# A Sense of Life: An Exploration of the Urban Image in 20th Century American Painting

*By* JOAN JACOBS IRWIN

Throughout the nineteenth century the artist who wanted to paint "an American picture" turned to the nation's history or landscape as a source of inspiration. Artists such as Washington Allston, Thomas Cole, George Caleb Bingham, and Winslow Homer found the quintessence of America in paintings that glorified the land and its natural beauties. As the nation underwent the transition from rural to urban life in the post-Civil War decades, what constituted "an American painting" began to change. The conditions of life in the twentieth century demanded confrontation with the city; the urban scene became a natural and ready source material for American painters. In the late 1880's and the 1890's artists began to experiment with delicate cityscapes and etchings of buildings but it was not until the turn of the century that artists began to draw their subject matter from the city.

With so many twentieth century paintings devoted to urban topics, it is logical to try to assess the image of the American city as it appears in these many works, partly for what they graphically tell us about the changing city, but primarily for what they covertly tell us about the artist and his relationship to an American intellectual tradition. Pioneer investigation on the image of the city by Morton and Lucia White (*The Intellectual Versus the City,* Cambridge, 1962) would suggest that artists, like statesmen, writers, reformers, and social theorists had an anti-urban bias. The Whites state in their introduction that our contemporary urban difficulties are in part explained by the fact that so many American intellectuals have been "antipathetic to the city." To their account of the thinking of a mixed group of intellectuals from Thomas Jefferson to Frank Lloyd Wright, the Whites apply one yardstick and ask only one question: The American City—pro or con? They maintain conclusively that the American intellectual, and by implication the whole of the American tradition, has been consistently and persistently anti-urban.

In chapters on Progressive figures Frank Norris and Theodore Dreiser ("Disappointment in New York"), William James and Jane Addams ("Pragmatism and Social Work"), Robert Park and John Dewey ("The Plea for Community"), the Whites suggest that anti-urbanism was a concomitant of Progressivism. If he did not display overt antipathy toward the city, the Progressive had "deep reservations and feelings of uneasiness about the city of the twentieth century."

Of the almost one hundred works that form the basis of this study, few yield to the easy classification of the Whites' scheme. The works of painters of the Progressive period, particularly Maurice Prendergast and John Sloan, are considered in some detail; later works are offered as counterpoint and require further investigation. But of the twentieth century American painters considered here, only Thomas Hart Benton stands out as a vocal critic of urban life. Benton, like other Regionalist painters and writers, believed that the only true American works were those that told the story of the American hinterland and its people. New York was not America, Benton maintained in writing his farewell address to that city in 1939:

> The great cities are outworn. Human living is no longer possible within them . . . there is evidence that mental processes are undergoing marked stultification in the shadows of the great buildings.[1]

While Benton left New York for Missouri, most of the movement was in the opposite direction. Although Benton's comment has value for the particular moment in that it suggests that the conditions of life in American cities had altered considerably by 1939, his is a lonely cry among a chorus of artists that have paid tribute to the city. External factors of economic, social, and physical change have not left the artistic image of the city unaffected. Yet, throughout the history of twentieth century urban art there runs a central image of a living city—living both in its people and its physical form. Of the first, its people, the artist of the Progressive period indicates a wholehearted acceptance of the myth of the melting pot. His indefatigable optimism is expressed in portraits of

the common people doing everyday things. The environment has yet to become burdensome; the city is still a conclave of happy people. In the handling of the other, its physical form, the artist deals implicitly with the recurrent question: What is American? The answer is to be found in his living image of the towering cities of urban America.

Writing of a youth spent in Boston in the period before the Civil War, Mary Caroline Crawford recalled the spirit of Election Day festivals on the Commons. Crowds of adults and children meandered slowly among rows of booths sampling homemade cakes, doughnuts, gingernuts, lemonade, and spruce and ginger beer. According to her description, Boston in 1860 was still a walking city; every part was within ten or fifteen minutes of every other part. The pre-Civil War life of the city was described as tranquil, domestic and homogeneous:

> Many parts of Boston were still green with gardens, and in the softly cool evening of September people sat on their front door steps after the early tea . . . and perhaps sang a song together to the accompaniment of a guitar.[2]

In the three decades after 1870, life in Boston and in other urban centers changed radically. By 1900, the population of Boston's North End was swelled by immigrant groups that represented twenty-five different nationalities.[3] Lewis E. Palmer, a Boston social worker, observed that by 1910 conditions in the North and West Ends of Boston had degenerated to the point that civic action was a necessity. In the Sixth Ward, 44,000 people were housed on a piece of land that would have normally accommodated only a small one-family home. Twenty-six percent of the rooms in this ward were considered too dark and without sufficient air.[4]

As a consequence of urban changes, class cleavage became more apparent in the decades after the war. If there were only a handful of American millionaires in the 1860's, by 1892 there were over 4,000.[5] The physical separation of these rich from the immigrant poor became a fact of urban life in the

1870's. During this decade New York's Fifth Avenue, Chicago's Prarie Avenue, San Francisco's Nob Hill, and Boston's Back Bay isolated the rich in enclaves of fine townhouses and elegant mansions. Thus, as Stanley Buder describes in his study of railroad magnate George Pullman: "Slum and mansion had become part of the American cityscape, the two offering vivid illustration of the promise and the price of industrial society." [6] In the growing industrial society, the immigrant populations supplied the cheap labor and factories sprang up to feed on that supply. Lewis Palmer wrote that the willingness of the Boston immigrants to work for almost nothing had led some manufacturers to report that "it is cheaper to burn men and women than coal." [7]

It is the city, that swelling phenomenon of mansion and slum, immigrant and industrialist, that became a subject for the painters of the twentieth century. Of these early artists, Maurice Prendergast, who made Boston his home for the majority of his life, and Childe Hassam, who was born in Dorchester, Massachusetts, are the most notable. Their representations of elegantly dressed families in promenade amidst the scenery of splendid parks project an image of urban life that is far different from the one sketched by their contemporary Lewis Palmer. The paintings of Prendergast and Hassam portray an urban life which is closer to that of Boston before the Civil War than after it.

Prendergast's Boston paintings, like his water-colors of Paris, Rome, Venice, and Siena, reflect an important decision made while studying in Paris in 1891: to paint from life rather than the antique. Studying at the Académie, Julian Prendergast became associated with a circle that included Canadian painter James Wilson Morrice, British painters Charles Conder, Walter Sickert and Aubrey Beardsley, and writers Arnold Bennett and Somerset Maugham. Through these associations Prendergast developed a familiarity with the works of Cezanne, Gaugin, Whistler, Manet, Degas, Toulouse-Lautrec, Bonnard, Modigliani, and the young Picasso.

