women dared not enter), we should note their restricted, chiefly domestic realm as another, significant and thus equally representative, space of modernity that these women were particularly adept at analyzing.²⁵ This argument opened the door to a desperately needed reconsideration of the art of female Impressionists as well as the appropriate demand that the domestic life of women in this period be understood as itself modern and the women living it as conscious, active agents in their experience of it. One unfortunate legacy of the article has been, however, that its followers occasionally oversimplify Pollock's reading into a biologically binary approach. According to Robert Herbert, works by women Impressionists are 'easily distinguished' from those of their male counterparts, who tended to highlight the figures over their surroundings and fail to note the expressive capabilities of household furnishings.²⁶ Although both Pollock and Herbert have given critical and aesthetic value to the paintings of women Impressionists in their analyses, they still maintained the sharp gendered distinction of paintings once used to devalue those works by women. As a result, the division of subject matter between male and female Impressionists has often seemed unquestionable, and it has certainly become the 'new canonical' reading of their images. Yet neither of the two paintings under consideration in this study exactly fit that division. Photographs of Chase's studio clearly indicate his omission of elements that would have made the work setting of *A Friendly Call* more evident; he obviously chose to emphasize his studio's domestic qualities in the painting. Fairchild's inclusion of both domestic and art-making elements in her painting of a room that did not

need to contain both keeps the image from contributing to her effacement as a professional artist in favor of her socially predicated domestic role. The melding of domestic and studio spaces served to reinforce the linkage between women and artists – both were relegated the duty of maintaining society's creativity and beauty. Yet Chase's painting emphasizes the domestic and societal elements in his workspace over his own masculine labor, while Fairchild emphasizes both her labor and the labor of the other women of her household in equal proportion to the domestic and artistic elements. Therefore Chase's image seems to confirm feminine associations even more than Fairchild's.

As both Chase and Fairchild were successful, well-known artists whose works were widely considered typical of the prevailing styles and subject matter of their time, one cannot locate these two paintings in the margins of dominant cultural modes. Thus it seems that a more considered accounting of the domestic home studio or its absence is needed, and the most fruitful avenue for study of the complex images that represent it is from a gender and queer studies perspective.

The methodology I use, a melding of social history, contemporary feminist theory, queer theory, and formal analysis, is useful in moving past the tendency all scholars struggle with to see a time period or artifact as in some way hermetic and cleanly representative of a historical 'truth.' By looking through more than one lens, I try to avoid letting any one structure my view. New methodologies in academia can be powerfully controlling, and they can also be used inappropriately. While absolute care is required to avoid wildly speculative or erroneous conclusions, scholars should consider the usefulness of new approaches, particularly those that broaden, rather than narrow, the scope of study. Rather than link each time period with a constituent methodology, we should share our research and critical perspectives across materials and fields of study.

In the past three decades, queer theory has been particularly useful in finding a new entry into the assignation of particular qualities to gender categories. Traditionally, both societal norms and gender theorists promoted fixed essential gender identifications based on sexual binaries. Rather than accept the consequent status of marginalized 'Other,' queer theorists such as Judith Butler and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick have articulated more flexible and fluid definitions of gender. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Butler argues that feminists who attempt to locate universal commonalities among women end up forcing them into the same rigid gender bifurcations that allow for sexist valuations of women.²⁷ Further, these strictly defined categories are not inclusive of all women's lives, practices, and self-images. As Butler points out, there are times when one (male or female) might say that s/he is acting, feeling or living more or less 'like a woman' or 'like a man.' Butler thus recommends that we risk the incoherence of gender identity,

acknowledging our own and others' identities as being performed along a continuum of potential identities rather than being coherently fixed to a certain essential set of qualities based on biological or socialized difference.²⁸ Butler uses the term 'performance' to emphasize that she is not just casting gender and sex against each other, in the sense that one's gender and one's sex might not coincide. Instead, she sees individuals as performing a variety of constantly changing, imitative selves, with the string of performances 'constitut[ing] and contest[ing] the coherence of that "I."²⁹ Adopting, imitating, and performing a role or a set of behaviors or identifications often results in making the dominant conventions (of gender, sexuality, or any identity category) obvious as conventions, rather than inherent, predestined facts.

