Women in the Omnibus and Modes of Printmaking: The Iconography and Marketing of Cassatt’s 1891 Series

by

Margaret Waldo Bowers
Class of 2011

An essay submitted to the faculty of Wesleyan University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Departmental Honors in the Art History Program

Middletown, Connecticut January 2011
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A. Printmaking Processes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B. Cassatt and Leroy’s Printmaking Processes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C. Existing Impressions</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

From 1879 to 1891, the American expatriate artist Mary Cassatt produced more than two hundred designs intended specifically for the intaglio print medium. Printmaking was work she enjoyed. In a letter to the New York art dealer and collector Samuel Putnam Avery, Cassatt reported that she and the printer M. Leroy sometimes “worked all day (eight hours) both as hard as we could work & only printed eight or ten proofs in the day.” This period of intense printmaking activity culminated in the publication, during 1890 and 1891, of a series of ten color aquatints, now heralded as “among the most important prints made in the nineteenth century.”

Cassatt explained her intentions for her color prints in conversation with her close friend, the American collector Lousine Havemeyer. According to Havemeyer’s memoir, Cassatt said:

“I like making colour etchings and I hope that Durand-Ruel will put mine on the market at a reasonable price because nothing, I believe, stimulates the taste for art as much as the opportunity of having it about one at home. I should like to think that American collectors can have an example of my work, a print or an etching, for a few dollars. That is what happens in France. It is not only the rich who buy works of art. Members of the public, even quite humble ones have good taste and buy what they can afford. They can always find something within their means here.”
Cassatt believed that even “humble” members of the French public could exercise good taste by collecting inexpensive prints, and she hoped to find a similarly wide audience for her color prints in the United States. Her statement that reasonably priced artworks could stimulate taste reveals that she still held to certain notions about the efficacy of artworks that had circulated among American artists and social reformers since mid-century.

In this essay, I shall provide iconographic and formal analyses of *In the Omnibus*. This image of two women in an omnibus is an outlier in a series of women and children in domestic settings. I shall explore the omnibus as a mode of modern public transportation and as a subject in nineteenth-century French, British, and American art. This shall help illuminate Cassatt’s treatment of the omnibus theme.

These analyses shall also help distinguish between Cassatt’s statement about her goals for the 1891 series and the iconography she employed in creating it. Historians have focused almost exclusively on how Cassatt’s interest in printmaking grew out of her friendship with Edgar Degas, implying that her approach to printmaking derived principally from his influence. As a result, they have only briefly mentioned her involvement with reproductive printmaking. I shall discuss how Cassatt’s early association with reproductive printmakers may well have influenced her goals for the 1891 series. In her conversation with Havemeyer, Cassatt paid homage not just to the French but also to longstanding American notions of printmaking as a popular and populist art form. She wanted Americans to collect her prints and display them in their homes, but the series’ sales disappointed her. I shall venture some suggestions as to how and why Cassatt misjudged the American market.
for her prints. Her conversation with Havemeyer suggests that Cassatt looked to printmaking as a didactic tool. She used *In the Omnibus* to represent middle-class women’s discomfort in the public space of the omnibus. This was an unusual theme to market to middle-class Americans.

The Series

During 1890 and 1891, Cassatt made twenty-five sets of ten color prints using softground etching, drypoint, aquatint, and painted hand-touches. (For a description of these printmaking processes, see Appendices A and B.) The titles of the ten prints in the series are: *The Bath, The Lamp, In the Omnibus, The Letter, The Fitting, Woman Bathing, Mother’s Kiss, Maternal Caress, Afternoon Tea Party,* and *The Coiffure.* This list follows the order of the Durand-Ruel gallery’s catalogue for the 1891 exhibition, and there is no evidence that Cassatt stipulated a certain order to the series.3

There is some debate over where Cassatt’s work on the series took place. Colta Ives states that Cassatt brought an intaglio press and the printer M. Leroy to her family’s summer home, the Chateau Bachivilliers on the Oise, during the summer of 1890. According to Judith Barter, Cassatt started working at Bachivilliers only after her solo exhibition at Durand-Ruel in April 1891. Nancy Mowll Mathews states that Cassatt may have begun experimenting with color aquatint after she saw an exhibition of Japanese woodcuts at the École des Beaux-Arts in the spring of 1890. When Cassatt left Paris for the summer, she might have worked on other projects and resumed printmaking when she returned to her intaglio press in Paris in the fall.
However, Mathews later says that Cassatt began making the prints in the summer of 1890, when she and her family were renting a different house in Septeuil. Scholars have also disagreed over the identity of the printmaker M. Leroy. In recent texts, Kathleen Adler and Michel Melot have incorrectly stated that Cassatt’s printmaker was Alphonse Leroy. Both writers state that Alphonse Leroy worked for Alfred Cadart, who began the Société des Aquafortistes in 1861 in Paris and published print albums by Édouard Manet and Félix Bracquemond, among others. Melot also mistakenly states that Cassatt named Alphonse Leroy as her printer in a letter to Samuel P. Avery. These writers mistake M. Leroy, whose name Cassatt inscribed in the margin of final states, for the engraver Alphonse Leroy. This Leroy was born in 1821 in Lille and enjoyed Salon success as a reproductive engraver of master paintings in the 1840s and 50s. He would have been too old and too accomplished to work under Alfred Cadart in the 1860s.

Scholars know little of M. Leroy except that he worked at Cadart’s studio and assisted Marcellin Desboutin. Desboutin, who allegedly taught Cassatt to handle drypoint, introduced Cassatt to Leroy. Leroy was a new choice for Cassatt, who had previously worked with the printer Eugène Delâtre. His first initial may refer to the name Modeste Leroy.

By the time Cassatt began making the series with Leroy, she had made and exhibited prints for about ten years. Three of the sixteen works she contributed to the fifth Impressionist Exhibition of 1880 were etchings. Throughout the 1880s, she worked in drypoint and etching. At the end of the decade, Cassatt exhibited twice with a group of friends and established printmakers, the Société des Peintres-

In 1891, members of the Société decided to exhibit work only by French-born printmakers, thus excluding both Cassatt and Pissarro (born in the Dutch West Indies). The two artists took the opportunity to exhibit independently in solo shows at the same gallery.

Critical Response

French artists and art critics reacted positively to Cassatt’s 1891 series, and many noted the influence of Japanese woodblock prints. Pissarro famously wrote of Cassatt’s fine coloration and mastery of Japanese style in a letter to his son. He said that the French-born exhibitors would “be furious when they discover next to their exhibition a show of rare and exquisite works,” and he admired the images’ “mat tone, subtle, delicate, without stains or smudges: adorable blues, fresh pinks.” A writer in L’Art Moderne stated that the series was charming and innovative: he praised “the marvelous style of these honest works” and “the exquisite, unexpected grace of… gestures.” This writer also focused mostly on influence of the Japanese: “Scenes both intimate and worldly, these [prints], like the Japanese plates, are printed in color.” In the radical journal Le Chat Noir, the art critic and magazine editor Felix Fénéon offered praise that again focused on comparisons with Japanese art: “Today, the lace-like way she treats arms, shoulders, and generally all the lines of a nude recall too clearly dear [Utamaro], but here [the] lines are more inflated than in
[Utamaro], and, therefore, influenced by Kiyonaga, with his fat napes, yet without a trace of what is a little facile, a little vulgar in Kiyonaga’s naturalism.”

Although they reviewed Cassatt’s exhibition favorably, the writers questioned whether the series would fare as well with the general public. Pissarro wrote: “The general response is mostly hostile.” American journalists were especially critical of the prints’ appeal to the masses. A reviewer in the Chicago Daily Tribune acknowledged that the prints had attracted attention in Paris, but he also addressed “those who cannot bring themselves to unqualified admiration of Miss Mary Cassatt’s impressionistic style.” Close to Cassatt’s hometown, Philadelphia writers shared this opinion. A writer from the Philadelphia Press commended Cassatt’s technical achievements and the simplicity of her forms, but he suggested that only other artists would appreciate them. A writer from the Philadelphia Record stated that only those familiar with Japanese art would be able to understand Cassatt’s adaptation of Japanese styles. Even Cassatt’s admirers acknowledged that the public might not be able to grasp her stylistic references to Japanese woodblock prints.

It is likely that Cassatt looked to Japanese woodblock prints as she began the 1891 series. These prints had circulated among French artists and collectors since the 1860s, when members of the avant-garde felt a particular affinity with the ukiyo-e artists’ representation of leisure and pleasure. The first record of Cassatt’s interest was in 1890, when she visited an exhibition of Japanese graphic works at the École des Beaux-Arts. In a letter, she urged Berthe Morisot to see the show and added: “I dream of it and don’t think of anything else but color on copper.” Here, Cassatt connected her observation of Japanese woodblocks to her desire to attempt color
printmaking in intaglio. A letter Cassatt wrote to Samuel P. Avery in 1891 also legitimizes this connection: “The set was done with the intention of attempting an imitation of Japanese methods.”

Contemporary scholars have also focused on the compositional and thematic parallels between Cassatt’s 1891 series and Japanese *ukiyo-e* woodcuts. Nancy Mowll Mathews and Judith Barter suggest that Cassatt’s growing interest in developing multiple variations, in both paintings and prints, of compositions depicting women performing daily rituals may relate to albums such as Kitagawa Utamaro’s *Twelve Hours in the Pleasure Quarter of the Yoshiwara*. Certain formal aspects of the 1891 series do echo Japanese sources, notably Cassatt’s use of flat decorative color shapes and thin washes of color applied *à la poupée*. Many writers also see the influence of Japanese woodcuts in Cassatt’s use of asymmetrical composition, bold color choices, and decorative pattern.