Prendergast's exposure to the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists was formative, particularly in his choice of sub-

ject matter. Choosing to work chiefly in water-colors, his Boston paintings reveal a romantic conception of urban life, influenced in part, of course, by the Impressionist idiom in which he worked. Well-dressed women, happy children, ornamental bonnets, and handsome carriages abound. Nothing is terribly precise; much is suggestive. Prendergast's Boston is brightly colored, moving, and filled with attractive people having fun in what had become an archaic urban environment by 1900.

The "picnic spirit" of Prendergast is evident in a series of paintings on Boston and New York. In *Tremont Street, Boston* (1902. Monotype.), Prendergast depicts a group of people with carriages walking along in the rain. Prendergast often painted the city in the rain, but the suggestion is always of spring rain, as he calls attention to bright parasols and irridescent reflections on the pavement. In *West Church, Boston* (1909. Pencil and water color.), an autumn scene, small clusters of robust children are playing in a courtyard around a fountain. The golden leaves of trees and the colorful representation of the doors and red brick of the building present a positive, if not nostalgic, view of an urban scene.

Taken as a group, Prendergast's paintings of Boston (which include representations of Franklin Square, the docks of East Boston, the Public Gardens, and surrounding areas like Nahant, Nantasket, and Revere Beach) present a gentle, naive, and dreamy version of urban life. The women are always erect and elegant, the children colorful and joyous. There is an obvious fascination with pageantry and processions, an interest in animals, carousels, balloons, banners, and other spontaneous amusements. There is absolutely no sense of social class or of limited physical space. Prendergast has recorded the image of Boston as a green, country town rather than as a growing metropolis with large immigrant populations.

Childe Hassam reflects this same romantic view in his treatment of the late nineteenth century city. Yet, Hassam's painting *Boston Common at Twilight* (1885. Oil.) contains an element of reality that is totally absent from Prendergast's Boston. In this work, a well-dressed woman with her children are set against the background of the Tremont Street

horse-drawn trolley which is seen in the left foreground. Surprisingly enough, Prendergast all but ignored the colorful electric trolleys which according to Bostonian Samuel Eliot Morison had become the dominant mode of transportation in the city by 1902. Along Charles Street alone ran five different lines each represented by a different color.[8] In neither the Boston nor the New York series does Prendergast record the emergence of or see public transportation as a subject for artistic inspiration. The growing technology of the city is all but neglected.

Prendergast moved to New York City in 1914 and immersed himself in the life of the artists in and about Washington Square. His move from Boston to New York does not seem to have had any influence on him at all in terms of his representation of urban life. In New York he again chose not to paint the life of immigrant populations or the tenements of the East Side. Instead, he again portrayed a classless society in the "picnic spirit"—this time centered in Central Park. Prendergast's series on Central Park provides "an invaluable record of idle summer days at the turn of the century." [9]

Prendergast's version of the city obviously does not reflect the emerging social problems involved in urban life. Missing from his work is the growing awareness of both classes, rich and poor, which produced Thorsten Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class* and which motivated Congress in 1892 to authorize an investigation "relative to what is known as the slums of cities." [10] As an artist he developed a schematic rather than a realistic interpretation of the world based on his love of Renoir, Cezanne, and Bonnard. Prendergast was drawn to Central Park because it afforded him the opportunity to paint the kinds of things he admired in the Impressionist canvases of Paris and because the Park represented to him, as had the Commons in his native Boston, what urban life should be.

In this idealistic view of the city, the work of Prendergast is the artistic parallel to the work of that group of early twentieth century landscape architects and planners who

hoped to bring natural beauty to bear upon the urban scene. Broad boulevards and scenic parks were believed to be a necessary component of civilized urban life; such a life should combine the advantages of both town and country living. This idea, described by urban historian Roy Lubove as the "urban-rural continuum" or "city-park garden," was believed to have not only aesthetic but physical and social advantages.[11]

Frederick Law Olmstead, who was responsible for the design of Central Park, expressed his delight in the large numbers (50,000 recorded in one day) who came to the Park "with an evident glee in the prospect of coming together, all classes represented . . . each individual adding by his mere presence to the pleasure of others." [12] In the thirty year period between 1860 and 1890, many American cities laid the foundations for modern park systems that were received with great popularity. When park lands were, in fact, threatened by commercial or other intrusions the public did not stand by idly, as in the case of the 1909 proposal of the National Academy of Design to build a $600,000 gallery within Central Park on the site of the old arsenal used for Park Department offices. Many eminent New Yorkers urged that the Academy's proposal be accepted on the basis that it would add to the reputation of the city as an art center as well as provide open public exhibits. Apparently, hearings on the matter brought out a determined opposition which included representatives from lower-East Side debating clubs, the Outdoor Recreation League, the Peoples' Institute, the Citizens Union, the Neighborhood Worker's Association, and the Society of Landscape Architects.[13] The plan was defeated and public space was preserved without commercial encroachments.

Prendergast's *May Day, Central Park* (1901. Water color.), *The Mall, Central Park* (1901. Pencil and water color.), and *The Bridle Path, Central Park* (1902. Pencil and water color.), are filled with the same spirit of color, gaiety, and leisure that are present in his Boston works. Prendergast does record in the latter painting Frederick Olmstead's ingenious three-way transportation system for the Park with a carriage road, bridle path, and pedestrian walk in three parallel tiers. In each painting there is a sense of the excursion or "picnic

spirit" of New Yorkers out for a day of fun in a setting that is definitely too sophisticated and structured to have happened by chance. The Prendergast New York series does not represent the haphazard meeting of groups of people in a country setting but the grand promenade tradition of the great European cities. Everywhere there are people walking and watching each other very much in the way that the urban planners had hoped. In only one instance does Prendergast deviate from this image of the city. In *The East River* (1901. Pencil and water color.), he tries to paint a realistic, more socially-conscious portrait of the city.[14] The painting is significant because Prendergast attempts to record the commonplace, even the ugly in the city, but is unable to do so. His playground by the river is filled with his omnipresent colorful children, this time on swings. The green smoke coming from the smoke stacks of industries across the river appears playful rather than menacing.