Although the late nineteenth century certainly seems to be a time in which polarized roles were dictated by social norms in an extreme manner, attention to the actual people who lived with those norms suggests room for a more performative reading of their gendered identities. After all, the strictness of the boundaries for gendered behavior in the nineteenth century certainly stemmed not merely from the changing division of labor in the industrial era but also from concerns that the greater social freedom brought on by increased wealth and leisure time was carrying with it a greater threat to such divisions. If middle-class women could buy garments that imitated those of the upper classes in department stores and men like Oscar Wilde could find generally appreciative audiences for their feminized personas, those who wished to maintain societal divisions would have to work much more diligently at defining them.³⁰ Thinking of the late nineteenth century's normative standards for gendered behavior as open to performative play, parody, and subversion by those who experienced them, whether subconsciously or consciously, expands our understanding of those moments, such as certain painted representations, in which the normative standards do not appear to be met coherently. Support for such an interpretation is found in the period itself, not just with the examples of Wilde and Rosa Bonheur, but in the words of Fairchild herself, defending her use of nude figures in her mural for the Women's Pavilion of the 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition: 'I think that one of the objects of the Woman's Building is surely to show what I may call our "virility", which has always been conspicuous in its absence.'³¹ While at first Fairchild's conflation of virility with depiction of the nude seems binaristic and normative, her desire to display virility in her own work suggests that even this seemingly *über-*'feminine' nineteenth-century woman could imagine performing a complex self.

Late nineteenth-century American artists provide a challenging but relevant focus for studying these broader social constructions and their subversion. By this time in the US, artists had achieved a modicum of respectability and influence, with well-known male artists belonging to prestigious and exclusive social clubs like New York's Century Club. As

both Sarah Burns and Russell Lynes show, artists of the 1880s and 1890s were a confident bunch, believing in their specific worth to society 'apart from the fusty men of merchandise.'³² In many ways it could be argued that they represented the Gilded Age itself – the period of American history between the Civil War and the Progressive Era, roughly 1865–1900 – through their emphasis on the aesthetic (which could be read both positively and negatively as artifice, (re)creating the lily or merely gilding it), their need for and association with wealthy donors made wealthier by the period's rapid economic growth, and their status as both a sign of change and a sign of its potential corruptions – of gender norms, class hierarchies, and what constituted labor. These artists were also quite diverse, providing the ever-informed public with a variety of personalities and aesthetic interests rather than a united front. Burns notes that although the American artist's standing as a celebrity developed gradually throughout the course of the nineteenth century, the last decades (with 'the machinery of American publicity ... in high gear' and artists one of its favorite subjects) saw a more significant shift in public attention from the art to the artist, and particularly the artist's personality. 'Whether courting publicity or shunning it, the artist of the period had to confront an unavoidable fact of modern life: in addition to being a producer of aesthetic commodities, he (or she) had to become a commodity as well,' and artists' responses to that fact varied significantly, from James Abbott McNeill Whistler's studied aesthetic intellectualism to Winslow Homer's hermit-like retreat to the rugged landscape of Maine.³³

Thus, to come to a single, coherent image of the American artist in late nineteenth-century society is impossible. But certain anxieties come through in the literature, paintings, and popular culture of the time to give a sense of the grounds artists negotiated. As Burns argues, one of the first problems male artists had to face was the tendency of others to link their work, so associated with leisure and dependent upon the earning power of businessmen for success, with women and femininity. Although male artists certainly had greater freedom, mobility, and political and social power than women, they had to engage in what Burns has called 'outselling the feminine,' associating their extravagant studios with sales strategies and asserting biological differences in critical analyses of art to avoid their being connected with women's spheres.³⁴ Female artists had to face the same possibility of being unsexed or seen as manly for their efforts in a masculine realm. The most successful American women artists usually dealt with this problem by emphasizing their femininity, as Burns has argued Cecilia Beaux did.³⁵ American periodicals at the end of the century painted both female and male artists with a broad, critical brush, depicting them as trivial, faddish, and entertaining in their abnormality.³⁶ Contemporary author Kate Chopin captured similar feelings through the various social responses to Edna Pontellier's studio in *The Awakening* (1899). As Edna sacrifices her

marriage and family for art, moving from her home to her studio, society condemns her for being frivolous, irrational, and even insane. How do we reckon with these conflicting views of the late nineteenth-century artist, a figure of adulation and mockery, influence and questionable status?

