

Newsletter

The Catalogue Raisonné Scholars Association

an Affiliated Society of the College Art Association

January 1997

No. 6

A NOTE FROM THE OFFICERS

by Gail Levin, Barbara Buhler Lynes
and Roberta K. Tarbell

We are pleased to publish in this issue material received from members: on choosing computer software to support the research, writing and publishing of a catalogue raisonné by Peter Rooney and a letter about similar matters from Elizabeth Oustinoff. Although the officers of CRSA, who edit the *Newsletter*, have not used either system and, therefore, cannot attest to their excellence, we believe that the ideas presented here will be helpful to anyone involved in compiling a CR.

We hope that other members will submit ideas and articles for publication in upcoming issues of this newsletter. We look forward to seeing you at our annual meeting in New York on Thursday, February 13th at 12:30 p.m., immediately following the CRSA panel described below.

COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, NEW YORK CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ SCHOLARS ASSOCIATION SESSION

9:30 a.m., Thursday, 13 February 1997

"Determining Authenticity and the Implications for Art History"

Anyone who has compiled a catalogue raisonné has been asked to determine the authenticity of works of art that have not previously been attributed to the artist under consideration. Often valid documentation for such pieces is not available; they are neither signed nor dated by the artist, and their provenance is unclear. Yet, the particular characteristics of these works often are quite similar to works in the artist's established oeuvre.

CR authors use various methodologies to assist them in making decisions about whether to include these kinds of works in their catalogues, such as connoisseurship, documentation, scientific/technical analysis, theory, and/or a combination thereof. Speakers at the session will explore the effectiveness of these methods as well as the issue of determining authenticity by committee.

Co-Chairs:

Barbara Buhler Lynes, Maryland Institute, College of Art, The National Gallery of Art, The Georgia O'Keeffe Foundation, and Roberta K. Tarbell, Rutgers University, Camden, NJ

Speakers:

(listed in order of presentation)

Peter Schmidt, Technische Universität Berlin, "Defining the Corpus of Michael Wolgemut: Questions of Authentication in Late Medieval Panel Painting"

Hilliard T. Goldfarb, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, "Raphael and the Two Versions of the Portrait of Tommaso Inghirami: Did He Paint Both?"

Marilyn S. Kushner and Toni Owen, The Brooklyn Museum, "Benjamin West Rediscovered in Brooklyn"

Nancy Mowll Mathews, Williams College Museum of Art, "Authenticity in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction"

Francis V. O'Connor, Independent Scholar, "The Need for Communal Connoisseurship in the Authentication Process"

CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ SCHOLARS ASSOCIATION BUSINESS MEETING

12:30 p.m., Thursday 13, February 1997

A short short business meeting will take place immediately after the CRSA Session, "Determining Authenticity and the Implications for Art History."

Come with your membership form filled out and a check to renew your membership.

HOW TO SHOP FOR A CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ SOFTWARE SYSTEM

by Peter Rooney

I am an indexer of art publications, and a programmer/analyst in the art field. I have designed software for several catalogue raisonné (CR) projects. In the course of these projects, I examined several CR systems. I also specified new software, which subsequently I wrote.

Software specification is a frequently performed exercise. Software (new or to-be-written) is compared in terms of power, ease of use, price, and support. In this paper, I'll first discuss general criteria that apply to almost any software, and then make specific observations about CR software in particular.

Software Design

The design of the software should model the reality of the task to be performed. (For example, "windows"-like programs (GUIs) are modeled on a one-person office with desk, telephone, and wastebasket.) If you apply this principle to the construction of CR software, you will first analyse what a traditional researcher (without a computer) would do, and then try to emulate it, and hopefully improve on it. With a good computer system, input, access, and compilation should all be easier and faster.

A traditional researcher will probably set up a file folder for each art work. The file folder probably contains a worksheet describing the work and its history, and a photograph. Since the folders need to be filed in a certain order (say chronological), there's a need for indexes (probably on cards) of other orders (say, of titles). Exhibition catalogues are on a bookshelf. Correspondence from owners is stored in file folders, probably arranged by owner. Monographs on the artist are shelved on a bookshelf; tearsheets of articles are stored in files; and there probably is a card catalogue to help you find them.