In 1907 Prendergast was invited to join seven New York artists in preparing a joint showing at the Macbeth Gallery.[15] The exhibition, which opened in February of 1908, received much attention in the press and in art circles because it represented something new in the development of American art. Robert Henri, the leader of a group which was far from homogeneous in terms of style, was in open rebellion against the National Academy of Design and its extensive control of the American art scene. Henri brought together the following group of artists, later to be known as The Eight, who shared his impatience with the approved academic art of the time: John Sloan, Everett Shinn, William Glackens, George Luks, Arthur Davies, Ernest Lawson, and Maurice Prendergast.

The exhibition of The Eight was significant because of the subject matter which many of the paintings introduced. George Bellows, who was not a member of the original group, came to be associated with The Eight because of his choice of subject. Implicit in the work of five painters in particular (Henri, Flackens, Luks, Shinn, and Sloan) was the belief that the city was valid subject matter for serious painting. In the city was to be found truth and beauty, and the every-

day experiences of life in the city were to provide the themes for their art. These five painters were later to be dubbed "The Ash Can School" by critic Art Young who disliked pictures in which ash cans figured.[16] They were also called "The Black Gang" or "The Black Revolutionists" because of their lavish use of black and other dark colors. In almost every case they were accused of emphasizing the ugly—a direct contrast to the idyllic vision of Prendergast.

The image of New York that emerges from the canvases of this first group of urban realist painters revolves around a central theme that was expressed by Henri in his opposition to the academic painting of the time: "What we need is more sense of the wonder of life, and less of this business of picturemaking." [17] Henri and the others saw their art as a record of and an involvement in the daily life of the city of New York. They believed that to paint the American scene one need not turn to landscape or other styles that glorified the American tradition. "We loved life and people," wrote John Sloan, "and we tried to express that love of life which happened to be American." [18] The central theme of their work is the common humanity of the city, with little sense of despair or social protest.

New York was their inspiration, and looking back on his life as a painter and his work in Philadelphia until the age of thirty, John Sloan was to tell his friend Van Wyck Brooks, "I emerged into real interest in the life around me, with paint in my hand, only after I came to New York." [19] It was as if The Eight were the first group of American painters to sense the essential nature of the transition from a rural to an urban nation—the first to describe on canvas their encounter with the city. Some art critics erroneously labeled their work "social realist" painting when in fact it contains little critical social commentary. They walked the streets of New York, observed the people, and recorded the incidents they saw—all with a sense of exhilaration. In reply to his labeling as a social realist, Sloan was to write, "I was never interested in putting propaganda into my paintings, so it annoys me when art historians try to interpret my city life

pictures as socially conscious. I saw the everyday life of the people, and on the whole, I picked out bits of joy in human life for my subject matter." [20]

The image of New York that is presented in the paintings of Sloan, whose work best typifies The Eight, revolves around the theme of the common humanity of the city. Sloan saw the life of the modern city with honesty, humor, and affection. He was himself totally involved in it and his New York diaries from 1906-1913 are filled with accounts reflecting a love of and immersion in the urban milieu of theatre, restaurants, vaudeville and burlesque, and shopping on the East Side. Like others in his circle, Sloan supported himself through his work as an illustrator. In this sense, New York was liberating for him as it was for other artists. Free from acute financial worries, somehow able to eke out a living, Sloan had the time to take daily walks which proved to be sources of inspiration for him as this May 1907 entry relates: "Walked up to Henri's studio. On the way saw a humorous sight of interest. A window, low second story, bleached blond hairdresser bleaching the hair of a client. A small interested crowd about." The next day's entry records that Sloan walked out to take another look at the hair restorer's window, "came back and started to paint it." [21] Thus evolved the famous *Hairdresser's Window* (1907. Oil.).

Sloan never stopped observing and painting what he saw. Even when he was in his studio he kept an eye on the city around him: "I have been watching a curious two-room household," he wrote, "two women and I think two men, their day begins after midnight, they cook at 3:00 a.m." [22] This unique domestic scene became the subject of the painting *Three A.M.* (1909. Oil.). When Sloan painted immigrant girls on the roof of a tenement it was not out of anger with tenement conditions but out of his enthusiasm for life and his love of the picturesque. The girls on the tenement roof were enchanting and spontaneous, as can be seen by a simple viewing of *Sunday, Women Drying Their Hair* (1912. Oil.). The dancing white laundry in the background creates an impression of movement and happiness. Sloan is not concerned with why the women must take to the roof to dry their hair but

with the very beauty of their doing it. The point is that Sloan was not motivated by any formal social philosophy, and that the subject matter he chose, by his own definition, does not represent specific social concerns as has sometimes been maintained.[23]

Thus, one finds in Sloan's paintings a celebration of city life and a great deal of humor. Sloan, like many other urban painters, was to discover areas of the city which he found especially enchanting. His own special "beat" was the West 14th Street and lower Sixth Avenue area. He was known to prefer Sixth Avenue, of which he did four or five paintings, to Fifth Avenue which he painted only once or twice and in satiric tones as in *Fifth Avenue,* (1909. Oil.). Of *Sixth Avenue and 30th Street* (1907. Oil.) which he loved, he wrote: "It has surely caught the atmosphere of the Tenderloin, drab, shabby, happy, sad, and human." [24]

This fascination with areas of the city that were far from elegant is evident in Sloan's contemporaries and in a later group of New York painters who have come to be known as the Fourteenth Street School because of their association with that area.[25] Writing of these urban painters, Van Wyck Brooks suggests that they found happiness rather than misery in the life of the common people while Fifth Avenue faces struck them as unhappy. Guy Pene du Bois, who was associated with the Fourteenth Street painters, chose to represent wealthy New Yorkers in two paintings done after 1910. *The Doll and The Monster* (1914. Oil.) is a pointed portrait of an unattractive, wealthy New York lecher with an innocent young girl. His canvas of *Mr. and Mrs. Chester Dale Dining Out* (Mid-1920's. Oil.) is similar to Sloan's portrayal of Fifth Avenue ladies in that Mr. and Mrs. Dale are painted as elegant and formal. Even the restaurant appears austere and is in direct contrast to the types of glowing, hospitable establishments that Sloan and the others of his group patronized and painted in warm, friendly, and golden tones. *Reganeschi's, Saturday Night* (1912. Oil.) appears lively and inviting with its tables of working girls. *Yeats at Petipas* (1910. Oil.) is a fine portrayal of a mellow Greenwich Village gathering of artists at a simple local establishment. One senses that the

food and conversation are good. Taken *in toto,* these representations of New York life appear to be weighted heavily on the side of New York's masses rather than her elite. When the elite is portrayed, it is done in mocking terms.

