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TWO years ago, the work of the American impressionist Daniel Putnam Brinley (1879-1963) was brought to the attention of the Bowdoin College Museum of Art by the artist’s niece, Elizabeth M. Loder. Mrs. Loder had recently moved to Maine and had brought with her several of her uncle’s works and many of his personal papers. A survey of Brinley paintings and drawings in New England convinced R. Peter Mooz, then director of the Bowdoin Museum, that the unique talent of this artist deserved greater exposure.

Shortly after the commitment to the Brinley exhibition was made, Margaret Burke Clunie, an American art historian, joined the staff as curator and accepted the assignment of developing the show. Her essay in this catalogue reveals an insight and informative perspective that enable the reader to gain an understanding of the artist’s role and influence within the modern American movement.

The exhibition would not have been possible without the generous assistance and patient guidance of Elizabeth and Albert Loder. The Museum wishes to thank lenders to the exhibition, especially Mr. and Mrs. Frank Hemingway of Hemingway Galleries in Jamestown, New York, and the Maine State Commission on the Arts and Humanities for its financial assistance.

Scholars are currently reconsidering many American artists who were active during the first quarter of this century but were not in the forefront in the development of the modern movement. The research of these scholars is expanding knowledge and is creating a public awareness of previously unrecognized contributors to this period. The Bowdoin College Museum of Art is pleased to offer this exhibition, the first major review of the accomplishments of Daniel Putnam Brinley.

Russell J. Moore
Acting Director/Curator

FOREWORD
1. Assisi
WERE Daniel Putnam Brinley alive today, he would be celebrating his ninety-ninth birthday on March 8. A very tall, distinguished-looking man with sparkling blue eyes and beautiful long-fingered hands, he was kind, generous, and full of fun—a great entertainer and humorist. His friendly way attracted people to him wherever he went. A deeply religious man, his spirituality was reflected in his work and in his relationships with people. Many of his English ancestors were among our earliest settlers: the Brinleys in Newport and Boston, the Putnams in Salem, and the Porters in Newburyport. He inherited his artistic talent from his mother, Rebecca Maitland (née Porter) Bradford Brinley.

Daniel and his wife, Kathrine, had no children. As I was their niece and closest relative geographically, I had the responsibility of dismantling their apartment and studio following Kathrine’s death in 1966. My husband and I moved their papers to our home and, over a period of time, arranged them chronologically, preserving them in document cases. Because of the unusual and interesting life that Daniel and Kathrine had led, I felt that the papers should be carefully read before making a decision about their disposition.

The more I delved into the papers, the more convinced I became that the Brinley story should be written, an intention shared but never fulfilled by Aunt Kathrine. I began research toward that end; progress was slow. The papers provided information about periods of their lives of which I had no previous knowledge as well as details of periods I remember well.

There is still much work to be done, and in order to aid scholars in their research of this period in American art, the papers have been promised to the Smithsonian Institution’s Archives of American Art.

I owe a debt of gratitude to many people, too numerous to mention here, for their continued interest and assistance. I am especially grateful to my husband and family for their patience and understanding of the time this project has required during the past ten years. Very special thanks and appreciation go to the Bowdoin College Museum of Art for presenting this exhibition and to Margaret Burke Clunie, in particular, for the time, effort, and interest she has put into assembling it.

ELIZABETH M. LODER

January 1978
13. Boulevard Montparnasse
THE career of Daniel Putnam Brinley is an art historical paradox. Sympathetic to modernist trends, the artist opposed the power and self-interest of most official art institutions and actively participated in the search for alternatives to the highly regulated academic exhibition. During his years in Paris, he was involved with the New Society of American Artists. In New York he exhibited at Alfred Stieglitz’s Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession, was associated with Robert Henri at the MacDowell Club, and aided in the organization of the Armory Show.

Brinley’s style, however, does not reflect an allegiance to avant-garde movements in Paris or New York. He painted in an impressionist manner, a style which had been introduced to America by such artists as Childe Hassam and John Twachtman in the 1880s. By the early twentieth century, impressionism was being taught at the Art Students’ League and, although it had not yet been reduced to an academic formula, the style was by no means avant-garde.

Many of the contradictions between his artistic style and his attitudes were the result of the conditions of the time. The artist’s significance, in fact, lies neither in the individuality of his artistic production nor in the changes he effected in the traditional art establishment; rather, he is fascinating artistically and historically because he was a man completely of his age, whose experiences, thoughts, and actions offer insight into a remarkable period of American artistic production.

Brinley’s lifelong interest in landscape painting developed at the Art Students’ League in New York, where he studied, between October 1900 and December 1902 with such artists as Bryson Burroughs and Kenyon Cox. As noted by an early biographer, “...even when a student at the League [Brinley] was interested in landscape and never in figure painting. But in landscape painting his absorption was in light and color and perhaps almost unconsciously in pattern...” It is probable that in 1902 he attended the Art Students’ League summer school at Cos Cob, which specialized in landscape painting.