If a CR system is modeled after this traditional setup, you have made a good start. From now on in this article, such a system will be referred to as The System.

The design of The System is not necessarily simple, because the CR problem is inherently complex. However, it should at any level seem simple and manageable. Layers of complexity should be hidden in onion-like fashion. By analogy, the human body is complex, but on one level of reality it can be represented by a child's stick figure.

A key characteristic of a CR system is many-to-many relationships. For example, one artist creates many art works. An art work may have had many owners. An owner may own other art works of the artist (or of other artists). An art work may have appeared in many exhibitions. In a given exhibition, many art works are displayed.

Such a situation is called relational. What you want to avoid in this situation is redundancy. For example, information about an exhibition (its dates, curator, venue, catalogue publication, etc.) should be entered only once. You don't want to type the same information over and over for each art work that appeared in the exhibition. Likewise, the basic information about each art work should exist in only one place in the art database. The System itself will be able to duplicate the information under whatever heading it appears.

A relational system is usually called a database. A database is a collection of related files, held together by software. In The System, art works will be represented by a computer file in which each record represents a single work. Exhibitions will be described in another file; bibliographic citations in yet another file; and so on. The opposite of a relational system is a flat file system, usually consisting of only one file. This is to be avoided. Some flat files do have what is called Lookup fields - but even these are not sufficient for the CR task.

Hardware and Software Platform

The platform is the environment where The System resides. The System needs to run on an adequate machine and operating system, and be written in a powerful database system and/or programming language. Names like IBM-compatible, Pentium, Windows, dBase, Visual C, Pascal, etc. come to mind.

Importantly, the platform should be well known and popular. The System should not be written in a

dead-end system (like, perhaps, Filemaker Pro), or for a dead-end machine (like, perhaps, Macintosh). Exceptions would be if you intend to finish your project in a year or so, or if your own organization or funding source has specific demands.

Bowing to the reality of the marketplace, The System should run on an IBM-compatible machine, and operate with or under Windows 3.1. The System may be DOS-based so long as it can interact at least minimally with Windows. As yet, there is no need to design specifically for Windows 95, especially since both it and Windows 3.1 are likely to be supplanted soon. There are also various industry-wide standards that it should adhere to (ASCII, SGML, SQL, etc.).

If the project is at all sizable, it should be networked, so that several researchers can work on it concurrently.

Installation and configurability

The System should be easy to install. It is nice if the user can personalize elements such as the color of screens. Even though most researchers are not and do not want to be programmers, they should be "empowered" to do quasi-programming, like macro creation. They should also be able to exit to the operating system and base language, to make use of facilities that are not supplied by The System itself.

Interface with users

From the point of view of user interaction, there are currently three types of programs: menu-driven, graphical-user-interface ("GUI" or "windows-like"), and command-driven. Menu-driven programs lead you through a series of A-B-C choices to perform your task. In GUI programs, you can freely use different parts of the program, by "selecting" areas of the screen. A command-driven program waits for you to tell it to do something.

Menu and GUI systems are suitable for all levels of users, but especially novices and casual users. Command systems are often preferred by expert users, because they are faster. Since a mix of users is likely, a system that offers several modes of operation is best.

Many command codes are becoming standard, such as

the F1 key to get help, ESC to cancel, Enter to accept, F10 to return. The System should try to conform to these standards.

Performance

The System must be fast - there should be no waiting around for searches and sorts. When data is changed, the screen should be instantly updated. Otherwise, the researcher's concentration suffers. For a CR project that may take years to complete, a sluggish system is intolerable.

The screens should be in color, with a pleasing visual interface. The "gory details" of raw data should be hidden behind user-friendly captions and graphic layout. Otherwise, the screen rapidly becomes tiring. Ergonomics is a big concern - look for a system that reduces keystrokes, mouse clicks, etc.

Data Capacity

The System must accommodate many records and fields. An artist's oeuvre may comprise several thousand works. A famous work may be exhibited scores of times and be cited or reproduced hundreds of times. A collection (in particular, the Collection or Estate of the Artist) can own hundreds of works. Large projects may occupy many megabytes of hard disk space.