Jerome Myers and Eugene Higgins, who were contemporaries of Sloan but not of The Eight, along with those later painters of the Fourteenth Street School, present another, yet similar, view of the life of the ordinary New Yorker. The Fourteenth Street group, including Pene du Bois, Isabel Bishop, Louis Bouche, Reginald Marsh, Kenneth Hayes Miller, and Raphael Soyer, follows a direct line of development from The Eight both in the style of their work and the choice of subject matter. Their work is, however, tempered by the Progressive enthusiasm and by the Depression. These artists, like Sloan, devoted themselves to recording the life of the Fourteenth Street area, Greenwich Village, the Bowery, and the neighboring Italian, Jewish, and Chinese communities. Echoing Robert Henri, Kenneth Hayes Miller, the mentor of the Fourteenth Street group, was to write, "This [Fourteenth Street] is the greatest landscape in the world. It is made by man. Nature we cannot understand." [26]

These painters like Sloan before them, left an interesting record of their image of urban life and particular areas within the city. Although they depicted the city in a colorful way, their work is best understood in terms of the numerous changes, far too extensive to outline here, that American urban life had undergone since The Eight. What their work demonstrates most acutely is a changing notion of the nature of poverty. While Sloan, Luks, and Glackens exhibit a gentle sympathy for the poor and a recognition of the debilitating effect that poverty can have on the spirit, there is no cry for change and little effort to lay the blame for poverty on any particular institution. It is only in work after The Eight that one senses an awareness of the relationship between poverty and powerful social forces.

Although the early New York painters simply observed the poor with sympathy and humor, there are a few interesting works of greater sentimentality and conviction. In a family

portrait *The Gamblers* (1917. Oil.), Eugene Higgins presents a tragic picture of three figures grouped in a triangular arrangement around a gambling table. Set in a squalid tenement interior, the husband is squandering money away while the wife, who holds their child, looks on. The burden of guilt rests not on the husband, an individual, but on a severe and hostile environment.

This type of characterization of slum life is reminiscent of those descriptions of immigrant life that were used to enlist scores of middle class Americans to the cause of reform during the period 1900-1917. While Jacob Riis and Lewis Hine told the story of human want and devestation in photographs, artists rarely made such harsh statements. In part, this difference may be attributed to the essential nature of each art form. Using photographs as reportage, Riis and Hines turned out severe institutional and environmental criticism. From the environment of the ethnic ghetto and tenement house, The Eight drew something else. Unlike Prendergast who simply ignored the reality of Boston, their canvases were filled with people who somehow transcend the environment. Personal warmth, spontaneous movement, companionship and intimacy exist on tenement roofs, in dark apartments, and in shabby restaurants. Sloan and other urban painters of his time ignored the connection between poverty and environment that was implicit in the reform activities of the Progressive period and in the doctrine of the Social Gospel. The message of Henry George's *Poverty and Progress* was not reflected in the work of The Eight, nor in that of most of their successors. The slum dweller was portrayed as picturesque rather than victimized. Only with the coming of mass unemployment and the economic disorganization of the 1930's did urban painters turn to the bleaker side of poverty.

In *The Bowery* (1930. Oil.) by Reginald Marsh there is a vivid portrayal of the Depression mentality. Groups of men stand idly by waiting for nothing. The presence of the El overhead and line of shingles from transient rooming houses captures the feeling of Depression New York. It is a representation on canvas of the isolation and despondency of a city

on the verge of bankruptcy where one hundred thousand meals a day were consumed on breadlines.[27] The breadline itself is captured in a striking 1932 etching by Marsh of a line of closely packed men with hands pushed dejectedly into long overcoats. The monotony of the life of the time is conveyed in the very composition of the work. *The Mission* (1935. Lithograph.) by Raphael Soyer has the same kind of quality in its treatment of lean, hungry men drinking coffee and eating bread. It is not the Depression diet that is upsetting but the vague and lonely stares of the men.

With the grim tone of Depression New York captured on canvas, new themes began to emerge in the visual portrayal of the human condition in the urban environment. Tempered by their own experiences in the Depression, artists like Ben Shahn, Philip Evergood, and Jack Levine became committed to the causes of labor, racial equality, and later disarmament and peace.[28] Shahn was one of many artists who sought work in the Depression through the Works Progress Administration, and in 1938 began a mural series on immigrant life under the sponsorship of the Farm Security Administration.[29] In the period from 1931-33 Shahn was to produce a series of twenty-three gouaches on the controversial Sacco and Vanzetti trial and another series of paintings on behalf of convicted labor leader Thomas Mooney. Jack Levine was to write of his concern for social conditions in the period, "I took my place in the late thirties as part of the general uprising of social consciousness in art and literature. It was part of the feeling that things were going the right way; we were making a point. . . . We had a feeling of confidence about our ability to do something about the world." [30]

The image of the city that can be extrapolated from the works of these social realist painters is not as benign as that produced by earlier artists. Their technique is literal enough so that their attitudes on social questions become abundantly clear. Yet, it would be unfair to describe their vision as anti-urban in orientation. Shahn, Levine, and Evergood were themselves confirmed urban dwellers. Consequently, they chose their subject matter from the urban milieu. The critical social attitudes which they offer are not directed at urban

life but at the whole of America. Even their non-urban works are filled with the same spirit.

Shahn's work on the city has been centered essentially around the lack of human values and spirit in twentieth century America. He wrote of the great problem of our time:

> The people who long ago, cut down their rulers to wrest out of them freedoms had a strength of philosophy which we lack. We seem to have little left of the great spiritual force by which they were motivated. I feel that this present sort of degeneration is due to our acquisition of vast physical wealth, and to our meagerness of spiritual and cultural values—meager because some bright entrepreneur has seen how to turn into big money every activity in which we engage . . .[31]

Shahn's disgust with the materialism of modern life and his desire to return to more basic human values are reflected in *Willis Avenue Bridge* (1940. Tempera.), and *Handball* (1939. Tempera.). In the first painting two elderly people sit lonely and estranged in a complex world. In the latter, the boys playing handball are isolated from each other; their stance and positioning indicate that they are not really playing for fun, or out of any desire for human contact. Shahn's characteristic distortion and shortening of the human form contribute to the presentation of human life as potentially powerful but pathetic; the agonies Shahn portrays are of the whole of humanity and not just of New Yorkers.