While Cassatt certainly looked to Japanese prints for design ideas and content, she did not copy them slavishly. For one thing, she did not use woodcut. Moreover, in her letter to Avery, Cassatt wrote that she abandoned her homage to Japanese woodblocks “after the first plate and tried for more atmosphere.”

The domestic subjects of the series also perpetuate themes that Cassatt had been treating since the 1870s, before she wrote that she had Japanese prints in mind. All of the prints in the series show women. Nine of the ten show women in domestic settings alone or in the company of other women. Four show women with a baby. In *The Bath*, Cassatt repeated the scene of a mother giving her child a bath, which she had painted in *Mother about to Wash Her Sleepy Child* (1880). Mothers lovingly
embrace their babies in many of Cassatt’s works, including *Mother and Child (The Oval Mirror)* (1889). Similar scenes of maternal embraces in the 1891 series are *Maternal Caress* and *Mother’s Kiss*. Women also perform the same domestic tasks in the 1891 series as they do in Cassatt’s paintings. For example, a woman privately arranging her hair at a mirror in *The Coiffure* echoes the painting *Girl Arranging Her Hair* (1886). Cassatt painted women sipping tea in *Five O’clock Tea* (1880) and repeated this theme in the 1891 aquatint *Afternoon Tea Party*. Although Cassatt did not paint women writing letters, as in the print *The Letter*, she had painted women reading privately in *Reading Le Figaro* (1878) and *Young Woman Reading* (1876).

One exception to the correlation of themes between the 1891 series and Cassatt’s paintings is the half-nude adult figures in the aquatints *The Coiffure* and *Woman Bathing*. Cassatt had treated nudes in prints such as *Standing Nude* and *Standing Nude with Towel* while working with Degas ten years earlier. Printmaking must have offered Cassatt a different opportunity to depict nudes. She included nude infants in many paintings, but only in the undated painting *Reclining Nude* did Cassatt paint an adult nude.

*In the Omnibus*

*In the Omnibus* is the only print in the series that shows women and a baby in a public place (Figure 1). Two women sit inside an omnibus as it passes over a river outside the window behind them. The woman on the right, dressed in a pink dress and hat, speaks to the baby holding a yellow ball seated on her right knee. The woman on the left wears a brown coat and hat. She holds an umbrella in her right hand and gazes
outward to the omnibus interior, perhaps to the outside beyond. Because there are no other passengers and they sit close to one another, we may presume that the women are traveling together.

Based on their costumes, we may presume that the women are an upper-middle-class mother and a nurse. Both wear high-necked dresses with long, fitted sleeves. The left woman’s hat has a larger brim and more elaborate attachments than her companion’s. Their hats in particular distinguish them from working-class women, who usually wore bonnets or more modest caps, or prostitutes, who could not legally wear hats. The women’s gloves and umbrella are also typically upper- or middle-class accessories. The baby wears the customary white dress and bonnet that does not indicate his or her gender.¹⁴

Although the iconography of women in the public space of the omnibus was unique for Cassatt, depictions of omnibuses existed in French, British, and American art. Most images were commercial advertisements or illustrations aimed at a popular audience, but several painters and printmakers treated the space of the omnibus as a claustrophobic setting of class conflict. Cassatt’s treatment of the problematic public space of the omnibus within a series of domestic scenes was therefore quite daring.

The Omnibus in Paris

The omnibus system in Paris arose in 1828 to meet the needs of workers who lived in the far reaches of the city and traveled to the commercial center to work. Entrepreneurs like Stanislas Baudry, who pioneered the omnibus in Nantes in 1826, intended the omnibus to serve citizens who traveled long distances to a steady job but
who would not normally take a private cab.\textsuperscript{15} Baudry’s first omnibus in Paris used three horses to pull a carriage with fourteen passengers. By 1838, there were sixteen omnibus firms operating in Paris and a total of 409 cars running on thirty-five lines. In 1855, the French government combined smaller firms to create a nationalized \textit{Compagnie Générale des Omnibuses} with a fleet of one hundred buses operating in Paris. From 1855 to 1867, the number of passengers in Paris tripled from 40,000,000 to 120,000,000.\textsuperscript{16}

In the early years of omnibus operation in Paris, contemporary commentators and government officials emphasized that omnibuses could attract a diverse ridership. In 1828, the police administration created a poster that advertised the “immense advantages these [transit facilities] offer to commerce and industry.” The administration emphasized especially the usefulness of the omnibus “to the industrial and laboring classes.” In 1830, Charles Louis Lesur predicted that the omnibus would succeed “because the modest price of a single ride… effectively permits everyone to enter.” Édouard Gourdon wrote: “Everyone passes through the omnibus; a history of the omnibus is a history of society.” In 1834, one writer stated that “the omnibus is… the sanctuary of equality.” He emphasized the variety of types on board: “I saw enter one [omnibus] a servant, a peer… a woman agent of a foreign exchange office, a female cook, each for thirty centimes.”\textsuperscript{17} These writers believed that omnibuses were affordable for a variety of Parisian citizens.

The historian Nicholas Papayanis counters these claims by arguing that the omnibus was, at least at first, a distinctly bourgeois space reserved for the middle class. The omnibus lines were located in the wealthy, commercial center of Paris, and
civil servants were among those who benefited most from the routes. In addition, high fares deterred working-class citizens. A second-class ride on an omnibus from the *Dames Blanches* company, for example, cost twenty-five *centimes* at a time when most workers earned much less than that per day.  

The poet and journalist Félix Nogaret confirmed that omnibus passengers had a variety of occupations, but they were all “well-positioned people.” He noted that working-class citizens were not often passengers on the omnibus: “As for the unfortunate class, / Which does not have such beautiful clothes, / The day-laborer, the mender of garments / These people are not admitted.” In a footnote, he continued: “since [a miller or a coal miner] enters into [society’s] projects only to be excluded, why say the omnibus is for everyone?” Nogaret decided that the word “omnibus,” which meant “for all,” was a “lie” since the Paris omnibus was not actually open to everyone.

Changes in operating procedures made the omnibus slightly more affordable in the following decades. As prices declined, the omnibus became more truly “public.” As early as 1860, a *New York Times* writer visiting Paris observed that “thousands of workmen avail themselves of the cheap part of the various lines to ride to and from their work morning and night.” Also, the “correspondence” or transfer system made it easier for workers to travel greater distances, using many lines, for the price of one ride. In 1853, additional second-class seating became available on open roof platforms. Some buses could then accommodate up to forty passengers. Later in the century, the number of female passengers also increased as women traveled from the wealthy western *arrondissements* of Paris to shop in the city center. Still, even new
omnibus routes covered mostly the wealthier and more commercial districts in the center and west of the city. Poorer areas, like the twentieth arrondisement on the eastern edge of the city, had few routes.21

French artists’ depictions of omnibuses take class encounters as their point of interest. Adrien Marie’s 1874 drawing Interior of an Omnibus shows passengers of different class types packed shoulder-to-shoulder and grimacing at one another. A man with a top hat and a monocle furrows his brow at the overweight man across from him, who falls asleep on the woman next to him. A middle-class woman in the left foreground covers her mouth with a handkerchief, perhaps responding to something odorous in the working woman’s basket to her left. In the background, a clergyman reads a book, and a worker in a cap pays the attendant for his ride. This image features many class types, and they are visibly uncomfortable in such close proximity.22

Honoré Daumier satirized the omnibus variously as too small, too motley, and too dangerous to one’s health. In his 1864 watercolor The Omnibus, Daumier painted passengers densely packed with varying degrees of discomfort (Figure 2). A large man obliviously overcrowds the women seated at his sides, and another man falls asleep on an angry woman. In his 1862 lithograph Un Zeste, un Rien... Et L’Omnibus se Trouve Complet (“In the twinkling of an eye the omnibus is filled to overflowing”), Daumier shows passengers’ anger and surprise as an overweight woman walks over to an empty seat that is far too small for her (Figure 3). In these images, Daumier presented the omnibus as a claustrophobic space. He also depicted the omnibus as a space of mixed class interaction, as in the 1839 lithograph Intérieur
d’un omnibus, part of the series *Types Parisiens* published in the satirical newspaper *La Charivari* between 1840 and 1843 (Figure 4). Daumier shows a prim middle-class girl, identifiable by her hat, scarf, gloves, and umbrella, squeezed between “a drunkard and a butcher.”24 She regards them warily and clutches her umbrella for support. Daumier also depicted the omnibus as a space of contagion that posed a health risk to passengers. In the 1858 drawing *An Omnibus During Flu Season*, Daumier shows top-hatted men covering their noses and mouths while two women tend to a baby (Figure 5). Daumier presented the omnibus as an overcrowded, socially uncomfortable, and unhealthy space.

Mme. J. Delace-Feurgard’s *Un Coin d’omnibus* was an image that Cassatt may have seen at the Salon of 1887. Delace-Feurgard’s composition features two women, perhaps a mother and a nurse, seated together with the nurse holding the baby, an older child who gazes out the window, as well as a male figure. The women and children huddle together on the left side of the omnibus’ corner. The man faces them from the other side of the corner.25 It is as if the women have gathered together at the left side of the composition to avoid physical proximity to the lone man.