Following his marriage to Kathrine Gordon Sanger and at the urging of friends, Brinley traveled abroad to widen his artistic horizons. The pair made the compulsory visits to major art museums in London and Paris, and exhibited a predictable conservatism when confronted with modernist paintings at the 1904 Autumn Salon. Their ultimate destination was Florence, where they passed the winter actively participating in American artistic circles in between trips to Rome, Assisi, Venice, and Milan. Brinley attended informal drawing classes in Florence and composed numerous crayon and pencil sketches, as well as a few paintings, of the Italian landscape. Though tentative in handling, many of these early works are moderately accomplished and reveal the artist’s sentimental taste for picturesque composition (cat. nos. 9 and 10).

In July of 1905, Brinley returned to Paris. He knew several artists from the Art Students’ League who were studying at the Académie Julian, the mecca for serious American students. In August he joined the American Art Association, a relatively conservative organization of American artists in Paris, which exhibited a number of his works, including several Venetian sketches (cat. no. 7), the following March.

Eager for recognition, Brinley attempted to exhibit his works at the official, highly competitive French salons. He submitted four paintings, executed in Florence, to the Autumn Salon of 1905, and two of the works were accepted for exhibition. Unfortunately for the artist, the jury approved more works than could possibly be exhibited at the Salon; thus two small Italian sketches were substituted for the larger paintings (cat. no. 3). All the artist’s entries were rejected at the
Spring Salon of 1906. Brinley finally had three paintings accepted in the Autumn Salon of that year, which he describes in a letter to his father-in-law:

I just received word yesterday that I have had three of my pictures accepted at the Fall Salon! So I wanted to write you at once and tell you the good news. They are pictures which I think would please you, as a moonlight on the Seine, another is the arrival of a cargo steamer just coming into the dock, the sketch I got for this when we were in Venice, and the last is a street scene in Paris on a wet morning. So you see they are all somewhat varied in subject. They are all rather a good size about 2½ feet by 2 with the frame.7

Perhaps as a result of his experiences with the Salon system, Brinley became increasingly active in the American Art Association, which sponsored more frequent and less restrictive exhibitions. He exhibited three times with the organization in 1907; such works as *La Seine à Meudon* (cat. no. 17), and *Wet Morning in Paris* (cat. no. 18) were included. His increasing prominence in the association is suggested by his election as chairman of the house committee during that year.

Although it is impossible to pinpoint Brinley's relationship to leading members of the American modernist movement in Paris, it is probable he was aware of their work. Coexhibitors at the American Art Association included such figures as Alfred Maurer, Max Weber, Robert Coady, and John Marin. While in Paris, the Brinleys frequently socialized with Patrick Henry Bruce and his wife, and were neighbors and close friends of Edward Steichen.8 In January of 1908, Brinley and Steichen sponsored the *Special Invitational Exhibition of American Impressionist and Tonalist Paintings* at the American Art Association. It included, in addition to their own work, paintings by such artists as Theodore Scott Dabo, John Marin, and Maurice Sterne, as well as sculpture by Jo Davidson and Mahonri Young. A month later, Steichen, Brinley, and several other progressive American artists formed the New Society of American Artists in Paris. According to Steichen, the artists strongly opposed conservative art organizations such as the Society of American Artists in Paris, which consisted of painters whose work has not developed beyond that of early Impressionism. The Society vigorously excluded all the younger and bolder painters from their exhibitions. One evening I invited Marin, Weber, Maurer, Putnam Brinley and Arthur Carles to my studio, and we discussed forming a new society. After several more meetings we announced in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald* and cables to the New York edition that the Society of American Painters had been formed.”9 The event, in fact, received excellent coverage from several newspapers, including the *New York Times*, which compared the organization to other secessionist movements in Munich, Berlin, and Vienna.10

The importance of the Society to Brinley's career is primarily symbolic. While the group had little apparent impact on the organization of exhibitions in Paris, it marked the artist's first active participation in an organization devoted to the promotion and patronage of modern art. For the next several years, Brinley aided in the establishment of several progressive art associations and was particularly active in the search for alternatives to the conservative academic exhibition system.11

Brinley's close personal association with the American avant-garde in Paris had little influence on his own stylistic development. Though the artist's work abroad was regarded as progressive by such prominent artists as Steichen, Weber, and Maurer, his surviving works from this period reveal little that suggests an awareness of modernist trends. Obviously based on traditional format, Brinley’s Paris paintings reveal carefully planned, even contrived, compositions. His use of color is still tentative and his paintings generally display a limited array of soft, muted tonalities. Many of the works, such as *Boulevard Montparnasse* (cat. no. 13), reveal not only a subtlety of color but also a linear softness which dissolves their underlying structure.