A similar theme of isolation has been continually portrayed by Edward Hopper in both his urban and non-urban paintings. Even Hopper's uninhabited paintings have the same quality of devestating loneliness.[32] From the study of *From Williamsburg Bridge* (1928. Oil.), *East Side Interior* (1922. Etching.), *Hotel Room* (1931. Oil.), and *Office In a Small City* (1953. Oil.) comes the impression that Hopper's work is haunted with the dominant theme of isolation. Thus, he sees in the urban scene the same qualities of life which affect him in the countryside and town. His studies of light and his use

of outline and detail create an image of a lonely world that is difficult to forget. Philip Evergood's *Lily and the Sparrows* (1938. Oil.) has the same kind of quality in its representation of a strange young child with a translucent face feeding the birds from a tenement window. Evergood wrote that as he walked under the old El near Sixth Street he saw the child in the window alone. "Mother out to work, probably," he reasoned, "Father in the hospital." [33] Evergood's other city works of which *Street Corner* (1935. Oil.) is representative are different in tone. They are often exuberant portrayals of the common life of the city.

Two other observations on the handling of the human condition deserve attention before turning to the physical image of the city. Just as the visual complexity of the city increased in the twentieth century, the artists' ways of dealing with subject matter became more varied and complex. Ben Shahn, who was himself a representational painter in his early years, stressed the suitability of this stylistic change when he wrote that "non-objective [abstract] art is the perfect expression of the scientificio-mechanical age." [34] Eduardo Paolozzi's *Wittgenstein in New York* (1965. Serigraph.) is just such a non-objective painting of a pair of robots among a complex of skyscrapers. The mechanisms below the robot heads suggest the workings of a computer. It is an interesting contemporary comment on New York in The Computer Age and suggests man's growing dependence on the machine. In *Government Bureau* (1956. Egg tempera on gesso panel.), George Tooker has employed the stylistic techniques of the Surrealists in this presentation of Brooklyn's Municipal Building. The painting is so horrifying that we can assume Tooker was making a direct comment on the facelessness and loss of individuality in the modern urban bureaucracy.

While some painters have been obviously intrigued by the people who make up the city, others have taken their inspiration from the city itself—its towering buildings, handsome bridges, elevated railroads, and many moods. John Sloan, who was essentially a painter of people, dismissed its impressive skyline as "a comb in the restroom of a filling station. . . . a

tooth here and there missing and all filled with dirt." [35] Others celebrated with poet Carl Sandburg the living quality of these inanimate objects: "The skyscraper looms in the smoke and the stars and has a soul."

John Marin, an architect turned artist, is one of the many New York painters who found inspiration in the physical nature of the great metropolis:

> Shall we consider the life of a great city as simply confined to the people and animals on its streets . . . ? Are the buildings themselves dead? We have been told somewhere that a work of art is a thing alive. . . . Therefore, if these buildings move me they too must have life. . . . I see great forces at work; great movements; the large buildings and the small . . . influences of one mass on another greater or smaller mass. . . . While these powers are at work, pushing, pulling, sideways, downwards, upwards, I can hear the sound of their strife and there is music being played. And so I try to express graphically what a great city is doing.[36]

Marin's *Brooklyn Bridge* (1910. Water color.) is only one of many paintings that he and other New York painters did of the famous bridge, which at the time of its opening in 1883 was the longest suspension bridge in the world. In each of Marin's bridge portraits there is a sense of excitement in this urban technological triumph.

Joseph Stella, an Italian immigrant, was to find in the bridge the classical example of American expertise and technology. His variations on the Brooklyn Bridge theme, done between 1913-1923, reflect his admiration for New York and his adopted land:

> I was thrilled to find America so rich with so many new motives to be translated into art. Steel and electricity had created a new world. A new drama had surged. . . . a new poliphony was ringing all around with scintillating, highly colored lights. The steel had leaped to hyperbolic attitudes and expanded to

> vast latitudes with the skyscrapers and the bridges . . . a new architecture was created, a new perspective.[37]

The adoration of the city as a symphony in steel and light was not peculiar to Marin or Stella who later expanded their New York works to include other impressive buildings and landmarks.

These ecstatic tributes to the technology of America as it was demonstrated in the American city were a common theme in twentieth century painting. The development of the first steel skeleton skyscraper, begun in Chicago in 1883 by William Le Baron Jenney and continued by Louis Sullivan in the Wainwright and Guarantee buildings in Chicago and Buffalo, caught the imagination of the American public. W. A. Starret, an engineer who worked on many of Chicago's first steel frame buildings, declared with enthusiasm, "The skyscraper is the most distinctively American thing in the world. It is all American and all ours in its conception. . . ." [38] Starret, like many others, saw the new building form as a typically American triumph that represented the success of the business motive and the American love of bigness. "We Americans," he wrote, "always like to think of things in terms of bigness; there is a romantic appeal in it, and into our national pride has somehow been woven the yardstick. . . ." [39] Although academic critics loathed the giants, Americans began to develop a romantic attachment to their skyscrapers while they kept a sharp eye tuned to the efficient and profitable commercial character of the buildings.

From 1841 to 1893, Trinity Church dominated the New York skyline. In 1893, the seventeen story Manhattan Life Insurance Building was completed and the city skyline as we know it today was on its way.[40] The skyline of the nation's largest city—at night and in the day—provided the inspiration for many painters of the urban scene. Some like Marin were fascinated with a particular skyscraper. In *Woolworth Building* (1923. Etching.), Marin conveys his excitement with the skyscraper in an explosive impressionistic portrait of the 1915 building which was labeled "the five and ten cathedral"

by its detractors. Other works depicting the same type of subject are Marin's *Street Crossing* (1928. Water color.), Guy Wiggin's *Metropolitan Tower* (1912. Oil.), and Charles Sheeler's *Delmonico Building* (1926. Lithograph.). Each of these works represents an artistic vision of the skyscraper as it stands alone or within the panorama of the skyline.

Wiggin's *Metropolitan Tower* is especially interesting because it records the days before New York was a mass of high-rise buildings. The tallest skyscraper in the city is contrasted with the low buildings around it. The scene is snowy and calm and the artist was obviously interested in recording the spirit of that particular moment. In all of the later skyscraper portraits there is a greater interest in the forms and tensions of the skyscraper and how it can be translated into graphic language.