This image may attest to the fact that women had only limited access to omnibuses in Paris. According to nineteenth-century commentators, most female passengers had to pay strict attention to proper etiquette. Young women could ride with their mothers as chaperones, and groups of young women could ride in the company of groups of young men as chaperones. According to Papayanis, only “older” women could safely ride alone. Even then, the omnibus was fraught with
problematic social situations. These included physical proximity to strangers who might presume to start a conversation and seeming like a prostitute.\textsuperscript{26}

An abundance of literature from the time describes the rules and risks of an omnibus ride for women in Paris. Louise d’Alq wrote a manual on manners that included the rule that no men or women should speak to strangers on an omnibus. In her 1834 guide, Elisabeth Félicie Bayle-Mouillard insisted that men help women on and off omnibuses, give the front seats to women, and never “take advantage of their ‘superiority.’” In response, women should be modest in their demands and in their displays of gratitude. In 1858, a male writer’s experience exemplified the risks for female omnibus passengers. When a woman fell asleep at his side, he thought, “What impudence, madam, you are sleeping and your face is very close to mine; I sense the warmth of your breath on my cheek; the least shock of the coach could compromise you.” The writer soon realized that the man at the other side of the sleeping woman was her husband. Another writer described how easily men could confuse single women on the omnibus with prostitutes soliciting clients.\textsuperscript{27} For women in Paris, the omnibus was a socially dangerous space governed by many behavioral rules.

Women in Parisian Public Space

These rules for women in the omnibus are consistent with scholarly understandings of nineteenth-century Paris as a socially dangerous place for women. In their discussions of \textit{In the Omnibus}, many scholars have focused on the social dangers of Paris and how middle-class women were restricted in their ability to move through the urban space. Griselda Pollock cites Jules Michelet’s 1859 essay \textit{La}
*Femme*, in which he describes how a middle-class woman could not go out alone in public for fear that people would mistake her for a prostitute. A respectable lady could not move about without a chaperone, nor could she lock eyes with an unrelated man. To Pollock, a woman’s ride on an omnibus would therefore constitute “a transgressive act.”

But other scholars such as Janet Wolff, Elizabeth Wilson, Aruna D’Souza, and Tom McDonough have assembled literary and pictorial evidence that contradicts the concept that women lived a spatially constricted existence. They argue that women must have experienced public life, but literary descriptions from the period mislead contemporary readers. Janet Wolff, for example, states that “the literature of modernity” defines and observes women only in relation to men: as “whore, widow, or murder victim.” In this way, contemporaneous male writers have defined the female experience. Elizabeth Wilson also argues that the male *flâneur* who trolled the streets of Paris was a literary device invented to describe the loss of male power in the public realm. In this way, he was “an anxious figure” in the arts, not “a representation of actual masculine experience.”

Greg Thomas argues that women in late-nineteenth-century Paris enjoyed access to public space in the “marginal spaces” associated with modern Paris. Parks in particular exhibited a combination of private and public qualities that women could negotiate as they tended to their children. Thomas cites photographic examples of women in the Luxembourg Gardens in the 1880s. He clarifies, however, that women mostly enjoyed this access through their role as mother, which was important to “public bourgeois identity.” In this way, women had access to public life only
through their role as caretakers. Their public activity in parks met the expectation that middle-class women maintained family order.

Among Cassatt’s works, there are many examples of women alone or with children outside the home, especially in gardens and parks. Typically, however, the setting looks like private property. When women take part in some other outdoor activity, there is also a male chaperone. In *A Woman and Child Driving*, for example, the woman takes the reins of the carriage, but a groom is present as guardian (Figure 6). In *The Boating Party*, Cassatt depicted a woman and child in a boat rowed by a man with his back to the viewer (Figure 7). The 1895 aquatint *Feeding the Ducks* is closest to *In the Omnibus* in medium as well as in content, with two women and a child on some mode of transportation in view of water (Figure 8). The women are alone, but their position on a rowboat differs from that of the women on the omnibus. The women feeding the ducks and the women in other outdoor images are either safe with a male chaperone or within a domestic outdoor or park setting. By contrast, the omnibus picture presents women both unchaperoned and in a truly public setting.

Scholars have argued that the omnibus possessed qualities that were different from other public spaces. In her discussion of *In the Omnibus*, Pollock calls the omnibus interior an “ambiguous space of modernity.” Like the balcony and the theatre, “it represented a hybrid space of seeing and being seen.” This is consistent with Wilson’s assertion that the true spaces of modernity exhibited a blend of private and public characteristics. The omnibus’ close quarters mimicked the sense of intimacy a woman might feel at home. But as we have seen, women could ride only
under careful surveillance by fellow passengers who were strangers. A misstep could cost a female passenger her honor.

Cassatt channels these anxieties in *In the Omnibus*. In a preparatory drawing, she highlighted the sense of social anxiety by including other passengers. The image reveals Cassatt’s omission of a man who sits and a woman who stands to the women’s left (Figure 9). The seated mother would have been looking anxiously away from these figures if they had remained. In the print, Cassatt’s omnibus becomes a quiet, contemplative space devoid of other figures. Yet the mother retains her stiff discomfort.

The mother’s wariness contrasts with the nurse’s relaxed obliviousness. Norma Broude points to their differing demeanors as indicators of class, with the middle-class woman “cautious and protective” and the maid displaying “oblivious comfort.”33 The lower-class maid is more comfortable in the public space of the omnibus, while the mother has more of a reputation to lose. Pollock also argues that the women wear “the costumes of classed gender,” and their status as employer and employee separates them. The mother’s behavior suggests that she feels the social discomfort that scholars have described.

In the form of the baby, the women also carry their role as domestic guardians into the public space of the omnibus. Broude provides historical context for Cassatt’s representations of mother and child. In the nineteenth century, social philosopher August Comte and historians like Jules Michelet refigured the perceived weaknesses of women as their strengths. Women became vessels of morality and spirituality,
upholding the domestic front. This theory, which Broude calls the “cult of true womanhood,” relegated women to the private sphere.

Broude argues that Cassatt consciously employed the theme of mother and child to define herself as an artist in a way that was appropriate to her gender. This strategy coincided with anxiety about declining birthrates in France. The French public blamed the “New Woman,” who was gaining new access to education, employment, and divorce, for the birthrate problem. At the same time, there was a public discourse surrounding poor mothers who might abandon their babies. In this way, motherhood took on a civil role that Cassatt may have exploited.34

Given the theme of childcare in public space, one might read the scene as a commentary on the enduring function of women as domestic guardians even in the public realm. This would be consistent with Cassatt’s exploitation of the mother and child theme. Perhaps Cassatt attempted to reconcile the domestic role of women with the new opportunities presented by the modern city, such as riding the omnibus.

It is more likely that Cassatt presented the omnibus as the socially complicated space that both scholars and contemporary commentators described. As we have seen, an abundance of literature cautioned female passengers. The wary gaze of the middle-class mother attests to her discomfort on board. The content of the rest of the series also heightens the sense of anxiety in the image. Women inhabit domestic settings and perform domestic tasks in each of the prints in the series except for In the Omnibus. The abrupt change to a public venue emphasizes the uniquely public feeling of riding the omnibus. It is the only image in the series that possesses this potential for discomfort.
The Omnibus in London

British descriptions and depictions of omnibuses were similar to those of the French. Nineteenth-century commentators argued over whether the omnibus was affordable to all Londoners. As in Paris, descriptions indicate that the middle class initially rode the omnibus, but poorer passengers could afford to ride later in the century. British writers and artists also emphasized the claustrophobic close quarters of the omnibus’ interior.

The first omnibus service came to London in 1829, a year after it began in Paris. The entrepreneur George Shilibeer believed the omnibus could offer a safer, more comfortable ride than a stagecoach since all omnibus passengers would ride inside. The price of a ride was also less than the price of most short stagecoach rides, although the omnibus fare (one shilling) was still too expensive for the average worker in the 1830s. In 1855, the London General Omnibus Company bought hundreds of independent omnibus companies in order to standardize omnibus operation. In 1861, the American George Francis Train introduced horse trams or street railways in London. These used horses to pull buses along smooth tracks, which enabled them to use fewer horses to carry more passengers. The two-horse tram carried fifty passengers, twice the capacity of the horse-drawn omnibus at the time, which made it a more cost-effective enterprise.

Descriptions of London’s omnibus indicate that it was, at least initially, only available to the middle class. Still, traveling by omnibus in London was often a claustrophobic and filthy experience. A writer in the *New Monthly Magazine* in 1833 wrote: “Here we are… in all six and twenty sweating citizens, jammed, crammed and
squeezed into each other like so many peas in a pod…” In 1836, *The Times* newspaper published a set of rules for omnibus passengers. The writers were preoccupied with personal space: “Sit with your limbs straight, and do not with your legs describe an angle of forty-five, thereby occupying the room of two persons.” They also scolded those who believed they were superior to the poor conditions on board: “Refrain from affectation and conceited airs. Remember that you are riding a distance for sixpence which, if made in a hackney coach, would cost you as many shillings; and that should your pride elevate you above plebeian accommodations, your purse should enable you to command aristocratic indulgences.” In this way, the writers acknowledged that the omnibus targeted those who were money-conscious, not aristocrats. The passengers’ potential “affectation” suggested that they were not poor workers. Later in the century, the riding population of omnibuses may have changed as rides became more affordable. In 1893, W.J. Gordon wrote that the omnibus “exists for the convenience of the many” and “shuddered” at the idea of “depriving a poor man of his omnibus”. Issues of personal space and social class were therefore implicit in deciding to ride the omnibus in London.\(^\text{35}\)

Images from London confirm that the omnibus was a claustrophobic but middle-class space. In *Omnibus Life in London*, painted in 1859, William Maw Egley presents a socially homogeneous and densely packed scene (Figure 10). From the front end of the omnibus’ interior, both side rows are packed with men in top hats and women with shopping bags and well-dressed children.\(^\text{36}\) In *The Charing Cross to Bank Omnibus*, exhibited 1861, Thomas Musgrove Joy painted top-hatted men sitting inside the omnibus as a young lady begins to board (Figure 11). The attendant
suggests that the lady’s dog must ride on the top, not in the overcrowded interior of the omnibus. Alfred Morgan painted a similarly crowded scene in *An Omnibus Ride to Piccadilly Circus* in 1885 (Figure 12). The women’s attire is similar to the women’s in Cassatt’s *In the Omnibus*, and they also have young children and babies in tow. One man wears a top hat, and another carries a briefcase and newspaper, which indicate his professional status. In these images, English artists depicted the London omnibus as a crowded space for middle-class passengers.