One way to pay tribute to this complexity is to address the work of these artists in a manner that avoids the pitfalls of categorization that would make such a conversation simpler but less meaningful. As both William Merritt Chase and Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low steer their images away, even briefly, from the normative gender identifications and associations of the late nineteenth century, they form the ideal focus of a study that seeks to allow for greater play in the representation of the artist's identity.

By conflating their domestic and working spaces, Chase and Fairchild gave that location and themselves a complexity that the contemporary view of gendered bourgeois space would not otherwise have allowed. William Merritt Chase and Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low, by combining work and home lives in the most extreme manner, raise a specter of gender performativity that should not be restricted to the twentieth century. Chase was the aesthetic director of his home as well as the one who financed its fittings, and, at least at his Shinnecock Hills home, worked in the same place as he rested. Fairchild was painter, mother, and society wife simultaneously, and occasionally supported her first husband with her art making and student funding. Both artists crossed the physical borders of gendered spaces and the invisible borders of societal constructs to present an image of the artist's studio as a more complex site, not so easily divided into poles of masculinity and femininity as is so often asserted.

Notes

1. I will refer to Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low as Fairchild throughout the book, to avoid confusion with her first husband (who will be referred to as MacMonnies) or her second husband (who will be referred to as Low). It is tempting to reverse the standard in literature on Fairchild and her contemporaries and refer to her as MacMonnies or Low and to her husbands as Frederick and Will.
2. I believe Fairchild suffers not just from the usual lack of documentation that accompanies women artists, so well described by Linda Nochlin, Tamar Garb, Roszika Parker, and Griselda Pollock among others, but also from the devaluation of American art before abstraction generally, and the devaluation of American Impressionism in particular. Only since the 1990s have art historians begun to redress the bias that favored the European avant-garde until Abstract Expressionism's advent, and even since then the focus has continued to remain almost exclusively on the work of male painters.
3. See Kirstin Ringelberg, 'No Room of One's Own: Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low, Berthe Morisot, and *The Awakening*,' in *Prospects: An Annual of American Cultural Studies*, vol. 28 (2004), 127–54; and Ringelberg, 'Risking the Incoherence of Identity: Locating Gender in the Late Nineteenth-Century Paintings of the Artist's Home Studio' (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2000). Most useful for those interested in Fairchild from a biographical perspective are two works by Mary Smart: 'Sunshine and Shade: Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low,' *Woman's Art Journal*, vol. 4 (Fall 1983/Winter 1984), 20–25; and *A Flight with Fame: The Life and Art of Frederick MacMonnies (1863–1937)* (Madison CT: Sound View Press, 1996). Fairchild is

most often discussed critically in terms of her mural for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago – see especially Judy Sund, 'Columbus and Columbia in Chicago, 1893: Man of Genius Meets Generic Woman,' *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 65, no. 3 (September 1993), 443–66. For the most recent information on the whereabouts of the mural, see Sally Webster, *Eve's Daughter/Modern Woman: A Mural by Mary Cassatt* (Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press, 2004); see also Carolyn Kinder Carr and Sally Webster, 'Mary Cassatt and Mary Fairchild MacMonnies: The Search for Their 1893 Murals,' in *American Art*, vol. 8, no.1 (Winter 1994), 53–70. More typical in mentioning Fairchild is David Sellin's *Americans in Brittany and Normandy 1860–1910* (exhibition catalogue, Phoenix AZ: Phoenix Art Museum, 1982), in which Cassatt figures extensively in the section on Giverny, even though she did not paint there. Fairchild, who lived and painted there for more than ten years, is briefly described as 'his wife, the painter Mary Fairchild' (p. 73). For contemporary (and hence more laudatory) accounts of Fairchild and her work, the Mary Smart/Frederick MacMonnies Papers at the Archives of American Art are invaluable. Fairchild collected a scrapbook of articles on both her husband and herself that can be found there, including the article on Fairchild by Eleanor E. Greateorex in *Godey's Magazine* (May 1893), 630. A number of recent exhibition catalogues show Fairchild's *Dans la nursery* (attributed as such); Cartwright's textual contribution within one of these is the lengthiest (and is discussed further in the footnotes to Chapter 4), followed by Kathleen Pyne's 'Americans in Giverny: The Meaning of a Place,' in Katherine M. Bourguignon, ed., *Impressionist Giverny: A Colony of Artists, 1885–1915* (Giverny (France): Musée d'Art Américain Giverny, 2007), pp. 45–55. Pyne, transitioning from a discussion of how MacMonnies's role as teacher drew female students to Giverny, begins her treatment of both Fairchild's painting and her contributions to life in Giverny with 'Now family figures – the wife, Mary Fairchild MacMonnies, herself a painter, and the children – or a professional model imported from Paris ...' (p. 49), but the text that follows is appropriately even-handed. There is a brief entry on Fairchild, with a reproduction and short discussion of *Dans la nursery*, in *Americans in Paris 1860–1900*, a catalogue for the major exhibition which traveled to the National Gallery in London, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. In neither the exhibition nor the catalogue was Fairchild forced to play second fiddle, and this exhibition probably resulted in the largest audience this work has had since the turn of the previous century (there remains a link to the work on the Metropolitan Museum of Art's website, again, still crediting the work to Fairchild, at least as of August 2009). Nonetheless, the textual discussions of her work that accompanied the show were brief and based wholly on existing scholarship.