It has been stated that 300 fields are needed to fully express CR information. This may be exaggerated, but only by a little. Having so many fields implies variable-length data fields. Unless empty "space" is "squeezed" out, the size of a record and a file stretches the limits of storage and efficient processing.

The System needs scholarly and foreign-language strength, to express diacritics, special characters, subscripts, and the like. Most CR data is intended for print publication. The typographer should be able to capture the data with minimal loss of formatting.

Connectivity and safety

Safety of the data is a prime concern. A password helps lock out unauthorized users, and protects sensitive data. Computers will eventually fail, the only question is

when. You must keep your data backed up, not sporadically, but on a daily basis. Since users often are too lazy to do this, The System must make it easy to back up, and should ensure that the data is backed up.

However good The System may be, you do not want to be "locked into" it. You eventually will want to consider moving to another system. The System must have an import/export capability. This means that you can bring into your system data that has been produced on another system, and copy data from your system for use by another system. ASCII text is a standard interchange format.

Customization

CR software will never be mass-market. At any one time, perhaps only a few dozen CR projects are actively being worked on. There is great individuality of need - a one-size-fits-all system will not be accepted (given the present lack of standardization of the CR field.)

Expect your software vendor to work with you in customizing to your special requirements. Assuming good basic design, The System can evolve as you go along; the whole system does not have to be ready at once.

Vendor Support

Given the small market, only small companies can reasonably be expected to cater to it. This means that support issues are all- important. Will your vendor be around to answer your questions in the future? The system should have backup support staff. Naturally, you should check that the vendor has a track record.

For safety, ask the vendor to give you a copy of the source code. (Source code is the English-like precursor of the machine language that computers understand.) In this way, if you and your original vendor part, you can find another programmer to work on the code. You might have to pay extra for this option; and you will be required to sign a non-compete agreement.

Expect some support to be free (bundled as part of the system), but usually only during the initial phase of installing and learning the system. Ongoing support is usually purchased.

Price

A vertical or niche market program (like The System) sells for much more than a mass-market program. Probably a price of anywhere from \$500 to \$5000 can be expected. The actual price depends on the amount of customization and support that is included in the initial price. Ultimately, the cost of the basic system is insignificant when compared to the value of the researchers' time over the many months or years it takes to complete a CR project.

Research Capabilities of The System

Having considered the general criteria for any software system (design, platform, installation, operations, performance, capacity, connectivity, customization, support, and price), we can now proceed to specifics of the CR System.

The most important thing to realize about the CR task is that most facts are not hard facts. They are just guesses and estimates. Data is fuzzy - with varying probabilities of "truth".

For example, when the Creation Date of a work is given as "1950", this is often just the researcher's guess at the most probable date. (Many artists do not date their work or keep accurate records of production.) The Title of a work may be assigned not by the artist, but by dealers, collectors, and public consent. Signatures can be dubious. Measurements vary significantly. Probably there is not a single field which is not impeachable.

Given this, The System should allow expressions of doubt to be attached to the data. For example, the Creation Date field can be expressed in any number of ways: "signed 1950," "1950," "ca. 1950," "1950s," "1950 (?)," with precise shades of meaning for each type of expression.

Not only is it difficult to assign values to data fields, but often you depend on secondhand and unreliable sources. An exhibition checklist may be the only evidence that a work existed; yet the checklist may be undated; titles given in it may be different from the accepted titles; and it may cite works that were never actually exhibited. Recollections in memoirs and oral histories may be decades old, or biased. Even standard monographs may

be full of errors which are compounded as they are passed on. CR-making is therefore a problem of historiography.

What is knowable often is not information as such, but only the researcher's sources of information. These sources must be precisely recorded, if there is to be any hope of verifying the researcher's hypotheses. For each data field, therefore, there needs to be a "footnote field" which gives the source for each "fact."