The Omnibus in the United States

Nineteenth-century commentators revealed that omnibuses in New York were often as chaotic and claustrophobic as their London and Paris counterparts. In 1864, the *New York Times* published a petition by New York state citizens that demanded that passengers pay the omnibus fare only when they received a seat on board. “Your petitioners represent that the evils of the present system of packing rail cars and omnibuses, as practiced by all the different lines in the City, without exception, have become unendurable,” they wrote. In 1869, a writer for the weekly magazine *The Round Table* also complained about the conditions on board the New York omnibus. He acknowledged the general overcrowding of omnibuses and worried especially about female passengers:

“To be huddled and crammed together like sheep… in vermin-swarming, foul-smelling, sweltering, stifling boxes; to be pushed and hauled and dragged about, to be pawed and smeared, to see our wives and sisters and daughters pawed and smeared, and all but embraced,
by greasy-handed, filthy conductors; to stand up when we paid for a seat, or to content ourselves with half a seat when we had paid for a whole one… these are some of the intolerable inflictions which New Yorkers for the past ten years have quietly, almost without remonstrance, endured, and which certainly no other free people on the face of the globe could ever have been brought to endure.”

In response to such complaints, others stated that equal access to transportation, regardless of seating, was a distinctly American right. In 1867, a New York Times correspondent wrote that he “considers himself among the most fortunate of men, because he lives in a country whose institutions permit him thus to ‘ride even though there be already twenty-six persons on a car.’” The writer compared this American right to the Paris omnibus system, wherein the law protected the rider’s right to a seat. “But then France... is not a free and enlightened Republic like the United States.” For this writer, overcrowding became a political issue, but all agreed that New York omnibuses were defined by their overcrowding.

The New York omnibus was also a socially problematic space. Charles Dana Gibson’s 1893 drawing for Life magazine The American Comedy: “Irish or What” provides an example of the American omnibus as a space for social conflict (Figure 13). Unlike British and French artists, Gibson focused on ethnic differences among passengers. In his image, a middle-class couple sits at the far corner of an omnibus interior. In the foreground on the same bench sits a well-dressed, mustachioed man with a top hat and cane. He greets the viewer confrontationally with direct eye contact and his hand on his waist. Based on nineteenth-century stereotypes, the couple may
presume that the man is Irish from his top hat and unsophisticated physiognomy.\textsuperscript{38} The middle-class woman, meanwhile, regards the stranger skeptically. The text that appeared below this image may describe the woman’s interior monologue as she derides the near passenger’s Irish appearance, name, heritage, and allegiances: “He \textit{is} Irish anyhow. His race is Irish; his religion’s Irish; so are his sympathies; so is his temper. He votes Irish too.” The New York omnibus forced these different ethnic types into close quarters, and Gibson’s image and the magazine’s text exposed their subsequent discomfort.

Cassatt and the Omnibus

Cassatt experienced many of the spatial restrictions that scholars describe while living in Paris. As a young, unmarried woman, it was inappropriate for Cassatt to live alone in Paris. After she acquired her first studio, her sister Lydia therefore came from the United States to join her. In 1877, the Cassatt’s parents moved to join them. As a woman, Cassatt was also prohibited from attending the frequent meetings of her male artist friends at the Café de la Nouvelle Athènes in the Place Pigalle, even though her studio was right next-door on Rue Duperré. She would have passed the Café on her way to her studio from her apartment on Rue Laval, but it was not an appropriate haunt for a proper middle-class woman like Cassatt. As a result, George Moore wrote, “She did not come to the Nouvelle Athènes it is true, but… we used to see her everyday.”\textsuperscript{39} In these ways, Cassatt experienced the gendered spheres that scholars describe.
Still, Cassatt may have experienced rides on the Parisian omnibus. In her description of Mary and Lydia Cassatt’s lifestyle when they lived in Montmartre, Mathews describes a day that might include a ride on the omnibus. After a day of shopping and dining, she says, “the weary pedestrian could continue her journey by horse-drawn omnibus.”

Also, Cassatt moved to a larger apartment on the Rue Beaufon with the rest of her family when they came to Paris in 1877, but she maintained an independent studio in Montmartre. It would have taken Cassatt about forty minutes to walk from her family’s new apartment near the Arc d’Triomphe to her old studio. Although the Cassatts lived very comfortably in Paris, they did not keep their own carriage. Stabling the horses, paying the coachman, and maintaining a garage would have been more expensive than commissioning a private cab as needed. Cassatt might have walked or hired a private cab to commute to her studio. However, with her passion for travel and with her brother Alexander in the railroad industry, it is likely that she took the omnibus at least on occasion. After a few months, the family moved to Avenue Trudaine, which was closer to her studio in Montmartre. An omnibus line ran along Avenue Trudaine to connect them to the rest of the city. Later, Cassatt moved into another apartment of her own on Avenue Pierre l’er de Serbie (today Rue Pierre Charron), but she kept her old studio in Montmartre. Again, she might have used the omnibus to make this commute, as it would have been a forty-minute walk.

Contemporary maps confirm that it would have been possible for Cassatt to take the omnibus from either of her family’s apartments to her studio in Montmartre. Maps from 1860, 1905, and 1913 show that an omnibus line ran through the Place de
Étoile northward on the Avenue de Wagram and turned onto Boulevard de Courcelles at the Place des Ternes. The route continued as the boulevard became the Boulevard des Batignolles, which became the Boulevard de Clichy. There was an omnibus stop right at the Place Pigalle, the center of the artists’ quarter and a stone’s throw from Cassatt’s studio on Rue Duperré.\textsuperscript{41}

The 1891 Exhibition

Cassatt exhibited the 1891 series that included \textit{In the Omnibus} at the gallery of the avant-garde tastemaker Paul Durand-Ruel. His father, Jean-Marie Durand, had already been selling non-academic art to middle-class Parisians by the 1840s.\textsuperscript{42} When Paul Durand-Ruel took over in 1855, he succeeded as a major marketer of the Barbizon school. He met the painters Claude Monet and Camille Pissarro in 1870, when they fled to London during the Franco-Prussian War. Durand-Ruel saw these artists and their friends in Paris as the successors to the Barbizon painters. By 1876, he was the primary dealer for the Impressionists and organized their second exhibition.\textsuperscript{43}

Durand-Ruel and Cassatt began a mutually beneficial relationship after they met through the Impressionist exhibitions. In the 1880s, he sold some of her drypoints, and she helped him open the New York branch of his gallery and hold the Impressionist exhibition there in 1886. Cassatt’s brother Alexander and her friends the Havemeyers contributed works from their personal collections, in hopes of inspiring other Americans to buy. Cassatt had advised both collectors on their purchases, sometimes even buying the paintings directly for them.\textsuperscript{44} In this way,
Cassatt was able to offer Durand-Ruel helpful consulting services beyond her artmaking.

In return, Durand-Ruel promoted Cassatt’s art. In 1890, he offered her an exclusive contract similar to those he had signed with Monet, Degas, and Pissarro, guaranteeing an annual salary in exchange for a certain number of works. Durand-Ruel also promoted Cassatt in his art journal, *L’Art dans les Deux Mondes*: the first image in the inaugural issue in 1891 was a drypoint by Cassatt.45

It may have been Durand-Ruel’s idea to present Cassatt’s 1891 prints as a series. He claimed responsibility for packaging twelve of her earlier drypoints as a series. “The individual sale of your prints would be very inconvenient,” he wrote to Cassatt. “Everyone would want the same plates and once the sets were broken they would become unsaleable.” To Durand-Ruel, creating a series was a marketing technique to ensure the sale of all of the prints.46

Cassatt sent her prints to American galleries as well as to Durand-Ruel’s. Later in 1891, “some half-dozen” color etchings by Cassatt could be seen at Frederick Keppel and Co. in New York. At least some of those on display were from the series exhibited at Durand-Ruel in Paris. Keppel was a dealer and publisher of etchings, including exhibition catalogs, and his *The Print-Collector’s Bulletin* catalogued etchings he offered for sale. According to an article in *The Art Amateur; A Monthly Journal Devoted to Art in the Household*, Keppel’s company had previously been responsible for printing the contributions by American artists that appeared in Durand-Ruel’s exhibition of “Artist-Etchers, Engravers, and Lithographers” in 1889.
The show included etchings and drypoints by Cassatt. Keppel and Durand-Ruel were connected by their mutual exhibition of Cassatt’s color prints.\textsuperscript{47}

Durand-Ruel and other New York galleries continued to support Cassatt’s printmaking efforts throughout the 1890s. In 1893, Durand-Ruel hosted another solo exhibition at his Parisian gallery. This comprised the 1891 series of ten color aquatints, fifty drypoints including multiple states, seventeen paintings, and fourteen pastels. Durand-Ruel sent one of Cassatt’s color etchings, \textit{The Banjo}, to an exhibition of the Woman’s Art Club in New York in 1894. Durand-Ruel exhibited color etchings by Cassatt in New York again in 1909.\textsuperscript{48}

Cassatt and Reproductive Printmaking

Louisine Havemeyer’s memory tells us that Cassatt saw prints as instruments of taste education in the United States. By aiming to target members of the public “even quite humble,” Cassatt was articulating longstanding American attitudes. Since the early nineteenth century, American artists and commentators had recognized the value of prints as an economical way of educating American taste and promoting the work of American artists. Reproductive printmaking methods like engraving or lithography could produce highly-finished copies based on other works of art such as paintings or drawings. Like the works they copied, reproductive printmakers often treated morally enlightening themes from history, mythology, and religion.