Brinley's interest in the tonal movement is indicated by his organization of and participation in the *Special Invitational Exhibition of American Impressionist and Tonalist Paintings* at the Association of American Artists in 1908. Stemming primarily from the aesthetics of Whistler and the Barbizon School, tonalist works evoke a mood or suggest a state of mind through the use of soft, atmospheric light, intimate themes, and limited color. Brinley's interest in tonalism, probably stimulated by Steichen, is expressed not only by the style of his works at this time but also by his choice of evocative titles, such as *L'Arrivée, Temps humide* and *Le Crepuscule*.12

Toward the end of his stay in France, Brinley began to experiment stylistically. Works such as *The Fountain, Carcaonne* of 1908 (cat. no. 19), reveal his division of the canvas into flat areas of color, creating a balance between three-dimensional space and decorative pattern. His interest in decorative pattern would again emerge about 1914, though then it was accompanied by a more expressionistic use of color.
The Brinleys returned to New York in July of 1908. As was his custom, the artist quickly became involved in the progressive art world in New York, which was then dominated by two conflicting personalities. Alfred Steiglitz (1864–1946), who directed the Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession at 291 Fifth Avenue, was devoted to the elevation of photography as a fine art and to the introduction of European modernism to America. A close friend of Steichen, Steiglitz exhibited the work of leading European and American avant-garde artists at 291 and was vehemently opposed to academic, restrictive attitudes towards art. Robert Henri (1865–1929) also protested the authority of the official art establishment and, in reaction to the parochial policies of the powerful National Academy of Design, organized a large independent exhibition of American art at Macbeth Gallery in New York in 1908. Unlike Steiglitz, however, Henri was not interested in European modernist trends but was a leader in the development of an informal school of American realist art. Stylistically aligned with neither the Steiglitz circle nor the Henri group, Brinley was philosophically in agreement with their antiacademic stance and joined them in their search for alternatives to the conservative academic exhibition system, the dominant method by which a contemporary American artist could display his work.

Through his friendship with Steichen, Brinley was aware of the attitudes of Steiglitz regarding the exhibition of progressive art and, in July of 1909, became a member of the Photo-Secession. In March 1910 Brinley participated in Younger American Painters at 291, along with Arthur Carles, Arthur Dove, Lawrence Fellows, Marsden Hartley, Marin, Maurer, Steichen, and Weber. As the first exhibition in the United States of American artists strongly influenced by European modernism, the show was primarily the outgrowth of Steichen’s New Society of American Artists. Without representing a consistent artistic style, the painters included were united by their acceptance of advanced modernist trends. The degree of European influence on their styles varied considerably. Although it is not known which works of the artists were included, it is not surprising that Brinley’s paintings were regarded as being stylistically more conservative than the rest. According to B. P. Stephenson in the New York Evening Post (March 13, 1910), “...Brinley does not really belong to this group of younger American painters, who are creating so much discussion by their individuality, eccentricity, or whatever you choose to call it...” This opinion was reinforced by an article in the Brooklyn Eagle (March 16, 1910) which stated, “Although enlisting himself with the little band of so-called secessionist painters now exhibiting at the Photo-Secession rooms, Mr. Brinley is not wholly in sympathy with it; his interpretation of nature is saner and clearer in its message...”

Brinley never again exhibited at 291, but maintained a close friendship with Steiglitz in the years ahead. At the same time, he actively participated in Robert Henri’s struggle against the National Academy of Design. Two of his paintings, Sherman Square and Mill House, were included in Exhibition of Independent Artists organized by Henri, the first “no prizes, no jury” exhibition in America. More importantly, in 1910 Brinley was elected to the MacDowell Club, the association through which Henri offered artists a more permanent alternative to the academic exhibition. In 1911, Henri organized a system by which the club openly offered its gallery to small groups of artists at two-week intervals. Each artist in the group was allotted an exhibition area and was allowed total freedom in the choice of works presented. Brinley, then a member of the committee on painting at the MacDowell Club, contributed five paintings to the first exhibition under the new system, which also included works by other members of the same committee, such as Henri, George Bellows, Ben Ali Haggin, and Jonas Lie.

Brinley’s sympathetic attitude towards modernist trends, demonstrated by his alliance with both Steiglitz and Henri, is also apparent in his association with the progressive Madison Gallery in New York, which presented his first one-man show in 1910. In comparison to the show at 291, Brinley’s exhibition at the Madison Gallery received generally favorable critical reviews, of which comments by Guy Pene du Bois are typical:

Aspects of the dignity and refinement of nature are to be seen in the twenty-eight pictures by D. Putnam Brinley shown at the Madison Art Gallery. Brinley recently returned from Paris has brought back with him enough of the influence of the impressionists to make us realize in his pictures the gayety of sunlight, its brilliancy, and of the action that the scintillations of atmosphere lend to trees, to water, and to landscape generally. His pictures have charm... Brinley is lyrical. His attitude is poetical...

While none of the twenty-eight canvases included in the Madison Gallery exhibition has been identified, other paintings by the artist from this period reveal Brinley’s stylistic development since his return from France (cat. nos. 27, 28). The artist gradually abandoned his somber palette, atmospheric softness, and evocative titles for an impressionistic manner. Like many American artists in the early twentieth...
century, Brinley punctuated his works with painterly dabs of brilliant color and bathed his subjects in sunlight to suggest the glorious beauty of nature.