Another problem is that information is not handed to you readymade. There is rarely a source that can give you a neat data sheet about a work: its title, date, medium, dimensions, provenance, exhibition history, etc. If there were such a source, it would necessarily either be second-hand (in which case you must check it); or is itself a Catalogue Raisonné (in which case, why are you preparing a new one?)

The CR task consists of collecting bits and pieces of information from various sources, and trying to assemble them into a coherent whole. Therefore, The System is best described as a computer-assisted data collection system. "Computer-assisted" means that a computer assists the researcher in collecting the information. Often this means not just a saving of time, but also a deeper, more thorough job than can be done with cards and folders. The System is like a research assistant, ready to answer the researcher's ad hoc questions, such as:

- Where is a lost (often early) work? is it really identical with another work that is identified?
- If this unidentified work was owned by a given collector, what other paintings were owned by that collector? Maybe one of them is this work.
- If the unidentified work is "oil on wood" and of a certain size, what other paintings are oil on wood? (or panel, etc.) of a similar size? Maybe one of them is this work.

In the course of research, many printed and onscreen reports will be needed, e.g. "how many shows did the XXX gallery mount?" "how many oils did the artist paint in 19XX?" "what paintings from the show of 19XX were sold?" The System should create standard

reports, and also answer ad hoc user queries. A standard SQL report function is desirable.

In many projects, data is often first entered on worksheets (also called surveys or questionnaires). In The System, this should not be a requirement. The user ought to be able to type directly from primary documents (such as catalogues, correspondence, and gallery sales reports).

This means that partial records can be entered into the system. Sometimes all you know about a work is that it existed (because it was seen at a particular time). If this skeletal record can be entered, however, perhaps it can be filled in at a later time.

A special consideration with CRs is privacy and confidentiality. Current owners may want their names concealed. The researcher needs to respect this desire, and yet needs to maintain a private record of just who "Private Collector" is.

The CR will evolve. With an important artist, "new" works are always turning up; new exhibitions are mounted; new collections are formed; new monographs are written; new discoveries are made about provenance. Ideally, a few keystrokes will globally update the database. This is possible most easily with a relational system, as discussed above.

Required Features of a CR System

What are the principal functions of a CR program?

To begin with, the CR program should feel familiar. For example, a description of a work should look like, or be capable of looking like, a standard citation. Likewise, the reference, exhibition, and provenance sections should be laid out in familiar art-history layout.

The CR database should be divided into several separate files, for the several types of entities involved: Works, Proprietors, Exhibitions, References, etc. These files are linked together in a relational system.

The Works file will have all the fields generally used in describing art, e.g. title, genre, medium, support, technique, signature, inscription, dimensions (English and metric), editions, and many more. It contains both

"published" fields (title, date, etc.); and "working" fields (such as x-radiography reports, condition).

As a general principle (for all files), the fields should be divided into discrete elements. E.g., rather than having a compound field "oil on canvas", better to have "oil" (medium) and "canvas" (support). These discrete fields are more easily manipulated and searched.

Since Works are usually visible objects, the Works file needs to refer to images. More than one image can be associated with a work (different sides of a sculpture, for example). Images serve various needs: on the one hand, thumbnail images for identification, on the other hand, photoreproducible images.

The value of images shouldn't be overstated. Mainly, they help the researcher to distinguish the work in question from other similar works. But the image stored with the DB is probably not going to be the one used in the published CR.

The Provenance file contains two types of fields: historical (where was the collector when the work was owned by him), and contemporary (where to contact the collector or his heirs now).

The provenance function needs to be strong in dates and connections. The essence of the CR task is to settle the genuine corpus of an artist's work. An art work is like legendary Loch Ness monster, coiling up out of the sea of history and disappearing into it. There are clues to its identity: a work turns up at auction; it passes into a private collection; it reappears in an exhibition with a named lender. By fashioning a chain of linkages, you determine a continuous existence back to the artist's hand.

The provenance function therefore needs to express precise dates and transactions, if known, as well as fuzzy dates (like "by 1915"); and a whole variety of means of transfer of possession (e.g., "gift of the artist," "gallery sale," "auction sale," and even unusual transfers like "stolen," "reworked," and "destroyed").