Several mid-nineteenth-century American groups aimed to remedy the lack of fine art availability by bringing reproductive prints into middle-class American homes. The American Art-Union defined the problem in its \textit{Transactions} in 1842:
“We have no public galleries. The men of wealth and taste among us, who possess works of art shut them up within the walls of their houses, where they are as much lost to the world as though they had never existed.” The Union’s solution was to run a lottery system based on membership subscription. Members paid five dollars per year for a guaranteed number of engravings and the chance to win the original paintings the Union bought. The prints were “framing prints,” larger than album-sized and intended to hang in the home.

The Art-Union Committee selected the paintings, which were usually American history or genre scenes. The English-born, Philadelphia-based printmaker John Sartain engraved the first two prints: *General Marion Inviting a British Officer to Dinner*, from the painting by John Blake White (Figure 14) and *The Artist’s Dream*, from the painting by George H. Comegys. White’s painting documents a scene from the Revolutionary War, when a British commander asked the American General Marion for an opportunity to meet and discuss a battle. The scene acknowledges the hospitality of the Americans and condemns British cowardice, since they ended up fleeing after the meeting, before the battle could take place. This historical narrative was a suitable first image to visually propagate American patriotism.

The Union also brought art to its members in the semi-monthly *Bulletin*, an illustrated art journal with articles, biographies, and criticism. The *Bulletin* grew out of the annual publication of the *Transactions*, which the Union’s Constitution required. The Committee issued the magazine from April to December in advance of the annual raffle. The aim of the *Bulletin*’s editor was “to elevate and purify public
taste, and to extend among the people, the knowledge and admiration of the productions of ‘HIGH ART.’”

The Union achieved the goal of bringing fine art into many American homes. In 1849, there were 18,960 subscribers. By some accounts, the Union was too successful for its own good: Maybelle Mann cites an editorial in the *Boston Daily Advertiser* that criticizes the number of households that owned the same print. Though this had a negative effect on the Union, it proved that their method was an effective way of dispersing art to Americans, until the New York Supreme Court declared the American Art-Union lottery illegal in 1852.

Other organizations and publications encouraged Americans to acquire affordable art reproductions for their homes. In their 1869 book *The American Woman’s Home*, Catherine E. Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe advised “the masses to enjoy the fine arts and purchase in a moderate style.” Their moralistic guide to home decoration hinged on the popular notion that the physical space of the home could help instill religious faith and moral values. They also based their text in practical economics; the guide was for middle-class women who could not afford servants. For example, they encouraged those who could not afford frames to make their own rustic frames out of twigs. This way, any American could afford to hang art in her home.

American printmakers and publishers targeted women as customers in the 1840s and 50s because they were responsible for the home. At this time, women were tastemakers because their domain was the home, while men worked outside the home and enjoyed the home as the reward for their work. The proliferation of periodicals
for women like Leslie’s and Ladies’ National Magazine is a testament to this fact. Magazines and “gift books” like The Iris reproduced fine art images for women. Gift books in particular were available at the end of the year so that they targeted the holiday consumer. Like the prints that hung in homes, illustrations in gift books promoted middle-class values of morality, family, and patriotism.54

In their book, the Beechers guided American women by suggesting specific reproductive prints for purchase and listing their prices. Three out of the four listed are chromolithographs by Louis Prang’s famous company, whose glossy color prints could imitate the finish of oil paintings. The Beechers continue: “Besides the chromos, which, when well selected and of the best class, give the charm of color which belongs to expensive paintings, there are engravings which finely reproduce much of the real spirit and beauty of the celebrated pictures of the world.” Like the American Art-Union, the Beechers proposed reproductive prints as suitable home décor objects.

Reproductive print enthusiasts like the American Art-Union and the Beechers believed that art could be educational in a variety of ways. “The educating influence of these works,” the Beechers wrote, “can hardly be overestimated.” They, along with printmakers and publishers, believed that decorating could stimulate religious devotion and provide lessons in patriotism, morality, and taste. According to Peter C. Marzio, chromolithography also signaled a broader social change that connected the common people with the cultured elite. In Marzio’s words, “This attitude embraced the notion, heretical to some, that fine art should be reproduced, packaged, and
offered to the masses.”

Print enthusiasts believed that they could enlighten the uncultured “masses” by making prints available and affordable.

Art displayed in homes could also simply provide pleasure. In another publication for women, Philadelphia’s *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, Leigh Hunt asked the readership: “May we exhort our readers as have no pictures hanging in their rooms, to put one up immediately? No matter how costly, or the reverse, provided they see something in it, and it gives them a profitable or pleasant thought.”

The dispersal of reproductive prints through these methods meant that students, including Cassatt, could have seen print collections in their own homes and in the homes of other Americans. According to Helena E. Wright, wealthy collectors in Philadelphia invited artists and students to study their collections. Katharine Martinez notes that the Philadelphia printmaker and publisher John Sartain conceived of his private collection as publicly useful: “The ground floor rooms were devoted to Sartain’s collection of paintings, books, engravings, and *objets d’art*, a conscious marketing strategy and an impressive and aesthetically stimulating environment for friends and clients.” From these connections and visits, young art students like Cassatt certainly became familiar with Sartain’s work and other reproductive printmaking.

Cassatt also knew Sartain’s reproductive mezzotint work through her relationship with his family. Beginning in 1860, Cassatt took classes at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, where Sartain was among those who taught and determined the curriculum. All of Sartain’s children were familiar with engraving techniques from their father’s teachings. Sartain’s daughter Emily, who wanted to be
a painter, was Cassatt’s classmate, and they became friends after Cassatt returned from a trip to Europe in 1870.59

Cassatt encountered reproductive engraving again when she traveled to Parma with Emily Sartain in 1872. The purpose of the young women’s visit was Cassatt’s commission to paint copies of two works by Correggio for St. Paul’s Cathedral in Pittsburgh. It is possible that Cassatt visited the home of print collector and dealer James L. Claghorn, who owned reproductive engravings by Paolo Toschi depicting Correggio’s fresco cycle in Parma. In this way, she may have used reproductive prints as a reliable preview before she saw the work in person.60

In Parma, Cassatt and Sartain benefited from their connection with the reproductive engraver Carlo Raimondi. Raimondi was a student of Toschi and collaborated with his teacher on engravings after Correggio and Parmigianino. He then succeeded Toschi as Professor and Director of the School of Engraving at the Accademia in Parma. John Sartain may have provided the connection to his daughter and her friend.

Raimondi’s studio was another place where Cassatt would have absorbed reproductive printmaking values. She and Sartain befriended Raimondi and his son Eduardo, and Raimondi offered both women a free and large studio space in the Accademia. Adelyn Breeskin alleges that Cassatt must have learned to etch from Raimondi, although there is no evidence of Cassatt making any prints at this time.61 Regardless, she was clearly immersed in a reproductive printmaking environment. A letter from Emily Sartain to her father describes Raimondi’s studio at the School of Engraving. She saw engravings by Toschi and Raimondi, some of which she said she
got to keep, and some of which she sent home to her father. In her letter, Sartain emphasized the reproductive nature of the printmaking in Raimondi’s studio. She noted the physical accoutrements of the Italian engravers and suggested that her father adopt some of their methods. The walls were “covered with fine engravings by the best masters” as models for the students. A debate arose among the printmakers over the placement of a leg in a copy of Correggio’s *Virgin Crowned Queen of Heaven*, which Cassatt was also copying. The disagreement ascended to the level that a medical doctor is called in to share his opinion. Emily Sartain’s story proves the importance of accurate reproduction in this kind of engraving. It also provides a glimpse into the reproductive techniques and values with which Cassatt was familiar before attempting printmaking for herself.

Cassatt exhibited her debt to the reproductive printmaking tradition in the 1891 series. As we have seen, nine of these prints replicated themes that Cassatt had treated in her drawings and paintings since the 1870s. The prints were not direct copies of other works, but they did provide similar content. Cassatt may have offered these prints as an affordable alternative to purchasing one of her paintings. This idea was consistent with the goals of American reproductive printmakers throughout the nineteenth century.

The Etching Revival

The values of reproductive printing that Cassatt learned in her early training contrasted with the printmaking she eventually pursued in France. Cassatt met Degas and his peers at a time when the art world was witnessing a revival of interest in intaglio printmaking, especially etching. At the heart of this renewed interest was the
tension between original *belle épreuve* printmaking and commercial or reproductive printmaking. Since the fifteenth century, engraving had served as the principal reproductive medium, with its fine lines woven to create the illusion of three-dimensional surfaces. The invention of lithography in the first half of the nineteenth century pushed intaglio processes out of the market for popular and commercial purposes. Engravings, however, persisted as a mode for some reproductions of paintings and depictions of the elite. By the 1850s, some artists began to retrieve intaglio processes, especially etching, to make non-reproductive work. As the ability to create photographic reproductions made intaglio reproductions obsolete for these purposes, this generation of artists looked backward to techniques no longer in favor for commercial or academic reasons.