Critics such as du Bois frequently cite Brinley’s relationship to French impressionism. By 1910 impressionism was still regarded as progressive in this country but, particularly in comparison to works produced about that time by Marin, Weber, and Maurer, was by no means avant-garde. In fact, American impressionism rarely incorporated the more revolutionary aspects of the French movement and was more concerned with the decorative effects of color and light than in the theoretical and optical aspects of the style. Unlike artists such as Monet, to whom he was occasionally compared, Brinley never allowed his interest in luminous color to dissolve the formal structure of his subject; rather, works such as The Garden Gate (cat. no. 28) and The Peony Garden (cat. no. 33) suggest the artist’s interest in subject matter as well as style to express nature’s lyrical beauty. In comparison with his professional associations, Brinley’s artistic production once again appears surprisingly conservative.

Many of the artist’s charming impressionist works were painted in Silvermine, Connecticut, where, beginning in 1909, the Brinleys generally spent their summers. Here, Brinley frequently exhibited with the Silvermine Group of Artists, which met informally each week in the studio of Solon Borglum. Several works completed while in this area reveal an awareness of the work of other American impressionists who painted in southern Connecticut. In color, composition, subject matter, and point of view, Brinley’s A Colonial Church (cat. no. 27) closely resembles the Church at Old Lyme (1903, private collection) by Childe Hassam, to whom Brinley was frequently compared. The Emerald Pool (a study for this painting is cat. no. 34), painted in Silvermine, is strongly reminiscent of John Twachtman’s Hemlock Pool (1902, Addison Gallery of American Art) in composition and mood, and recalls Brinley’s earlier interest in tonalism.

Brinley’s association with the Madison Gallery led to his most significant involvement with modernist trends. Upon the invitation of Henry Fitch Taylor, he attended there the first meeting of the American Painters and Sculptors group (soon to be incorporated as the Association of American Painters and Sculptors). The organization was formed “for the purpose of exhibiting the works of progressive and live painters, both American and foreign—favoring such works usually neglected by current shows and especially interesting and instructive to the public.” The group’s first exhibition was held at the Sixty-ninth Regiment Armory in New York in 1913 and probably was the most significant exhibition in the history of American art. Initially intended to illustrate the evolution of art from the nineteenth century, by including the work of such avant-garde figures as Picasso, Duchamp, Kandinsky and Picabia the exhibition ultimately served as the first large-scale introduction of European modernism to America.

Brinley aided in the organization of the Armory Show and served on the reception and publicity committee, as well as on the committee on domestic exhibitions, which selected the work of American artists to be included. Three of Brinley’s paintings, The Emerald Pool, The Peony Garden (cat. no. 33), and A Walled Garden, were included in the show, which also contained the work of such similar painters as Childe Hassam, Theodore Robinson, John Twachtman, and Elmer MacRae. The impressionistic palette, traditional subject matter, and realistic form of such American artists reveal their stylistic conservatism in comparison with some of the more radical European works. Brinley also submitted four unidentified “color notes,” which were purchased by Frederic C. Torrey of San Francisco.

The impact of European modernism on American art transmitted through the Armory show cannot be overestimated, and a distinct change in Brinley’s style at about this time signifies its influence. The artist abandoned his impressionistic use of the divided brush; an intensification of color was accompanied by a flattening of form and a more structured composition. His awareness of modernism generally inspired a greater boldness and led to a variety of stylistic experiments. In some works, such as The Pine (cat. no. 42) and The Elm (cat. no. 37), his division of the canvas into flat areas of intense, expressionistic color suggests an awareness of Fauvism. A fascination with decorative pattern on a flat surface, illustrated in Renaissance (cat. no. 43), signifies, among other influences, an interest in Oriental aesthetics which had not previously surfaced in his art. A boldness in his use of the palette knife and in his approach to form, as well as a broadening of subject matter, is revealed in his figural studies of this time (cat. nos. 38, 39, 40).

However, Brinley was not directly influenced by a particular member of the European avant-garde; rather, his exposure to the numerous radical styles was primarily visual, and he was unaware of the complex underlying theories regarding color and form which differentiate the various modernist modes. As a result, Brinley adapted elements from several artistic approaches and applied them to his style.
Decorative adoption of European modernism was not unusual for an American artist and can also be seen in the paintings at that time of Andrew Dasburg, Arthur B. Davies, Arnold Friedman, and Hugo Robus, among others.

In spite of the dramatic, swift change in Brinley's art at the time of the Armory Show, his style maintained its decorative emphasis, a quality noted by many critics, including a reviewer for The American newspaper (November 23, 1914):

These latest examples of Brinley's show a broadening both of his outlook on nature and his method. His compositions of delicate lace-like design have been replaced by large and simple distribution of masses. He has let in free circulation of air and taken out distances. Yet the feeling of the compositions still seems to be for decorative pattern. The sense of plastic bulk is not apparent, and even where distance enters, it is something seen rather than felt. This tendency of flatness of pattern appears to be so marked an idiosyncrasy of this painter that I hope he will not let himself be distracted from it ...

While decorative in its modernist approach, Brinley's style exhibits a brilliancy and vitality previously lacking in his oeuvre. Like other American artists influenced by the Armory Show, Brinley was able to absorb fully disparate avant-garde elements into his style to produce his most inventive original works. This vitality and visual excitement was maintained until World War I forced an interruption in the artist's career.