The Exhibitions file contains a chronology of one-person and group exhibitions (including gallery shows and auction appearances). This file has both historical and contemporary fields. Many exhibitions are

traveling. A work must be tracked through its various venues (whether it was shown, and the titles by which it was known). Exhibitions are a valuable way of tracking provenance (because works are "lent by" owners).

The References file should conform to a standard bibliographic system, such as the Chicago Manual of Style. The file refers to publications about the artist and about the artist's work. It notes whether a work was illustrated. (Incidentally, photo credits in a publication are often helpful in working out the provenance of a work.) Exhibitions generally have printed catalogues, so the reference file is also linked to the exhibitions file.

Other useful files are:

A Persons file - containing not only collectors and curators, but also spouses, friends, offspring, dealers, and critics.

An Organizations file - containing, e.g., the addresses of museums and galleries that mount exhibitions.

An Artists file - in the case of a standard CR, containing one record which is the life of the artist him or herself. From this, a C.V. of the artist can be generated.

The various genres of art (painting; sculpture; multiples; etc.) have significantly different requirements. These need to be handled by subsets and customized versions of The System.

Some other problems to be considered are: collaborative works; prints and other multiples; related works; variations in titles over time; changes in the art work over time (first state, etc.); destroyed and lost works; forgeries and copies, as well as works "in the style" or "of the school" of the artist.

After the CR project is "completed" (or must be delivered), the entire CR should be printed from the database. There are several conventional styles for CRs, which The System should be capable of producing. Then the print file will be sent to the typographer on tape or diskette. Little retyping should be required at the typographer's end. If the typographer has to retype the entire CR, that cancels out much of the benefit of having a computer program!

Appendices that may appear in a CR are: a bibliography of frequently referred to publications; and an exhibitions list. Appendices should be generated in a standard format, without retyping.

Peripheral tasks

The System can usefully handle a variety of tasks that are not directly part of the published catalogue.

The researcher needs to write many letters to collectors and museums, asking for information, and ultimately, permission to reproduce images. The System should support a letter-writing function.

The System should contain or be compatible with a wordprocessor, hopefully, one of the researcher's choice. For example, if the researcher is comfortable with WordPerfect 5.1, that wordprocessor should be available.

The System ought to help in handling the voluminous files generated by the CR project: indexing of correspondence; cataloguing of photos; keeping a log of the researcher's interaction with each work; and so on.

In many cases, an estate or personal collection of the artist is sponsoring the CR and also owns a large bulk of available works. These need to be treated as property, and so an inventory function is needed, to keep track of the location of works, whether they are out on loan and for how long, insurance evaluations, and so on.

The Future

What might the future bring? This might be answered in terms of the dynamic growth of the CR. It is obvious that as soon as a CR is published, it is obsolete. Traditionally, supplements are issued. With modern technology, it is now possible to make the entire CR database available on the Internet. This makes it easy for the public and scholars at large to suggest modifications to the CR. This might be done through a BBS or newsgroup approach, refereed by the original CR project team. From time to time, the entire updated CR would be published on CDROM, by now a fairly cheap medium.

We might even envision an interconnection of CRs - joint cataloguing of the works of a certain school, or catalogues of entire collections. This then becomes a worldwide network.

Summary

Generally, the best approach to buying a new CR system seems to be to start with a general system that is customizable. The system should:

- model the reality of the CR task;
- be based on an interactive, relational database system;
- be written for commonly available hardware and software;
- be easy to install and operate;
- be fast, and able to handle large amounts of data;
- have backup and import/export functions;
- be customizable, and be supported by a vendor;
- be helpful in answering research questions;
- perform basic CR functions (including storing the descriptions and images of works; tracking the provenance, exhibition, and bibliographic history; and final layout and typography);
- perform peripheral functions (such as record-keeping and inventory);
- be adaptable to future developments (particularly on the Internet).