Instead, publishers and editors courted painters to make etchings based on the concept of the *peintre-graveur*. Etchings by painter-etchers possessed values that opposed the academic, reproductive values of precision, cleanliness, and completeness. In etchings, connoisseurs valued the spontaneous, imprecise line imbued with the intimate sense of the artist’s particular touch. Rather than reproducing identical images, printmakers began to take interest in the way that impressions even from the same image could be different. The format of etchings also distinguished them from reproductive media. Reproductive prints might aspire to the grand scale of the paintings they reproduced. Etchings, on the other hand, were often (but not always) small enough to fit in personal albums.

In the 1860s, individuals and organizations responded to this intaglio trend in printmaking. Beginning in 1861, Alfred Cadart’s *Société des Aquafortistes* provided a
hub of supportive activity and supplies in Paris. For five years, they published monthly albums of prints by artists like Manet and Félix Bracquemond. Cadart also published *L’Illustration nouvelle* in 1867 and *L’Eaux-Forte en…* in 1874. Art critic and print enthusiast Philippe Burty proclaimed the superiority of *belle épreuve* intaglio in 1867. From 1893 to 1895, Andre Marty’s *L’estampe originale* featured both established and new contemporary artists. Among the artists at the forefront of this revival were James Abbott McNeill Whistler, Bracquemond and, in England, Whistler’s brother-in-law, Francis Seymour Haden, who led the Royal Society of Painter-Etchers.

In the United States, as early as the 1860s, Samuel P. Avery was collecting and marketing work by French etchers, inspired by Cadart. At the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, the French exhibited 106 “Watercolors, Engravings, etc.,” at least seventy of which were original, non-reproductive prints. The art critic Philip Gilbert Hamerton also played a role in popularizing etchings in the United States. His *Etching and Etchers* appeared in two editions in England and the United States in 1868 and 1876. Also inspired by Cadart’s activities in France, he emphasized many of the same qualities, such as “the rapid autographic rendering of artistic thought” in etchings. Hamerton gained such wide readership that J.R.W. Hitchcock deemed it “no exaggeration to say that the modern revival of etching has been due very largely to this book.” In Boston, Sylvester Rosa Koehler also shared the beliefs of the international Etching Revival and showed his support by publishing “Original Painter-Etchings by American Artists” in the *American Art Review*, for which he was managing editor. During 1880 and 1881, the publication included
reproductions of twenty-six original etchings by Americans. Koehler also translated the French etcher Maxime Lalanne’s writings. By the 1880s, the Etching Revival was so popular among amateur artists and collectors that organizations like London’s Society of Painter-Etchers and the New York Etching Society, one of several in the United States, were founded.

During the 1880s, dealers and journalists in the United States and France advertised etchings as appropriate home decoration. In *The Dial; a Semi-monthly Journal of Literary, Criticism, and Information*, James MacAlister said that “no department of art has of late excited so much interest, as well among the uninitiated as among professional artists and amateurs, as etching.” Echoing the American Art-Union, Prang, and the Beechers, he also noted that etchings would promote “the art education of the American people.” In France, Theodore de Banville placed the audience for etching in the home when he called etching an “art enjoyed by the fire.” In Philadelphia, James S. Earle’s & Sons advertised its etchings as “Bridal Gifts and Home Decorations” in the *New York Observer*. New York’s Frederick Keppel & Co. advertised the “moderate prices” of their “high-class etchings and engravings, of permanent value, for home decoration, or Holiday and Wedding presents; costing from $6 upward, suitably framed.” *The Art Amateur* also advertised its “Expert Advice Free” in etchings among other items of home décor in Philadelphia’s *The Ladies’ Home Journal and Practical Housekeeper*, again targeting women as the primary home decorators.

Etching enthusiasts emphasized the importance of collecting original prints rather than reproductive prints. Beginning in 1880, *The Art Amateur* responded to the
increasing number of original print collectors by devoting a portion of each issue to print collecting. Their concerns included deciphering fake reproductions from originals. Keppel also addressed this issue in an extended interview with *The Art Amateur* later in the same year, when he discussed the “ever-growing American demand” for original prints. He gave advice as to the best places in Europe for purchasing prints, signaling that the collectors were wealthy enough to travel there. He also disparaged English dealers who ignored the quality of the print but emphasized only the rarity of it by saying: “only forty impressions were taken, and the plate destroyed.” Keppel said he would prefer to make more prints for cheaper prices, which would make them more accessible as well as increase his profits.68

Cassatt aligned herself with important figures in the Etching Revival in both Paris in New York. Her printmaker M. Leroy had trained under Cadart and worked with Desboutin in Paris. Keppel’s New York gallery provided Cassatt with her first solo exhibition in the city. The Grolier Club included Cassatt in an 1896 exhibition of etchers that included Whistler, Timothy Cole, and Winslow Homer. These venues were synonymous with the Etching Revival and her affiliation with them helped position her for commercial success.

Failing Sales

Despite Cassatt’s personal and professional networking, the 1891 series was a commercial failure. In a letter to Durand-Ruel, Cassatt revealed her overall opinion of the sales: “As my etchings have not sold in America, perhaps it would be as well to
sell them here separately… I am greatly disappointed that there have been no amateurs in New York…” Cassatt elaborated:

“I am afraid I expressed myself very badly or that you misunderstood me. I did not mean to advise you about the sale of the etchings & I have always been opposed to separating them. I replied both to M. Hirsch and to M. Brigeau that I had no power to sell them any proofs as the etchings were no longer my property. Only as M. Brigeau wrote me so very polite a note, I would ask your permission to give him a proof, or ask you rather to sell him one. I only thought that the etchings not having sold in America they were left on your hands. I am very glad you have any sale for them in Paris. Of course it is more flattering from an Art point of view than if they sold in America, but I am still very much disappointed that my compatriots have so little liking for any of my work.”

Cassatt expressed her desire to sell her work to Americans on more than a few occasions. She understood the value of American collectors and helped build some of the most important collections of European art in the United States, most notably the Havemeyers’. She advised her brother Alexander, whom she convinced to buy Monet and Pissarro paintings in 1881. Both these collectors contributed to Durand-Ruel’s Impressionist Exhibition in New York in 1886, which in turn would help inspire other Americans to buy from the group. Cassatt believed that collecting art was in the American national interest: “All the pictures privately bought by rich Americans will eventually find their way into public collections and enrich the national taste. This is
the case with all great collections in Europe.” Even if collectors she advised were “rich Americans,” their purchases would ultimately serve to enrich the taste of the entire nation.

There is some evidence that the 1891 series did sell, but the collectors were not the middle-class Americans Cassatt envisioned. Melot states that after Cassatt’s 1895 exhibition at Durand-Ruel in New York, “her prints were bought by all the important American collectors.” Although this inaccurately implies that the series was a great commercial success, it does describe those who collected the series: important American collectors. Many who owned impressions from the series were either family members or wealthy, elite collectors, and many acquired the works ten to thirty years after Cassatt exhibited them.

Among those who owned editions of the series were Alexander Cassatt and their father Robert, both of whom received theirs in the summer of 1891. Also in that year, the Dutch painter-etcher Philip Zilcken, who also exhibited at the Grolier Club in New York, inquired as to the prices of the series. The writer, art critic, and print enthusiast Claude Roger-Marx obtained an impression of In the Omnibus. Robert Hartshorne, who collected many of Cassatt’s prints, eventually acquired this impression. Over ten years after the 1891 exhibition, Cassatt biographer Achille Segard revealed that he owned a complete edition of the series, as did Durand-Ruel and gallery owner and print publisher Ambroise Vollard.71 Durand-Ruel sold the preparatory drawing for In the Omnibus to the wealthy American collector Harris Whittemore in 1921, thirty years after Cassatt first exhibited the series.
In the aftermath of the 1891 project, Cassatt began to express bitterness about Durand-Ruel’s mismanagement of the series and of her career in general. After a purchase, Justine Whittemore, the wife of the collector, wrote: “[Cassatt] was so pleased that Harris had bought one of her [pastels] and that it was to go to her country. She says M. Durand Ruel [sic] takes everything she paints and keeps them in his own home. Consequently, no one sees her work, especially any Americans.”

According to Havemeyer, Cassatt was upset that Durand-Ruel said “there [was] not enough in” etchings. Based on the failure of the project, they probably meant that there was not enough money in selling them. “They want me to go back to pastels,” Cassatt said. All of these factors most likely contributed to the final deterioration of Cassatt’s relationship with Durand-Ruel. Pissarro described Cassatt’s complaints about “the problem of selling pictures” in a letter to his son in 1891. She was “very desirous of upsetting Durand” and went so far as to ask Pissarro if he would join her if she left his gallery for good.