* * * * *

Upon initial investigation, Brinley's career appears inundated with contradictions. Although devoted to modernist causes, his artistic style can at best be regarded as moderately progressive. Yet, when the attitudes of the artist are further considered, such discrepancies appear less pronounced.

Brinley's incorporation of innovative elements into his style around the time of the Armory Show, when the influence of modernism was widespread, is typical of his approach. By personality, he was not a radical but was extremely sensitive to artistic allegiances and their implications. Such concerns are indicated in a letter dated November 10, 1910, from Israel White, a longtime supporter from the Newark Evening News:

Ever since the season opened I have been thinking about your identification with the Stieglitz crowd and with the fellows that exhibit at the Madison Art Gallery. I speak to you about this in confidence, because you have asked my opinion about it heretofore. I do not wish to misadvise you but I think it will do you more harm than good. Your work does not belong there. You ought to be at Montross.31

Brinley continued his association with Stieglitz and with Madison Gallery, but he also heeded White's advice and began to exhibit at the more conservative Montross Gallery, which handled the work of other American impressionist painters.

The career of Brinley was governed by his temperament. Extremely outgoing in nature, amiable and humorous, Brinley was one of the few figures who moved easily among the various factions of the fragmented modernist groups in the early twentieth century. As has been noted, the artist was the only member of the Association of American Painters and Sculptors formally linked to the Stieglitz circle, a situation further complicated by his relationship with Henri.32

In his discovery of the one common link between Henri, Stieglitz, and the Association of American Painters and Sculptors, the extraordinary nature of Brinley's personality is most fully revealed. The artist's involvement with the American avant-garde was not dependent upon his interest in radical stylistic innovation but was based primarily upon his objection to conservative exhibition procedures then current in this country. Brinley appreciated the efforts of Henri and Stieglitz and supported the Armory Show, not only for its inclusion of European modernism, but also for its ability to offer progressive American artists the opportunity to exhibit.

Seen in this light, Brinley emerges as a stylistic and philosophical moderate, whose charming paintings offer a delight to the eye and whose experiences offer a fascinating insight into contemporary American artistic attitudes.

MARGARET BURKE CLUNIE

2. Kathrine Brinley’s diary described her own and her husband’s reactions to modern works in the exhibition: “Here I, and I think I may add Put, experienced sensations unique in our history thus far. Of all the unhealthy, abnormal, distorted work I ever looked upon, these works displayed the very worst... Rotten the society which could have produced such ‘Art.’” (Entry for October 22, 1904, Brinley Archives.)

3. After considerable debate, they once again revealed an artistic conservativism in their consideration of a relocation in Munich.

4. One reason for the couple’s active social life is suggested by Kathrine Brinley in a letter to her sister in September 1905: “A great deal depends on his meeting the artists here and that means going about and entertaining. That is what he is here for, to go to men’s studios and see what is being done...” (Brinley Archives.)

5. In a long letter to her sister in September 1905, Kathrine Brinley describes the event. Like many American artists, Brinley submitted his work to the Salon through M. Lefebre, a paint supplier and framer. According to Mrs. Brinley, of the two hundred and fifty artists whose work Lefebre handled, only three Americans, including Brinley, had their work accepted at the Salon. One of the three artists, and possibly a friend of the Brinleys at that time, was Alfred Maurer, “a man who has ‘arrived,’ perhaps the best known American painter here.” Although we have no record of the two works initially accepted, it is possible that they were generally impressionistic in nature. In a letter to her sister on October 8, 1905, Kathrine Brinley reports, “Put had a visit from a rather influential art critic here, who studied his pictures and remarked that if his two paintings had been hung in the Salon they probably would have been placed with ‘Monet and that bunch,’ one of the most important of the modern French impressionists!” (Brinley Archives.) Although it is difficult to believe that the works might have had anything but a most superficial relationship to Monet, it is possible they displayed some characteristics of the style, suggested by an overall softening of Brinley’s work about this time.

6. Kathrine Brinley reported the event in a perhaps not unbiased letter to her sister on April 5, 1906: “You will all be sorry to know that his pictures were rejected at the Salon. But neither of us take it seriously because the jury did all kinds of crazy things this year—just to be original, I imagine. Men who have been accepted for years and even received honors have been thrown out this time. All one hears about in the Quarter these days is ‘Have you heard—Bruce had all his pictures turned down!’ (an American who has exhibited in France, Germany, England and America)... There is a good deal of jealousy towards the Americans—they so often eclipse the Frenchmen at the big schools and studio classes.” (Brinley Archives.) It is obvious that the Brinleys are aware of the work of Patrick Henry Bruce, who was to become a close friend in the months ahead.

7. Letter from Daniel Putnam Brinley to his father-in-law, September 18, 1907. (Brinley Archives.) The exhibition catalogue lists the titles of the three paintings as *L’Arrivée, Le Crepuscule, and Temps humide* (which is possibly *Wet Morning in Paris*, cat. no. 18). In a letter of October 4, 1907, Kathrine Brinley describes the hanging of the exhibition to her brother, Will: “We found Put’s three pictures very well hung, two being ‘on the line,’ the other being just above. It is an excellent show this year—best in many years according to many entries.” (Brinley Archives.)