Peter Rooney can be contacted at:

Magnetic Reports
332 Bleecker St. (#X6)
New York NY 10014

Telephone and fax: (212) 675-0904
E-mail: magnetix@ix.netcom.com

NOTES FROM MEMBERS

Report from the John Singer Sargent Catalogue Raisonné Project by Elizabeth Oustinoff, Director Adelson Galleries, Inc., New York

Over the past four years I have developed a program for the John Singer Sargent Catalogue Raisonné. The program has finally been completed. It was a long and expensive slog, and I would welcome the opportunity to help anyone who is embarking on a catalogue, if only to share thoughts about programming pitfalls. Although our goals were clear from the outset, our main stumbling block was not getting the right programmer for the job and I didn't know what any of this meant until I'd been through it once. The first two years were totally wasted due to a company we used who made endless promises but was unable to produce reliable results. After many frustrating disasters including endless crashes and lost data, I hired a free-lance programmer who has been a pleasure to work with and has not only affected my design but improved on it in many areas.

The Sargent program is both comprehensive and simple to use. The primary record screen gives the essential information - Title, Alternate Title, Verso, Date, Medium, Signature, Inscription, Current owner, Creditline, etc. Across the bottom of each primary record is a series of tabs that contain information pertinent to that particular painting. The tabs include **Provenance**, **Photography** information, **Descriptives** (type of picture [i.e., portrait, subject picture], theme [landscape, genre], location where painted, and attribution); **Condition**, **Bibliography** (abbreviated), **Exhibition** History (abbreviated), **Essay**, **Archive** (letters and other non-bibliographic primary sources), and a **Confidential** file.

Some of the main features of the program include:

- a scanned image of each painting seen on each record
- automatic updates of provenance history: (The name of any owner [past or present] is typed only once so there is no possibility of misspelling in another field)
- photo rights and reproduction tracking
- photo and file folder labeling
- a comprehensive query screen that will produce

reports for any combination of searches (i.e., all watercolors painted in Venice between 1902 and 1906; all portraits of children ordered by date and medium) - and it's easy to use!

- an owner screen with full information about the owner (living or deceased); it can also sort owners by type (dealer, institution, private collection) and will generate a list of all works currently owned, formerly owned, or ever owned.
- a master exhibition file which lists all paintings shown in any particular exhibition; and master bibliography
- an infinite number of printed report possibilities in any number of chosen font styles and sizes.
- the ability to choose a painting from any list in any field and jump directly to the primary record for that painting

There are many other aspects to this program. It's fast, it's simple, and it works. We are so thrilled with it that we are now adapting it for our gallery inventory.

I would be happy to discuss the Sargent program with anyone who is interested. If you have any subscribers who are struggling to find a way to deal with their material, I would be glad to speak with them. We've put an enormous amount of time, effort and money into this and we've learned a lot over the past few years. The requirements for each catalogue are, of course, different but I think I've covered most of the possibilities and have probably made most of the mistakes. Although we are not in the business of marketing this program, it could be custom designed for another catalogue if someone were interested.

Rockwell Kent Information Sought by Scott R. Ferris

I am cataloguing the paintings of Rockwell Kent, and I have assumed the responsibilities of compiling a bibliography of Kent's oeuvre after my late friend Dan Burne Jones (author of the CR of Kent's prints). I am also organizing "Soaring Spirit: The Art of Rockwell Kent," a definitive retrospective, and a smaller exhibition on Kent's Adirondack work.

Scott Ferris can be contacted at:

7866 Steuben St., P.O. Box 28
Holland Patent, NY 13354
Telephone and Fax (315) 865-5455

NEWS FLASHES

Excerpt from Alan Riding, "Art Fraud's New Trick: Add Fakes To Archive," *The New York Times*, June 19, 1996, p.C11.

"Now an extraordinary new scam has come to light here that illustrates the growing sophistication of art forgers. Accomplices of forgers were found to have doctored the archives at the Tate Gallery so that when consulted by a prospective buyer of a painting or sculpture, the record shows that the fake is authentic.

'We've often seen fake documentation, but this is the first time I have come across tampering with research material by inserting documentation,' said Constance Lowenthal, executive director of the New York-based International Foundation for Art Research. 'It's very worrisome, particularly since we don't know the extent of it. We're a little nervous about whether this has happened elsewhere.'