New York, the City of Light, and New York in different moods has been another persistent theme of both the photographer and artist. *Central Park* (1930. Lithograph.) by Stefan Hirsch is a classical portrayal of the irregularity of the New York skyline and the activity of the city's evening lights. Stow Wengenroth's *New York Nocturne* (1945. Lithograph.) expresses the same feeling for New York as a city of nighttime excitement. Joe Tilson's *Rainbow Grill* (1965. Color serigraph of plastic.) is a "pop" version of the same theme. The artist seems to proclaim with engineer Starret, "Who can look on the majestic skyline of New York in sunshine or in shadow and not be moved . . . by the power of its mass and the beauty . . . of its detail." [41] The city at night, and the divertissements it provides, has been recorded on canvas from the time of Sloan to the present. Representations of New York, the Entertainment Capital, have been supplied in abundance.[42]

Another New York institution which has received its fair share of representation in paint is the elevated railway. "The El" appears in Sloan's early work of the Fourteenth Street-Sixth Avenue area, in Marsh's Bowery scenes, and in Evergood's Richmond Hill Murals. In Sloan's paintings *Sixth Avenue and 30th Street* (1907. Oil.), *The City From Greenwich Village* (1922. Oil.), and *Sixth Avenue Elevated at Third*

*Street* (1928. Oil.), the El is not seen as oppressive, and groups of young women dash gaily beneath it. Sloan himself described the yellow cars of the railroad built on stilts in the latter painting as "a circus train running through the city." [43] In the Marsh and Evergood work, the El creates a dark, bleak atmosphere beneath it.

In more contemporary work, the El has received different treatment in the hands of the abstract artist. Stuart Davis's *Sixth Avenue El* (1931. Lithograph.) is a translation of the elevated into the artist's personal vocabulary of two-dimensional forms. The work is, in a sense, a visual puzzle, whose pieces are components of the El arranged together in a composition that suggests activity, light, and noise. *Third Avenue Elevated No. 1* (1952. Color lithograph.) by Ralston Crawford is an abstract study in form and color. Although far from representational, the work suggests through color the visual complexity of the El's structure and the interplay of light and dark that is sensed in walking beneath it.

The fact that colors do carry with them certain associations is reflected in the number of people who express color preferences and is substantiated by a large body of psychological research.[44] Colors, which can be evocative of both words and feelings, are assigned roles by the societal situation as described by Harold Mendelsohn and Irving Crespi in a study of the differences between personal color preference and choices for a specific purpose.[45] The fact that many colors have roles is institutionalized in our acceptance of black for the widow, white for the nurse and bride, and a pink, rather than blue, bonnet for the female child.

If we examine the colors used to portray the American city, there does not appear to be an overall color theme. John Marin translated the steel gray of the Brooklyn Bridge into exuberant primary colors while Maurice Prendergast worked with a multi-colored palette of soft hues. It is the presentation of the early realist painters, however, that suggests a further consideration of the role of color in the image of the city. Although the works of Sloan and The Eight did contain certain elements of bright color, their general tendency

was to portray New York in relatively dark tones. These same tones have been traditionally associated in psychological tests with a complex of words that carry implications for the city: dirt, earth, mud, ink, and drab.[46]

Sloan, who was the only New York painter to explain the place of color in his view of the city, wrote that, "every city has its own colors. . . . It would be possible to study any of them in detail and to produce a series of paintings, in their predominant colors, reflecting the very souls of these cities." [47] In ascertaining the colors that are characteristic of a particular urban center, Sloan suggested a walk through a typical working-class neighborhood, to gather "the suggestion of color emanating from the people themselves" and finally a consideration of "the broader suggestions of nature and art." [48] Sloan's belief that certain colors were associated in the mind with particular cities led him to the classification of San Francisco as a blue and gold city, Los Angeles as gray and brass, Chicago as milky blue and gray, and Pittsburgh as velvet purple and brown. Yet, Sloan believed that all cities had one color in common: "Gray predominates in every city's notes . . . cities, the creation of man, are always gray."

And what of New York? So often Sloan's own paintings and the work of the Ash Can School have been read as dismal portraits of urban existence because of the predominance of gray and other dark tones. "We New Yorkers have blues in abundance," wrote Sloan. "Anywhere we turn," he continued, "there is brilliant color, the color of clothing, Broadway's twinkling signs, the vivid spots of the East Side." But Sloan had not yet defined the colors of New York:

> It [New York] is a city in which all colors become vivid at times, but finally blend into the beautiful blanket of grayness once more. New York, in a way, is the grayest of our cities, a massive creation heaped upon one small island—ambiguous, evasive, ever changing and always fascinating like a woman's smile.[49]

The New York gray that Sloan described does not mean drab-

ness, for the city's very grayness has color and life within it. It is a misrepresentation of Sloan, and others like him, to view his works as bleak pictures of urban life because of their coloration. Sloan saw in the massive grayness of New York the mystique which enchanted him throughout his life; his choice of color was related more to his realistic style than to emotion. His affection for New York was so exuberant that he once climbed above the famous arch at Washington Square proclaiming his loyalty to his beloved Greenwich Village and the whole of New York.[50]

Just as historians, writers, sociologists, and architects have been attracted to the city by a complex of intangibles, the twentieth century urban painter has left no precise or indisputable records of his image of the city. Instead, we have been left with a collection of impressions and a record of the changing landscape of the city. The kind of image that these works project cannot be easily classified as either pro- or anti-urban. To say that artists like Shahn or Marsh were engaged in a love affair with the city would grossly misrepresent their deepest social concerns. At the same time, it would be unfair to present the paintings of Maurice Prendergast as anything but romantic. What has been established is that the image of the city, as it exists in twentieth century American painting, revolves around diverse themes which, in general, portray the city in a positive fashion.

If considered in the light of simultaneous urban coverage in the press and in literature particularly during the Progressive period, the city fares well at the hands of the artist. While Maurice Prendergast painted idle summer days in the beauty of Central Park, Lewis Hine was producing devastating photographic essays like "Roving Children", "The Construction Camps of the People", and "Immigrant Women." In 1904, the year in which Lincoln Steffens' *Shame of the Cities* was compiled, John Sloan was visiting New York and sketching the happy children he saw in Madison Square. While these artists have generally not associated poverty and environment in their paintings, they have all but ignored the city as a fertile breeding ground for political corruption even after the Steffens' expose. Municipal corruption was indeed a

common theme in the popular literature of the day,[51] yet only two paintings, both of a later period, seem to deal with what is admittedly a difficult subject for an artist. Sloan's *The Wigwam, Tammany Hall* (1930. Oil.) is a nostalgic representation of that infamous pillar of New York City politics; Glenn O. Coleman's *Election Night* (1928. Lithograph.) celebrates the by-gone days of election bonfires on the lower-East Side.