8. Kathrine Brinley suggests an interesting picture of Steichen in a letter dated February 27, 1908: “This letter will go to you on the ‘Provence’ which is also to carry our good friend Edouard Steichen to New York for two months business. I did not give him a letter to you as he said he will be awfully busy, and I thought it might bother him, but he said he might pop into the office someday just to tell you that we are flourishing. He is the most famous photographer in America and I might also add Europe. Not yet thirty, his career as a painter as well as a photographer has been meteoric. He is fine and straightforward as a man and we have this winter enjoyed him and his delightful wife very much. In the *Century* for January and February there were articles on Mr. Steichen and his color photography, such as are seldom written of men until after they are dead. (He gets $25 and $50 a print for his photos and has taken many of the most famous people on both sides of the water). They live just across from us here.” (Brinley Archives.) Steichen was in fact transporting Matisse prints and drawings to New York for their exhibition at Stieglitz’s Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession from April 6 to 25, 1908.

9. Edward Steichen, *A Life in Photography* (Garden City, New York, 1963), n.p. In addition to Brinley and Steichen, the Board of Governors consisted of Maurer, Weber, and Donald Shaw MacLaughlan; the charter members included Marin, Arthur B. Carles, Bruce, Jo Davidson, Richard Duffy, J. Kunz, E. Sparks, Maximilien Fischer, and Albert Worcester. Although Steichen refers to the group as the Society of American Painters, it has since become known as the New Society of American Artists.

10. According to the February 25, 1908, issue of the *New York Times*, “The first battle of the new movement will be fought to obtain official recognition at the international exhibition which will open shortly in Vienna.” Further mention of this possibility is made by Kathrine Brinley in a letter to her sister on March 3, 1908: “The Quarter is much excited over ‘The New Society of American Painters.’ It is certainly making a stir. Put, with other members, will have pictures exhibited in Vienna next spring!” (Brinley Archives.) The exhibit, unfortunately, never materialized.

11. The group is also of interest for it indicates the intimacy of Brinley’s connection with American progressive painters abroad. Certainly he must have been personally acquainted with Weber, Maurer, and Carles. It is possible he had met Matisse, and he was undoubtedly aware of his work. As has been previously mentioned, Steichen had arranged an exhibition of Matisse’s work in New York in the spring of 1908. About this same time, Matisse taught a painting class, organized by Max Weber, which several American artists attended. Patrick Henry Bruce, a close friend of Brinley, was an active participant in this class. It is possible
Brinley was further aware of modern French art through the collection of Gertrude Stein. Unfortunately, the Brinley archival material consists primarily of letters written by his wife to her family, and she dwells little on his artistic associations abroad.


13. The artist spent the next several weeks painting in Woodstock, New York, where the Art Students' League was holding its summer school directed by Birge Harrison, a leading tonalist painter.

14. American artists sponsored by Stieglitz at 291 included John Marin, Arthur Dove, Marsden Hartley, and Georgia O'Keeffe. Stieglitz was the first to introduce the work of Picasso, Matisse, Toulouse-Lautrec, and Cézanne to this country.

15. Composed of the work of Henri, John Sloan, William Glackens, Everett Shinn, Maurice Prendergast, Ernest Lawson, and Arthur B. Davies, the group became known as the "Eight Independent Painters" or simply "The Eight." Although their styles were dissimilar, the artists were united in their objections to the conservative policies of the National Academy of Design. A landmark in the history of American art, the exhibition was a surprising financial success.

16. Stylistically conservative, the school was interested in the depiction of contemporary life, particularly urban scenes.

17. As was its custom, the Stieglitz publication Camera Work, no. 31 (July 1910), pp. 43-49, published several reviews of the exhibition, which suggest the variety of critical response to the works represented.

18. Along with many other artists, Brinley was asked to contribute an essay on "What 291 means to me" to an issue of Camera Work. Though Brinley did not comply with the request, Stieglitz inscribed his copy of the magazine: "The man who had a Bully idea and wanted to write it down for this Book. But the man got cold feet and the idea remained unexpressed. The man whose top of the Head is very far removed from the bottom of his Feet. To Brinley from Stieglitz, March 13, 1915." (Issue 47; dated July 1914, published January 1915.)

19. For additional information on the Exhibition of Independent Artists, see William Innes Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle (Ithaca, New York, 1969).

20. Founded in memory of the American composer Edward MacDowell, the club was devoted to the understanding of the fine arts. Although its original emphasis was primarily musical, it soon broadened its interest and sponsored small exhibitions in its gallery.

21. For more information on Henri's exhibition system, see Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle, p. 165.

22. Unfortunately, none of the paintings included in this important exhibition have yet been identified.


24. For additional discussion, see Moussa Domit, American Impressionist Painting (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C., 1973).

25. The couple was first introduced to Silvermine, a suburb of New Canaan, by Mrs. Charles Caffin, wife of the progressive art critic, who shared a house with them there during the summer of 1909. In 1913, the Brinleys built a permanent residence, Datcher House, in Silvermine.

26. Established about 1907, the group, which at first was known as "The Knockers," was composed of Brinley, Borglum, Austin Lord, W. A. Boring, A. T. Millar, Dan Webster, Albert Munske, George Thompson, R. B. Gruelle, F. C. Yohn, and Glen Newell in 1910.