4. See, for example, Katherine M. Bourguignon, 'Impressionist Giverny: American Painters in France,' in *American Art Review*, vol. 20, no. 3 (2008), 100–13.
5. On their collections pages for each of the images (the only published sources making the re-attribution argument at the time this book went to press), it is stated that the attribution has been debated. On the page for '*Painting Atelier at Giverny*' (*Dans la nursery*), an 1896 edition of the *Chicago Evening Post* is cited as supporting the change back to MacMonnies, stating that the reviewer in that text describes *Dans la nursery* differently than what appears in our painting. This is not necessarily the case as the reviewer states clearly that the described work is as yet untitled; additionally, the reviewer describes a work depicting a nursery scene by Fairchild – who submitted two differently titled 'nursery' works to various exhibitions, so this may in fact be describing the other or even an unknown third, as the work matching this description is at present lost or missing. It is also important to note that MacMonnies never submitted or documented any works with a similar title or setting, so there is no reason to believe that if one work by Fairchild is not the same as that described, that we must be seeing an entirely undocumented work by MacMonnies. See <<http://www.terraamericanart.org/collections/code/emuseum.asp?style=single¤trecord=1&page=seealso&profile=objects&searchdesc=Baby%20Berthe%20in%20a%20High%20Chair...&searchstring=id/,/is/,/2/,/false/,/true&newvalues=1&rawsearch=id/,/is/,/537/,/false/,/true&newstyle=single&newprofile=objects&newsearchdesc=Atelier%20at%20Giverny&newcurrentrecord=1&module=objects>>. On their page for *Baby Berthe in a High Chair with Toys* (*C'est la fête à bébé*), they cite a source they claim states that that painting was 'a large and 'elaborate' painting, not like this intimately scaled canvas' (<<http://www.terraamericanart.org/collections/code/emuseum.asp?style=single¤trecord=1&page=seealso&profile=objects&searchdesc=Atelier%20at%20Giverny...&searchstring=id/,/is/,/537/,/false/,/true&newvalues=1&rawsearch=id/,/is/,/2/,/false/,/true&newstyle=single&newprofile=objects&newsearchdesc=Baby%20Berthe%20in%20a%20High%20Chair%20with%20Toys&newcurrentrecord=1&module=objects>>). However, the source cited in the footnote below that interpretation is cited incorrectly (Helen Cole never wrote an essay entitled 'A Western Art Collection' – rather, this citation should have the title of 'American Artists in Paris'). Unlike the Terra, I give this quote in full in Chapter 3 (and also did so in my dissertation, which the Terra staff have been aware of since 2000). I will cite the relevant sentence here, with my own added emphasis: 'All these are of a size and elaborateness of composition that prove that the painter will not sink into the mother.' Cole is clearly talking about more than one work, not this specific one, and also is not so specific about the size and elaborateness to be conclusive in any