Cassatt finally took action when she first considered working with Ambroise Vollard. By 1904 she was selling many paintings, pastels, and prints to Vollard, and in early 1906 he paid her 1,550 francs for a group of paintings, pastels, and etchings. Cassatt had noticed Vollard’s success in buying works by Degas that Durand-Ruel rejected and selling them at large profits. Durand-Ruel found it distasteful that Vollard would work with Degas, whom Durand-Ruel had previously represented. But Degas was clearly more interested in selling works than in maintaining loyalty to any particular dealer. Cassatt praised Vollard’s entrepreneurial skill in a letter to Havemeyer: “Vollard is a genius in his line he seems to be able to
sell anything.”76 Indeed, Vollard was responsible for selling some of the 1891 series, after he and Cassatt began working together in the early twentieth century. Three states of In the Omnibus at the National Gallery of Art originally came from Vollard.77

Conclusion

In creating the 1891 series, Cassatt may have attempted to reconcile the commercial values of reproductive printmaking with the techniques of the Etching Revival. However, this goal was unrealistic in the context of the discourse surrounding etchings, and color etchings, at the end of the nineteenth century. Although journalists and galleries advertised etchings as appropriate home decoration, etching enthusiasts also described their preferred form as a subtle, intellectual art for elite connoisseurs. This opposed the reproductive print industry’s aim of providing art to all people. As a response to the fact that wider varieties of people could now afford reproductive prints, etching advocates separated themselves from such mass-marketed products. This contributed to their enthusiasm for the spontaneity, irregularity, and individuality of etchings. Many considered etchings too subtle for the general public.78 This opinion is similar to those of the reviewers who doubted that Cassatt’s 1891 series would appeal to anyone other than fine art connoisseurs.

Nineteenth-century commentators also emphasized that etchings might not be appropriate decorative objects in most American homes. In his popular guide A Plea for Art in the House, William John Loftie called Whistler’s “ragged style of
execution” meaningless “to the general taste.” Similarly, Loftie said that Alphonse Legros’s etchings were “too unpleasing, too rigid, too slight to be attractive except in the eyes of those who are educated in etching.” In this way, writers attempted to distinguish collectors of etchings from the chromo-collecting masses.

Meanwhile, other writers condemned the exclusivity of original print dealers. In a 1901 issue of the Chicago art magazine *Brush & Pencil*, Percy L. Barnard described original printmakers’ detachment from the public. Facing new opportunities to supply art to high demand, he said, artists had sought “to find a market for their ‘originals,’ and have been chagrined to find the public indifferent to their work, often preferring some simple but artistic product of mechanical processes.” Barnard acknowledged that it was “the prerogative of the wealthy to enjoy a monopoly of the ‘originals’ by medalists,” but he foresaw a time when exclusive copies and unique works mattered little “except as a source of pride to collectors and a means of revenue to dealers.”

The fact that Cassatt printed her series in color also may have contributed to its disappointing sales, even among serious collectors. Print connoisseurs were still cautious toward color prints in the wake of the proliferation of chromos. Color lithographic posters littered the streets (and the insides of omnibuses) and gave color printmaking a populist, commercial connotation. Barnard noted that American color posters were of poor quality, unlike those produced by French artists. He acknowledged that “much is even now said in criticism of the colour etching,” but he hoped that it would eventually achieve its potential as great art for the many.
Popular opinions about color printmaking may have hindered connoisseurs from seriously collecting original color prints like Cassatt’s.

The price and number of the 1891 series indicate that middle- or lower-class Americans could not have collected the prints. As we have seen, the recorded owners of the prints were gallery owners, fellow artists, or elite collectors. Scholars differ in their opinions of what the price and edition number meant for buyers. Melot called Cassatt’s intention to sell prints to the general public “generous” because she actually produced “complex and costly prints (compared with the price of pictures in the popular press).” Although Melot says that Cassatt’s prints would have been too expensive and “complex” for the poor, he does say that the middle class would have been able to collect them. Shapiro, on the other hand, acknowledges that the small edition of only twenty-five “signifies that the artist pictured them in only a few homes, to be appreciated by knowledgeable collectors.”

This statement accurately describes the records of who bought and owned the 1891 series.

The cost was probably too high for the audience Cassatt indicated in her conversation with Havemeyer. Although we do not know the original price of the series, we do know that Havemeyer bought a single impression of Cassatt’s color aquatint *The Girl with the Banjo*, not part of the series, for fifteen dollars in the early 1890s. This differs greatly from Cassatt’s intended price of “a few dollars” and from Keppel’s 1893 advertisement, which offered etchings for as little as six dollars. If each print in the series cost fifteen dollars, the entire series would have cost one hundred and fifty dollars. At the time, middle- and lower-class American workers
made only a few hundred dollars a year. Their budgets could not accommodate such an extravagance.84

The iconography of the series also may have contributed to its disappointing sales. Although Cassatt took on the ambitions of a reproductive printmaker and reproduced themes from her paintings in her prints, her depictions of middle-class women in domestic settings were not educational or morally uplifting. *In the Omnibus* would have been an especially bizarre image to the average American, as it related to populist imagery of class confrontations on the omnibus. It also would have reminded the viewer of printed advertisements for public transportation. This ambiguous iconography would not help the untrained viewer understand and enjoy the series, nor would it be educational or uplifting.

Finally, Cassatt’s own reputation may have negatively influenced her sales. Her 1891 exhibition of prints at Keppel’s gallery was her first solo exhibition in New York. Over fifteen years later, Grace Gassette wrote in *The Art Review* that Americans were still largely unaware of Cassatt’s work as an etcher. “I read not long ago what was supposed to be a comprehensive article on American etchers in which Miss Cassatt was not even mentioned.”85 Cassatt exhibited her series just two years before she painted a mural for the Women’s Building at the World’s Columbian Exhibition and Fair in Chicago. Although the mural inspired mixed reactions, it significantly elevated Cassatt’s reputation in the United States. At the time that she exhibited the series, Cassatt relied on her inner circle of family members, artist friends, and elite collectors to support her financially.
There are many possible reasons why the 1891 series disappointed Cassatt with poor sales. Comparing her intention with the results helps illuminate her experience with the changing printmaking climate as the century progressed and as Cassatt moved from the United States to France. Her belief that printmaking could bring her art to the middle-class masses may have been untenable at this time considering her choice of style and iconography. Cassatt chose printmaking methods that many believed the American public could not understand. She also used the omnibus theme to explore the anxieties of middle-class women in public space. For these and other reasons, the 1891 series did not adhere to the values Cassatt espoused in her conversation with Havemeyer.
Figure 1. *In the Omnibus*, Mary Cassatt, 1890-91. Final state. Drypoint, softground, and aquatint. Platemark: 36.6cm by 26.8cm. Cleveland Museum of Art.
Figure 2. *The Omnibus*, Honoré Daumier, 1864. Ink, water, and lithographic pencil on paper. 21.2 cm by 30.2 cm. The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.
Figure 3. *Un Zeste, un Rien... Et L'Omnibus se Trouve Complet*, Honoré Daumier, 1862. Lithograph on paper. 24 by 22.5 cm. Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts.
Figure 4. *Interieur d’un omnibus*, from the series *Types Parisiens*, Honoré Daumier, 1839. Lithograph. Image: 16.3 by 24.4 cm, sheet: 24.1 by 33.7 cm. Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco.
Figure 5. *An Omnibus During Flu Season*, Honoré Daumier, 1858. Black chalk, brush and gray and brown wash, blue, pink and white body color, on gray paper. Sheet: 19 by 25 cm.
Figure 7. *The Boating Party*, Mary Cassatt, 1893-4. Oil on canvas. 35 1/2 by 46 1/8 in. National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.
Figure 8. *Feeding the Ducks*, Mary Cassatt, 1895. Drypoint, aquatint in color and softground etching on ivory laid paper. Plate: 29.8 by 40 cm. Sheet: 38.4 by 51.1 cm.
Figure 9. *In the Omnibus*, Mary Cassatt, 1890-91. Black chalk and graphite on wove paper. 37.9 by 27.1 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.
Figure 10. *Omnibus Life in London*, William Maw Egley, 1859. Tate Gallery, London.
Figure 11. *The Charing Cross to Bank Omnibus*, Thomas Musgrove Joy, 1861. Oil on canvas. 76.2 by 63.5 cm.
Figure 12. *An Omnibus Ride to Piccadilly Circus*, Alfred Morgan, 1885. Oil on canvas. 81 by 110.5 cm.
Figure 14. *General Marion Inviting a British Officer to Dinner*, John Sartain, 1840. Engraving. After *General Marion Inviting a British Officer to Dinner*, by John Blake White. Oil on canvas. 25 by 30 in.
APPENDIX A
Printmaking Processes

Etching is an acid process. One lays a ground and etches or engraves into it to expose the metal beneath. The acid then bites away only at the metal, where the ink will collect in its absence. The ground has to be soft enough that one can draw through it, but it must still deflect the effects of the acid. Often one uses waxes, gums, or rosins. This ground might be dark, so that the lines drawn with an etching needle are visible. Etching is one of the easiest processes to attempt, because one simply draws and allows the acid to cut the metal. The artist does not have to handle the copper herself. For this reason, many artists who usually paint gravitate toward etching.

In drypoint etching, one drags a sharp but round point into the metal plate, and the metal pushed up by the point creates elevated burrs, which disappear with use of the plate. The burrs create lines that are thick and irregular. One inks the plate, wipes it, and prints it directly from this process.

Softground is a type of etching in which one draws on paper on top of a plate covered with a sensitive wax ground. When one lifts the paper, it removes the ground where the drawing took place. Acid then bites into the exposed metal.