28. Brinley's vibrant personality is suggested by the account of the opening night of the Armory Show. The Association of American Painters and Sculptors sponsored a party for "friends and enemies" of the press at Healy's Restaurant. Following the speeches, "the party became more boisterous as the irrepressible Putnam Brinley, almost seven feet tall, led the apparition in a wild turkey trot. Once started, Brinley was hard to stop, and he won the high kicking contest, which he probably instigated, through sheer physical advantage. A rousing time was had by all, but the high spirits, the gallantry, and the good humor hid a basic incompatibility. It was a pleasant but very temporary truce." (Brown, The Story of the Armory Show, p. 125.) The reaction of the press to the Armory Show ranged from surprise to outrage.

29. Torrey also purchased the extraordinary Nude Descending a Staircase by Marcel Duchamp, now in the Louise and Walter Arensberg Collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Although vigorous research has failed to locate the color notes, it is possible they resembled the abstract "color notes" painted by Robert Henri while he experimented with the Hardesty Maratta color system about this time. Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle, pp. 184-189, for further discussion of the system and for an illustration of Henri's color experiments. It seems likely that, regardless of their relationship to Henri, Brinley's notes were abstract color studies and, to have attracted Torrey, probably were visually quite exciting.

30. This relationship is particularly interesting in light of his earlier Paris period; he could have been aware of Matisse and his work as early as 1907. See note 11.

31. Brinley Archives.

27. A Colonial Church
Study for The Emerald Pool
37. The Elm
38. Garden Scene, No. 1
43. Renaissance
42. The Pine
Paintings which received their title from the artist are indicated with an asterisk (*). Dimensions are in inches, followed by centimeters in parentheses. Height precedes width. “l.l.” signifies lower left; “l.r.”, lower right. Following his election as an Associate of the National Academy of Design in 1930, Brinley is known to have signed and dated several of his earlier works and included the ANA inscription. Thus, the attachment of “ANA” to his signature on a work does not confirm a post-1930 date for its execution.

1. ASSISI
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley
oil on compact board, ca. 1905
26 x 20 (66 x 51)
Lent by R. A. Lenna

2. ASSISI
inscribed on mat, l.r.: D. Putnam
Brinley ANA
watercolor on paper, ca. 1905
13 1/4 x 9 1/4 (34 x 23)
Private Collection

3. RUES DANS FLORENCE*
(two works matted together)
light composition initialed l.r.: DPB
dark composition initialed l.l.: DPB
graphite and pastel on paper, ca. 1905
light composition 10 x 4 1/2 (25 x 11)
dark composition 9 3/4 x 5 (25 x 13)
Portland Museum of Art
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Albert A. Loder, Jr., in memory of Daniel and Kathrine Gordon Brinley
In original frame; exhibited in 1905 Autumn Salon, Paris

4. THE BEACH AT BLANKENBERGHE, BELGIUM
artist’s insignia at l.r.
oil on canvas board, 1905
11 3/4 x 17 3/4 (25 x 44)
Private Collection

5. EARLY MORNING ON THE ARNO*
l.l.: D. P. Brinley ’05
oil on canvas, 1905
28 x 22 (71 x 56)
Private Collection

6. FIESOLE
not signed or dated
oil on wooden panel, 1905
13 x 9 3/4 (33 x 25)
Private Collection

7. SEVEN DRAWINGS OF VENICE
(matted together)
each drawing initialed at l.r.: DPB ’05
graphite and pastel on paper, 1905
Lent by Hemingway Galleries
In original frame

8. CATHEDRAL VILLAGE
l.r.: D Putnam Brinley
graphite and watercolor on paper, ca. 1906
13 x 20 (33 x 51)
Lent by Hemingway Galleries

9. ITALIAN LANDSCAPE
artist’s insignia at l.r.
oil and graphite on artist’s board, ca. 1906
17 1/2 x 11 3/4 (44 x 25)
Private Collection

10. ITALIAN VIEW
artist’s insignia at l.r.
oil and graphite on artist’s board, ca. 1906
17 1/2 x 11 3/4 (44 x 25)
Private Collection
11. TRAFALGAR SQUARE
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley ANA
graphite and watercolor on paper, ca. 1906-07
18 x 13 1/2 (46 x 34)
Lent by Hemingway Galleries

12. VIEW OF LUXEMBURG GARDENS
not signed or dated
oil on artist's board, ca. 1907
10 x 13 1/2 (25 x 34)
Private Collection

13. BOULEVARD MONT PARNASSE*
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley '07
oil on canvas, 1907
26 x 32 (66 x 81)
Lent by Hemingway Galleries

14. BOAT
l.r.: Brinley - '07
oil on laminated board, 1907
12 x 19 (30 x 48)
Private Collection

15. HAYSTACKS
l.r.: D. P. Brinley '07
oil on laminated board, 1907
10 1/2 x 13 1/4 (27 x 34)
Private Collection

16. RIVER BANK
l.r.: Brinley '07
oil on canvas board, 1907
13 1/4 x 10 1/4 (34 x 26)
Private Collection

17. LA SEINE À MEUDON*
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley 1907
oil on canvas, 1907
19 1/2 x 25 1/2 (50 x 64)
Lent by Hemingway Galleries