- way. What is the size and elaborateness that proves one is a professional, not a dabbler? It should be kept in mind that one of Fairchild's many professional artistic successes involved the painting of miniatures (see Fig. 3.2). See Helen Cole, 'American Artists in Paris,' in *Brush and Pencil*, vol. 4, no. 4 (July 1899), 199–202; esp. 201.
6. 'Introduction,' n.p.
 7. There are books that cover in greater detail specific studios or sites for studios, such as Annette Blaugrund's *The Tenth Street Studio Building: Artist-Entrepreneurs from the Hudson River School to the American Impressionists* (exhibition catalogue, Southampton NY: Parrish Art Museum, 1997); and John Milner's *The Studios of Paris: The Capital of Art in the Late Nineteenth Century* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1988). However, both books emphasize the actual studios and their features over their representation in painting, as does the more general and helpful *Imagination's Chamber: Artists and Their Studios* by Alice Bellony-Rewald and Michael Peppiatt (Boston MA: Little, Brown, 1982) and the more recent but brief *Artists in Their Studios: Images from the Smithsonian's Archives of American Art* by Liza Kirwin with Joan Lord (New York NY: Collins Design, 2007). The studio as a painted subject has been pursued exclusively in either articles or exhibition catalogues such as: David B. Cass, *In the Studio: The Making of Art in Nineteenth-Century France* (Williamstown MA: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1981); Ronnie L. Zakon, *The Artist and the Studio in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (Cleveland OH: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1978); and *The Artist's Studio in American Painting 1840–1883* (Allentown PA: Allentown Art Museum, 1983). By contrast, the artist's self-portrait is more widely and deeply considered.
 8. See particularly Bellony-Rewald and Peppiatt, *Imagination's Chamber*, for a history of the studio.
 9. Bellony-Rewald and Peppiatt's text, which is the most comprehensive on the subject, has three chapters on pre-nineteenth-century studios and seven that cover the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Zakon's catalogue (*The Artist and the Studio*) focuses on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries exclusively, describing them as the most significant for such depictions due to the changing position and status of the artist in society. Cass states that the nineteenth century produced more pictures of artists' studios 'than the art of any previous century' (*In the Studio*, p. 7), also linking it to the changing status of artists and the changes in the art market that I discuss in Chapter 2.
 10. Robert L. Herbert, 'Method and Meaning in Monet,' in *Art in America*, vol. 67, no. 5 (September 1979), 90–108.
 11. My own translation, from the following: '*... une atmosphère se crée ainsi dans chaque intérieur, de même qu'un air de famille entre tous les meubles et les objets qui le remplissent. La fréquence, la multiplicité et la disposition des glaces dont on orne les appartements, le nombre des objets qu'on accroche aux murs, toutes ces choses ont amené dans nos demeures ... Et puisque nous accolons étroitement la nature, nous ne séparerons plus le personnage du fond d'appartement ni du fond de rue. Il ne nous apparaît jamais, dans l'existence, sur des fonds neutres, vides et vagues. Mais autour de lui et derrière lui sont des meubles, des cheminées, des tentures de murailles, une paroi qui exprime sa fortune, sa classe, son métier ...*' See Louis Emile Edmond Duranty, *La Nouvelle peinture à propos du groupe d'artistes qui expose dans les galeries du Durand-Ruel* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1876); reproduced in *The New Painting: Impressionism 1874–1886* (San Francisco CA: Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, 1986), pp. 477–84, with an English translation by Charles S. Moffett on pp. 37–49. Moffett's translation can also be found excerpted in *Art in Theory 1815–1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood with Jason Gaiger (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 576–85. The phrase '*et puisque nous accolons étroitement la nature*' is translated by Moffett as 'And, as we are solidly embracing nature,' but I believe Duranty is here referring to his previous paragraph, in which he discusses the way that Academic artists were combining various distinct details to create images that were not true to the subject as we might encounter it in lived experience. Duranty thus uses *accoler* to signal instead a close joining or uniting of things normally found together or existing in the same atmosphere, rather than a unity of dislocated parts; this is slightly different than the mere (yet 'solid') embracing of nature that Moffett's translation suggests. It is the close, direct observation of nature and its truthful visual re-presentation that Duranty finds missing if one ignores context or separates context from subject.
 12. All the members of the Société Anonyme, the Anonymous Society of artists who came to be known as Impressionists, have at some point or another been considered Impressionists, yet one struggles to locate stylistic and other similarities between the works of Edgar Degas, Berthe Morisot, and Camille Pissarro.
 13. Training in France or somewhere in Europe was considered vital to the development of the American artist, whose homeland was often viewed as indifferent if not hostile to art making as a career. When naming the most famous American artists of the late nineteenth century, this

paradigm is evident: James Abbott McNeill Whistler, John Singer Sargent, Mary Cassatt, Lilla Cabot Perry, Frederick MacMonnies, and Mary Fairchild MacMonnies Low were all expatriates for most or all of their artistic careers. Winslow Homer, Thomas Eakins, William Merritt Chase, Cecilia Beaux, and all of the members of The Ten spent years in European academies and schools.