Further study is needed to clarify both the personal relationship between artist and city and the ways in which artistic developments in this century affected an evolving image of urban life. After the 1913 Armory Show, American artists became less infatuated with the techniques of realistic art.[52] John Sloan, in fact, left New York for New Mexico where he devoted himself to painting the human figure and learning the new techniques. The most sensitive American artists and critics, confronted at the Armory Show with the work of European post-impressionism and modernism, discarded idealism and realism as moribund. There was a new interest in form and composition and a growing distaste for sentimentality, all of which led to the "art for art's sake" philosophy. It would seem that the American artist became less and less likely to record the ills of urban civilization in realistic documentary fashion. The greater interest was in the form of the city. Thus, the style of the modern artist may have made explicit comment on urban life a thing of the past.

The composite image of the city that we are left by the works covered here encompasses most of the artistic modes of the twentieth century. As time passes and as the city and artistic styles undergo further change, the image of the city will be refined further.[53] If in the period from 1900-1917, the American artist tended to shy away from social ills and rejoice in the picturesque, the portrayal of Depression New York indicates an artistic ferment that was not out of touch with reality. The image of the city that emerges from these earliest works is one of great excitement, celebrating the city for its heterogeneity, diverse moods, and common humanity. Simultaneously, the city became at the hands of other artists

the symbol of a living, sophisticated technology, and, in that sense, it is a particularly American triumph.

## NOTES

1. Thomas Hart Benton, *An Artist in America* (New York, 1937), 232.
2. Mary Caroline Crawford, *Romantic Days in Old Boston* (Boston, 1910), 316.
3. Arthur Mann, *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age* (Cambridge, 1954), 3.
4. Lewis E. Palmer, "Congestion in Boston," *Survey Magazine*, 24 (April 30, 1910), 173.
5. Stanley Buder, *Pullman: An Experiment in Industrial Order and Community Planning, 1880-1930* (New York, 1967), 34.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Palmer, *Survey*, 173.
8. Samuel Eliot Morison, *One Boy's Boston 1877-1901* (Cambridge, 1962), 28.
9. Hedley, Howell Rhys, *Maurice Prendergast* (Cambridge, 1960), 38.
10. Charles Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (New York, 1967), 239 ff.
11. Roy Lubove, *The Urban Community: Housing and Planning in the Progressive Era* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967), 4.
12. Glaab and Brown, *Urban America*, 255.
13. Editorial, *Survey Magazine*, 24 (April 3, 1909), 4-5.
14. Rhys, *Prendergast*, 38.
15. Prendergast was the only painter included in the group who was not at the time of the exhibition living in New York City. According to Brooks, some of the others in the group felt Prendergast was a good painter but too old-fashioned to be included with them. See Van Wyck Brooks, *John Sloan: A Painter's Life* (New York, 1955), 136.
16. *Ibid.*, 77.
17. Alexander Eliot, *Three Hundred Years of American Painting* (New York, 1957), 162.
18. Brooks, *Sloan*, 73.
19. *Ibid.*, 37.
20. *American Art Nouveau: The Poster Period of John Sloan (A Selection of Hitherto Unpublished Prints and Autobiographical Recollections by the Artist)*, collected by Helen Farr Sloan (Lock Haven, Pa., 1967), 18.
21. John Sloan, *John Sloan's New York Scene From the Diaries* (New York, 1965), 198.
22. *Ibid.*, 308.
23. Sloan was probably an unconscious philosopher of realism according to his friend and biographer Van Wyck Brooks. According to

Brooks, although Sloan enjoyed a brief flirtation with socialism he found it annoying when critics tried to make a connection between his kind of realism and that of authors Dreiser, Norris, and Crane. Sloan maintained until his death that he did not propagandize in his art and that he disliked Dreiser and had never read any of this type of literature. See Brooks, *John Sloan*, 84-97 *passim*.

24. Lloyd Goodrich and Rosalind Irvine, *John Sloan 1871-1951* (New York, 1952), 22.

25. Henry Geldzahler, *American Painting in the Twentieth Century* (Greenwich, Connecticut, 1965), 101.

26. Geldzahler, *American Painting*, 102.

27. Robert Bendiner, *Just Around the Corner* (New York, 1967), 15.

28. Geldzahler, *American Painting*, 111ff.

29. James Thrall Soby, *Ben Shahn Paintings* (New York, 1963), 43.

30. Geldzahler, *American Painting*, 112.

31. Ben Shahn, *Paragraphs on Art* (Roosevelt, New Jersey, 1952), 1.

32. Geldzahler, *American Painting*, 79.

33. John I. H. Baur, *Philip Evergood* (New York, 1960), 56-57.

34. Shahn, *Paragraphs*, 5.

35. Eliot, *Three Hundred Years*, 163.

36. MacKinley Helm, *John Marin* (Boston, 1948), 28.

37. Geldzahler, *American Painting*, 69.

38. W. A. Starret, *Skyscrapers and The Men Who Built Them* (New York, 1928), 1.

39. *Ibid.*, 74.

40. *Ibid.*, 3.

41. *Ibid.*, 3.

42. See titles of paintings in attached list of art sources.

43. John Sloan, "Souls of Our Cities Seen in Color," *New York Times Magazine* (February 22, 1925), 23.

44. See R. M. Dorcus, "Habitual Word Associations to Colors as a Possible Factor in Advertising," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1932, 16, 277-287; R. Staples and W. E. Walton, "A Study of Pleasurable Experience as a Factor in Color Preference," *Journal of General Psychology*, 1933, 43, 217-233; D. Sheppard and E. N. Sheppard, "Color Associations," *Psychological Newsletter*, 1954, 5, 77-95.

45. Harold Mendelsohn and Irving Crespi, "The Effect of Artistic Pressure and Institutional Structure on Color Preference in a Choice Situation," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1952, 36, 109.

46. *Ibid.*, 109-110.

47. Sloan, "Souls of Our Cities Seen In Color," 4.

48. *Ibid.*

49. *Ibid.*, 23.