18. WET MORNING IN PARIS*
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley
oil on canvas, 1907
20 x 25 (51 x 64)
Lent by Peter A. Voght
Probably exhibited in Paris at 1907 Autumn Salon as Temps humide

19. PLACE CARNOT
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, 1908
21 x 25 (53 x 64)
Lent by Mrs. Clarence Neher

20. HYERES, FRANCE
l.r.: Brinley
oil on artist's board, 1908
9 1/4 x 12 1/4 (23 x 32)
Private Collection

21. MARKET DAY, CARCASONNE*
l.r.: Putnam Brinley ANA
oil on canvas, 1908
21 x 24 1/4 (53 x 62)
Private Collection

22. OLD HOMESTEAD
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley '08
oil on canvas, 1908
24 1/4 x 26 1/4 (62 x 51)
Private Collection

23. DAISY FIELD
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley '09
oil on wooden panel, 1909
8 1/4 x 7 1/4 (22 x 20)
Private Collection

24. LANDSCAPE
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley '09
oil on wooden panel, 1909
9 x 7 1/4 (23 x 20)
Private Collection

25. VILLA
l.r.: Brinley '09
oil on canvas board, 1909
10 1/2 x 13 1/4 (27 x 35)
Private Collection

26. AUTUMN LANDSCAPE
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, ca. 1910
26 x 24 (66 x 61)
Private Collection

27. A COLONIAL CHURCH*
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley '10
oil on canvas, 1910
31 x 25 1/4 (79 x 65)
Private Collection

28. GARDEN GATE*
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley '10
oil on canvas, 1910
31 x 27 (79 x 69)
Private Collection

29. LANDSCAPE
oil on canvas, ca. 1911
26 x 30 (66 x 76)
Private Collection

30. GLOUCESTER HARBOR
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley '11
oil on canvas, 1911
24 x 26 (61 x 66)
Lent by Hemingway Galleries

31. THE SALT SHIPS*
oil on canvas, 1911
32 x 30 (81 x 76)
Private Collection
FIGURES IN THE SUN
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley ’12
oil on wooden panel, 1912
8 x 9 (20 x 23)
Private Collection

THE PEONY GARDEN*
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley
oil on canvas, ca. 1913
43 x 38 (102 x 97)
Private Collection
Exhibited in the Armory Show

STUDY FOR THE EMERALD POOL*
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, ca. 1913
31 1/4 x 29 1/2 (81 x 75)
Private Collection
This painting is a study for The Emerald Pool, exhibited in the Armory Show

BARNYARD
l.r.: Brinley
pastel on paper, ca. 1914
7 1/4 x 9 1/2 (18 x 24)
Private Collection
In original frame

THE HIGH HILL
l.l.: Brinley
pastel on paper, ca. 1914
13 1/4 x 10 1/4 (34 x 26)
Private Collection
In original frame

THE ELM
l.l.: Putnam Brinley ’14
oil on canvas, 1914
32 x 30 (81 x 76)
Private Collection

GARDEN SCENE, NO. 1
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley ’14
oil on canvas board, 1914
10 x 12 (25 x 30)
Private Collection
In original frame

GARDEN SCENE, NO. 2
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley ’14
oil on canvas board, 1914
12 x 10 (30 x 25)
Private Collection
In original frame

GARDEN SCENE, NO. 3
l.l.: D. Putnam Brinley ’14
oil on canvas board, 1914
10 x 12 (25 x 30)
Private Collection

LANDSCAPE
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley ’14
oil on canvas, 1914
40 x 40 (102 x 102)
Lent by Mrs. Lewis H. Hitzrot

THE PINE
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, ca. 1914
30 x 32 (76 x 81)
Private Collection

RENAISSANCE*
l.l.: Brinley
oil on canvas, ca. 1914
38 x 42 (97 x 107)
Private Collection

LANDSCAPE
l.l.: Brinley
watercolor on paper, ca. 1915
15 x 9 3/4 (38 x 25)
Private Collection
In original frame

THE RED HOUSE
l.r.: Brinley
watercolor on paper, ca. 1915
9 1/4 x 7 1/2 (24 x 19)
Private Collection

COUNTRY YARD
l.r.: D. Putnam Brinley 16/
oil on masonite, 1916
40 1/4 x 40 1/4 (102 x 102)
Private Collection

LADY WITH SQUIRRELS
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, ca. 1917
30 x 32 (76 x 81)
Private Collection

BERMUDA SCENE
not signed or dated
oil on wooden panel, ca. 1921
30 1/4 x 24 (77 x 61)
Private Collection

VIEW NEAR FEATHERBED ALLEY, ST. GEORGE
not signed or dated
oil on canvas, ca. 1921
30 x 32 (76 x 81)
Private Collection
Unfinished
ERRATUM

In the essay, catalogue number 19 has been incorrectly titled *The Fountain, Carcasonne.*
The correct title is *Place Carnot.*