14. Two notable exceptions are Swedish artist Carl Larsson (*Ateljé-idyll*, 1885, Nationalmuseum Stockholm) and Alfred Stevens, whose studio paintings will be discussed in later chapters. Their studio images differ significantly from the type discussed in my book (Larsson's barely evokes the room and could depict any interior; Stevens's are highly fantastical paintings that are clearly not intended to depict his own studio as it actually existed). The standard European studio images will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1.
15. See particularly Russell Lynes, *The Art-Makers of Nineteenth-Century America* (New York NY: Atheneum, 1970) and Lynes, *The Tastemakers* (New York NY: Harper, 1954); and Neil Harris, *The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years 1790–1860* (New York NY: George Braziller, 1966). Also useful are J. Meredith Neil, *Toward a National Taste: America's Quest for Aesthetic Independence* (Honolulu HI: University Press of Hawaii, 1975); and James Thomas Flexner et al., *The Shaping of Art and Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972). Neil, whose focus is more strictly upon literature, puts the shift to increasing acceptance of a national interest in aesthetics and the arts earlier, at the turn of the eighteenth century.
16. The growth of cities and the gradual development of the suburbs often placed a new physical distance between some men's work and their homes, eventually aided by transportation developments like the streetcar and subway, which then allowed some families to live even farther from the businessman's work. This time also marked the growing geographical separation between business and residential areas within the urban core.
17. For information about Chase, see the following biographies: Katherine Metcalf Roof, *The Life and Art of William Merritt Chase* [1917] (New York NY: Hacker Art Books, 1975); and Keith L. Bryant, Jr., *William Merritt Chase: A Genteel Bohemian* (Columbia MO: University of Missouri Press, 1991). See also Ronald G. Pisano, *A Leading Spirit in American Art: William Merritt Chase 1849–1916* (Seattle WA: Henry Gallery Association, 1983); Pisano's *William Merritt Chase* (New York NY: Watson-Guptill, 1979); and Barbara Dayer Gallati, *William Merritt Chase* (New York NY: Harry N. Abrams, 1995). There is a tremendous amount of literature on Chase both from his own time and now; however, he is relatively unknown to lay people today. Nonetheless, a glance at any art magazine of the late nineteenth century reveals his stature as one of the most influential and respected artists in American art.
18. Pisano notes that the quick and visible brushwork of the Munich years, combined with the lighter palette he believes Chase developed on plein air painting trips in Belgium, led to Chase's being seen as an Impressionist, despite his never having specifically studied under a French Impressionist artist. Pisano also notes that Chase was fond of the work of Eugène Boudin (Monet's mentor), was familiar with Manet before 1881, and probably saw the American Art Association's 1886 exhibition of Impressionist works from Durand-Ruel's collection. See Pisano, *A Leading Spirit*, pp. 149–50. Pisano thus argues that Chase's style is international, not having come from one particular source.
19. Giorgio Vasari used this type of criticism in writing about Sofonisba Anguissola in the sixteenth century, and its use was common in the nineteenth century as well: women, being of lesser intelligence (for whatever reason), fitted the patriarchal arguments of the time, and were capable of mimicry and manual skill but not invention of the type that showed intellect.
20. Gallati, *William Merritt Chase*, p. 50. Gallati also notes that none was as extravagant as the famed Tenth Street Studio in Manhattan, with the Shinnecock Hills studio on Long Island a close second in its fabulousness. Hence the relatively few representations of the others in his oeuvre.
21. See Gallati, *William Merritt Chase*, pp. 39–53; Celia Betsky, 'In the Artist's Studio,' *Portfolio* (January–February 1982), 32–9; and Sarah Burns, 'The Price of Beauty: Art, Commerce, and the Late Nineteenth-Century American Studio Interior,' in *American Iconology*, ed. David C. Miller (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. 209–38. See also Lynes, *The Art-Makers*. Nearly every article ever written about Chase mentions this or one of his studios in some way.
22. Abigail Solomon-Godeau, 'Male Trouble,' in *Constructing Masculinity*, ed. Martin Berger, Brian Wallis, and Simon Watson (New York NY: Routledge, 1995), pp. 68–76; these quotations are from p. 73 (direct) and p. 75 (indirect). This part of my discussion is also indebted to Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.
23. All biographical information on Fairchild comes from the sources mentioned in footnote 3.
24. There is not the same overwhelmingly universal consensus on Fairchild's concern with appearances and social standing that we find in Chase's literature, although as Mary Smart points