Aquatint is an etching process for producing color, and the most popular method of tinting in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Not actually made with water, its name derives from the water-like quality of the finished tint, which approximates watercolor. One might apply aquatint ink à la poupée, with a
cloth or paper roll, creating a smeared effect. Beginning in the eighteenth century, etchers might apply separate colors with separate plates. The aquatint ground contains tiny rosin particles that attach to the plate and resist acid, creating pools around the particles. These pools hold the ink, and the uneven effect produces a soft and grainy look. This is why it creates color blocks and not lines. For a smoother look, a printer may use an aquatint box to create a steady storm of rosin dust that will cover the plate evenly when heated. One can then apply varnish or tar to the parts without color before the acid process. When acid bites deeper, the depressions can contain more ink, and the tones will be darker. As it is more conducive to creating color blocks with hard edges than sharp or thin lines, printmakers often combine aquatint with line etching.
Cassatt and Leroy experimented with different types of paper as they worked through multiple states of each print, including laid paper with and without a watermark, wove paper, newsprint, and Japanese vellum. This difference in paper contributed to the difference in the size of the same plate’s impression, as Cassatt and Leroy had to dampen heavier papers before printing.\(^87\) It appears that they printed all the final states on cream laid paper, despite their use of different types throughout the prior states. At least one impression of the final state of *In the Omnibus* appears on cream laid paper with the ARCHES watermark.\(^88\)

Cassatt also experimented with the range and application of color. Cassatt printed *The Bath* in four colors: yellow, light and dark blue, and gray. *Afternoon Tea Party* was printed in as many as eight colors and with gold paint added by hand in the final state. Cassatt applied colors flatly and consistently among the final impressions of *The Bath*. In *The Fitting*, Cassatt chose different colors and applied them differently in the final states. In one impression, the carpet is light blue and green, and in another, it is dark purple and light blue. Also in *The Fitting*, Cassatt did not always evenly apply the color of the seamstress’ dress. In these ways, color and application vary among final states of the prints in the series.

In *The Bath*, the woman’s yellow dress has a simple black floral pattern. Other blocks of color in the image are flat and undecorated. In *The Letter* and *The Fitting*,
by contrast, Cassatt used complex patterns. Wallpaper and textiles vibrate with stripes and floral patterns on every surface.

We know the edition size because in the lower right margin of each surviving final state, Cassatt wrote: “Imprimée par l’artiste et M. Leroy / Mary Cassatt / 25 épreuves.” In the lower left or right margin of other preparatory states, Cassatt sometimes wrote her initials, or she left the margins blank.

Cassatt described her working method in a letter to Samuel P. Avery in 1891. “My method is very simple. I drew an outline in dry point and transferred this to two other plates, making in all, three plates, never more, for each proof—Then I put an aquatint wherever the color was to be printed; the color was painted on the plate as it was to appear in the proof.”

The process was physically demanding, according to Cassatt’s mother:

“It is very troublesome also expensive & after making the plates of which it takes 2 or 3 or 4 (according to the number of colors required), she has to help with the printing which is a slow proceeding and if left to a printer would not be at all what she wants.”

Impressions of *In the Omnibus* reveal that Cassatt began to sketch outlines in drypoint on one plate before adding aquatint for the third state on a second plate. Then, through to the seventh state, Cassatt made changes in both aquatint and drypoint. The main question among scholars has been whether softground served as an initial outline before Cassatt solidified her marks in drypoint. A preparatory drawing for *In the Omnibus* supports this notion. Cassatt probably used the drawing
in chalk and graphite to transfer the image in reverse to a soft ground. There is evidence of the ground on the verso of the drawing.

Scholars have often noted Cassatt’s use of spontaneous, painterly techniques in this series. Cassatt’s etched lines, for example, in the hair and hats of the women in *In the Omnibus*, are swift and interrupted. Her drypoint lines also create a sense of spontaneity and irregularity, especially in the wrinkles in the pink dress. The lines vary in thickness and sometimes break unexpectedly as they descend. Cassatt’s use of aquatint is also painterly and spontaneous. The rosin particles that resist the acid create a grainy, organic texture in an otherwise solid ground. The grain of aquatint vibrates in the large blocks of color in *In the Omnibus*: in the dresses, in the interior of the omnibus, and in the bridge and scenery outside. Inking the separate plates à la *poupée* could also result in unpredictable movement and misalignment. In the print, the colors of the dresses and hats do not always line up precisely with the drypoint outline. Cassatt employed these processes in ways that emphasized their unpredictable, spontaneous qualities.
APPENDIX C

Existing Impressions

For this paper, I studied the prints at the Yale University Art Gallery and the National Gallery of Art. The National Gallery’s Rosenwald Collection in particular contains a large number of Cassatt’s prints, including multiple states of *In the Omnibus* and the others in the series.


Final impressions of *In the Omnibus* exist at the following: The New York Public Library, New York; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Museum of the Fine Arts, Boston; The Brooklyn Museum, New York; Carnegie Institute, Museum of Art, Pittsburgh; Art Institute of Chicago; Cleveland Museum of Art; Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; National Gallery of Art, Chester Dale Collection; National Gallery of Art, Rosenwald Collection; Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts.

There is provenance information available for the following:
The Museum of the Fine Art’s impression of *The Coiffure* has been a part of both Cassatt’s and Alexis Rouart’s collections. Rouart collected other works including paintings by Cassatt, works by other Impressionists, and Japanese prints. The Museum of the Fine Arts bought another state of *The Coiffure, Maternal Caress, The Lamp, Afternoon Tea Party, In the Omnibus, The Letter, Woman Bathing, The Fitting*, and *The Bath* from New York print dealer Jean Goriany in 1941.

The Art Institute’s impressions of *In the Omnibus, The Bath, The Fitting, The Coiffure, The Lamp, Woman Bathing, Mother’s Kiss, The Letter*, and *Maternal Caress* were in the collection of one of its founding trustees, Martin A. Ryerson, until 1932.

At Yale, *The Lamp* was originally in Cassatt’s collection, and the University Art Gallery bought the print from Adelson Galleries in New York.

Some impressions had pencil markings or stamped initials (for example, “RH” on the second state of *In the Omnibus* and “BRS” in pencil on the fourth), but I could not identify these based on provenance information, which is not available in the collection. The fifth state of *In the Omnibus* was on laid paper with a watermark of a figure. The seventh state, on heavy laid paper, had a centered watermark of arches (possibly related to the Arches paper company). The final state contained a tiny stamp that also appears in Breeskin’s catalogue: an overlapping “MC” at the very center below the platemark.
NOTES


14. Crane discusses the increasing ability of late-nineteenth-century servants to dress like their mistresses. In general, impractically decorative clothing was a good indicator of middle- or upper-class status. Crane provides examples of strictly middle-class clothing items, including gloves and umbrellas or canes. Diana Crane, Fashion
and its social agendas: class, gender, and identity in clothing (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 48-55, 59. Corbin and Kessler discuss Parisians’ need to distinguish prostitutes from middle-class women. As department stores enabled more women to dress in middle-class fashions, clothing became a less reliable indicator of social class. Regulating hat size and use was one way of identifying prostitutes, although enforcing the law was difficult. Alain Corbin, Women for hire: prostitution

15. In Frédéric Le Play’s studies of working-class families from 1875-1909, he included lower-middle class people who were also workers. In descending order of median income, the groups were: skilled workers in Paris, such as artisans; landowning farmers; unskilled workers in Paris; skilled workers in the provinces; unskilled workers in the provinces; and unskilled farm laborers. Crane explores the extent to which the “elite” of the lower classes attempted to emulate the middle and upper classes with their clothing. Crane, Fashion and its Social Agendas, 32.


(Brussels: 1831-34), 76. All quoted in Papayanis, *Horse-Drawn Cabs and Omnibuses in Paris*, 62-63.


22. For a reproduction of Marie’s drawing, see Papayanis, *Horse-Drawn Cabs and Omnibuses in Paris*, 101-102.


25. Mathews and Shapiro make this suggestion and provide a reproduction of this image. Mathews and Shapiro, *The Color Prints*, 116.


33. Ibid, 41.

34. Broude, “Modern Woman or the Cult of True Womanhood?” 37.


36. Egley’s painting was reproduced as an engraving in the *Illustrated London News* in 1859. London’s Transport Museum, “From omnibus to ecobus, 1829-1850.”


41. For an 1860 map of Paris omnibus lines, see “Plan de Paris édité par les Archives de la Seine,” accessed online,

42. Non-academic art neglected the values of the *Académie des Beaux-Arts*, which included a high sense of finish, precise technique, and elevated subject matter such as historical scenes. Marci Regan, “Paul Durand-Ruel and the Market for Early Modernism” (Masters thesis, Louisiana State University, 2004), 4.

43. For more about Durand-Ruel’s marketing practices and family history, see Marci Regan, “Paul Durand-Ruel and the Market for Early Modernism,” 8-20. For more about Impressionist exhibiting practices, see Martha Ward “Impressionist Installations and Private Exhibitions,” *Art Bulletin* Number 73 (December 1991), 600. See also Moffett et al., *The New Painting*.


59. Emily Sartain exhibited two paintings at the Salon of 1875. She later earned a living by contributing mezzotint engravings to magazines and editing the illustrations for the journal Our Continent. She became principal of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women in 1886. Martinez, “A Portrait of the Sartain Family and Their Home,” 18-19.


62. In another letter, Emily Sartain told her father that the engravers in Parma had never heard of mezzotint engraving and subsequently thought her engravings were aquatints. Emily Sartain to John Sartain, January 12, 1872. Mathews, *Letters*, 86-90.


70. Melot, *The Impressionist Print*, 50.


76. Mary Cassatt to Louisine Havemeyer, December 4, 1893, transcript in Weitzenhoffer files, Department of European paintings, Metropolitan Museum. Quoted in Gary Tinterow, “Vollard and Degas,” in *Cézanne to Picasso*, 151.
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