50. Brooks, *John Sloan*, 82.

51. See Eugene Arden, "The Evil City in American Fiction," *New York History*, 35 (July, 1954), and Blanche Gelfant, *The American City Novel, 1900-1940* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1954).

52. Samuel Green, *American Art* (New York, 1966), 439. Also Geldzahler, *American Painting*.

53. Claes Oldenburg's proposed monuments for the City of New York are interesting in this light. Oldenburg devised an enormous frankfurter with pickle to be placed on Ellis Island and a soft electric fan as a replacement for the Statue of Liberty. Certainly this application of the recent "pop" trend to the city suggests a changing notion of urban life and technology and the individual's place in it. Another fruitful area of investigation might be contemporary urban portraits (photographic, murals, painting, etc.) of urban blacks and young white radicals.

## Alphabetical Listing by Artist of Art Sources

---

*George Bellows*
In the Park (1916. Lithograph.)
River Rats (1906. Oil.)
New York (1916. Oil.)

*Thomas Hart Benton*
July Hay (1943, Egg tempera. and oil.)
Cotton Pickers, Georgia (1932. Egg tempera. and oil.)

*Isabel Bishop*
Two Girls (1935. Oil and tempera.)

*Louis Bouche*
Ten Cents a Ride (1942. Oil.)

*Pol Bury*
Washington Bridge (1966. Color serigraph.)

*Glenn Coleman*
Election Night (1928. Lithograph.)
Minetta Lane (1928. Lithograph.)

*Ralston Crawford*
Third Avenue Elevated No. 1 (1952. Color lithograph.)

*Stuart Davis*
New York Under Gaslight (1941. Oil.)
Sixth Avenue El (1931. Lithograph.)

*Adolph Dehn*

*Die Walküre* At the Met (1930. Lithograph.)

*Guy Pene du Bois*
The Doll and the Monster (1914. Oil.)
Mr. and Mrs. Chester Dale Dining Out (Mid-1920's. Oil.)

*Philip Evergood*
Lily and the Sparrows (1938. Oil.)
The Story of Richmond Hill (1937. Oil mural.)
Street Corner (1935. Oil.)

*Antonio Frasconi*
Fulton Fish Market (1952. Color Woodcut.)

*Wanda Gag*
Elevated Station (1925. Lithograph.)

*William Glackens*
Chez Mouquin (1905. Oil.)
Hammerstein's Roof Garden (1901. Oil.)

*William Gropper*
Market on 38th Street (1965. Etching.)

*Richard Hamilton*
Guggenheim Museum (1965. Color Serigraph.)

*Childe Hassam*
Fifth Avenue (1890. Oil.)
Fifth Avenue: The Avenue of the Allies (1918. Dry point.)
Rainy Day, Boston (1885. Oil.)
Boston Common at Twilight.

*Eugene Higgins*
The Gamblers (1917. Oil.)

*Stefan Hirsch*
Central Park (1930. Lithograph.)

*Edward Hopper*
Hotel Room (1931. Oil.)
From Williamsburg Bridge (1928. Oil.)
Office in a Small City (1953. Oil.)
East Side Interior (1922. Etching.)
Nighthaws (1942. Oil.)

*Oscar Kokoschka*
Manhattan I (1967. Lithograph.)

*Armen Landerk*
Alleyway (1948. Dry point.)

*Jack Levine*
Street Scene No. 1 (1938. Oil.)

*Martin Lewis*
Subway Steps (1930. Etching and dry point.)

*Louis Lozowick*
Brooklyn Bridge Series (1910. 1913. Etchings and water colors.)
Woolworth Building (1913. Etching.)
Street Crossing, New York (1928. Water Color.)

*Reginald Marsh*
The Bowery (1930. Oil.)
Breadline (1932. Etching.)
Why Not Use the "El"? (1930. Egg tempera.)

*Jerome Myers*
The Night Mission (1906. Oil.)
Two Figures in A Park (1911. Pencil drawing.)
Summer Night, East End Party (1918. Oil.)

*Claes Oldenburg*
Proposed Colossal Monument: Fan in the Place of The Statue of Liberty (1967. Pencil Drawing.)
Proposed Colossal Monument for Grant Park, Chicago: Windshield Wiper (1967. Crayon & watercolor.)
Proposed Colossal Monument for Ellis Island: Frankfurter with Tomato and Toothpick (1965. Crayon & watercolor.)

*José Orozco*
Vaudeville in Harlem (1929. Lithograph.)

*Eduardo Paolozzi*
Wittgenstein in New York (1965. Serigraph.)

*Maurice Prendergast*
The Mall, Central Park (1901. Oil.)
The East River (1901. Oil.)
Tremont Street Boston (1902. Monotype.)
West Church Boston (1909. Pencil and Water Color.)
May Day Central Park (1901. Oil.)

*Robert Rauschenberg*
Front Roll (1964. Collage-combine.)

*Everett Shinn*
Hippodrome (1902. Oil.)
Herald Square (1951. Pastel and ink.)

*John Sloan*
Pigeons (1910. Oil.)
Hairdresser's Window (1907. Oil.)
Three A.M. (1909. Oil.)
Sunday, Women Drying Their Hair (1912. Oil.)
Sixth Avenue and 30th Street (1907. Oil.)
Fifth Avenue (1909. Oil.)
Reganeschi's, Saturday Night (1912. Oil.)
Yeats at Petipas (1910. Oil.)
The City From Greenwich Village (1922. Oil.)
Sixth Avenue Elevated at Third Street (1928. Oil.)
McSorley's Bar (1908. Oil.)
The Wigwam, Old Tammany Hall (1930. Oil.)

*Ben Shahn*
Willis Avenue Bridge (1940. Tempera on paper over composition board.)
Handball (1939. Tempera.)
Vacant Lot (1939. Tempera.)

*Charles Sheeler*
Delmonico Building (1926. Lithograph.)

*Raphael Soyer*
Girl in White Blouse (1934. Oil.)
The Mission (1935. Lithograph.)

*Joseph Stella*
Brooklyn Bridge (1918. Oil.)
Coney Island (1920. Oil.)

*Joe Tilson*
Rainbow Grill (1965. Color serigraph on vacuform plastic.)

*George Tooker*
Government Bureau (1956. Egg tempera.)

*Stow Wengenroth*
New York Nocturne (1945. Lithograph.)

*Guy Wiggins*
Metropolitan Tower (1912. Oil.)