- out, Fairchild's *Self-Portrait* (1889) clearly emphasizes her fashionable accoutrements, and in her memoirs 'reveals herself as very conscious of social position and appearance.' See both 'Sunshine and Shade' and *A Flight with Fame*.
25. Griselda Pollock, 'Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity,' in *Vision and Difference: Feminism, Femininity and the Histories of Art* (London: Routledge, 1988). For the gendering of subject matter in art, see also Pollock and Roszika Parker, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art, and Ideology* (New York NY: Pantheon, 1981). Pollock's more recent work, particularly *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (London: Routledge, 1999) takes a less essentialist stance, arguing, as I do, for a more comprehensive view of gender issues and the role of feminism in our understanding of art history. Even more relevantly, Pollock's newer reading of Alfred Stevens's 1888 *In the Studio* simultaneously considers the gender divisions of the times and their complexity in that image. See Griselda Pollock, 'Louise Abbéma's Lunch and Alfred Stevens's Studio: Theatricality, Feminine Subjectivity and Space around Sarah Bernhardt, Paris, 1877-1888,' in *Local/Global: Women Artists in the Nineteenth Century*, eds Deborah Cherry and Janice Helland (Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 99-119.
 26. Robert L. Herbert, *Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press), pp. 47-50.
 27. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York NY: Routledge, 1990). See also Butler's *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (New York NY: Routledge, 1993); and *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York NY: Routledge, 1997).
 28. I do not wish to enter the controversies over whether Butler originated these ideas or stole them from J.S. Mill or Nancy Chodorow or anyone else. Butler is, for better or worse, the most prominent voice in contemporary theory for this perspective. In any case, queer theory's resistance to essentialist theories allows for the separation of desire from a particular body, hence avoiding the compulsory heterosexuality of even the most progressive feminist or Freudian-based psychoanalytic views; the result is an opportunity to understand men and women as individuals, rather than wholly determined by their sex organs or societal constructions based on them.
 29. Butler, 'Imitation and Gender Insubordination,' in *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*, ed. Diana Fuss (New York NY: Routledge, 1991), p. 18.
 30. See Mary W. Blanchard, 'The Soldier and the Aesthete: Homosexuality and Popular Culture in Gilded Age America,' in *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1 (1996), 25-46. Blanchard's article focuses almost exclusively on Wilde, and thus does little to convince the reader of just how widespread acceptance of male effeminacy was in the 1890s. Nonetheless, the public nature of Wilde's effeminacy, along with that of other aesthetes during the period, does suggest a more broad play with gender identities that I hope to contribute to readings of visual arts of the same time period. See also John Kasson's *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (New York NY: Hill & Wang, 1990) for more on the continual refinement of manners with the encroachment of the middle class.
 31. Fairchild in a letter to Bertha Potter Palmer quoted in Jeanne Madeline Weimann, *The Fair Women* (Chicago IL: Academy, 1982), p. 211.
 32. Lynes, in Flexner et al., *The Shaping of Art and Architecture*, p. 114.
 33. Burns, *Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press), pp. 4-5.
 34. See Burns, *Inventing the Modern Artist*, pp. 159-86. Chase was a particular 'master' of these strategies, as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 2.
 35. See Burns, *Inventing the Modern Artist*, pp. 172-86. See also Pollock and Parker, *Old Mistresses*; they point out that this strategy may have been used by many women artists throughout art history, as for example Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, who 'was acceptable only in so far as her person, her public persona, conformed to the current notions of Woman, not artist' (p. 96).
 36. Burns, *Inventing the Modern Artist*, pp. 277-99.