The Tate discovered the fraud last September and called in Scotland Yard, but the case was not publicized until this month, and even now few details have been disclosed. Several people have been arrested and released on bail pending further inquiry. There are reports that the archives at the Victoria and Albert Museum and the British Council were also tampered with in a racket that dates back some six years. . . .

Investigators have reportedly discovered that, in some cases, forgers went so far as to print bogus catalogues and place them in museum libraries."

CR: WORKS IN PROGRESS AND REVISED REPUBLICATIONS

The Wildenstein Institute in Paris, publishers of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, announced their preparation of revised editions of out-of-print CRs of the works of the following artists: François Boucher, Gustave Caillebotte, Jean Siméon Chardin, Gustave Courbet, Jean Honoré Fragonard, Paul Gauguin, Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, Nicolas Lancret, Maurice Quentin de La Tour, Edouard Manet, Claude Monet, Berthe Morisot, Jean Baptiste Pater, and Diego Velazquez. As part of their stated mission to foster "a wider appreciation of European art and civilization through the sponsorship of scholarly research," the publishers are preparing CRs of the works of: Jean Beraud, Emile Bernard, Joseph Chinard, Jacques Louis David, François Gerard, Théodore Gericault, Jean Antoine Houdon, Albert Lebourg, Albert Marquet, Jean Marc

Nattier, Camille Pissarro, Odilon Redon, Hubert Robert, Auguste Rodin, Kees van Dongen, Elisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun, Maurice de Vlaminck, and Francisco de Zurbaran.

THE CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ: RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Harrison, Pegram. *Frankenthaler: A Catalogue Raisonné, Prints, 1961-1994*. New York: Abrams, 1996. Introduction by Suzanne Boorsch. 480 pp., 306 color illus., 70 B/W illus., \$125.

Joosten, Joop M. and Robert P. Welsh. *Piet Mondrian: Catalogue Raisonné*. New York: Abrams, 1996. 704 pp., 350 color illus., 950 B/W, \$250.

McCarron, Paul. *The Prints of Martin Lewis: A Catalogue Raisonné*. Bronxville, New York: M. Hausberg, 1995. 256 pp., 187 B/W, illus., \$120.

Schwarz, Arturo. *The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp*, rev. ed. New York and London: Abrams, 1996. 2 volumes, 1,000 pages, 222 color illus., 900 B/W illus.

Wilkinson, Alan G. *The Sculpture of Jacques Lipchitz*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1996. Introduction by A.M. Hammacher, 444 B/W illus., 100 in duotone, \$60.

NEW MEMBERS

Vivian Endicott Barnett
140 Riverside Dr.
New York, NY 10024

Jacques Olivier Bouffier
Greenwich, Connecticut
(Eugène Delacroix)

Sheila Dugan
216 Homer St.
Newton Centre, MA 02159

Steve Good, President
Old West Publishing Co.
1228 E. Colfax Ave.
Denver, CO 80218

Leslie Griffin Hennessey
1520 Shadford Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Wendy Jeffers
Canal Street Station
P.O. Box 419
New York, NY 10073

Lois Swan Jones
3801 Normandy
Dallas, TX 75205

Constance Lowenthal, Executive Director
International Foundation for Art Research
500 5th Avenue, Suite 1234
New York, NY 10110

Nancy Mowll Mathews
Eugénie Prendergast Curator
Williams College Museum of Art
Main Street
Williamstown, MA 01267-2566

Marilyn Nance
P.O. Box 521
Adelphi Station
Brooklyn, NY 11238

Selma Nelson

Aimée Brown Price
225 West 86th St.
New York, NY 10024

Sarah T. Radic

Judith Steinhof
Department of Art
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77204-4893

ABOUT THE CRSA

The Catalogue Raisonné Scholars Association, founded in 1993, currently has a membership of 70. The annual dues are \$10.00; \$15.00 overseas. CRSA provides a forum for discussing the catalogue raisonné. Sessions at CAA address authentication, funding and publishing possibilities, legal issues, new technologies, and obtaining cooperation from museums, collectors, dealers, estates of artists, conservation scientists, and other scholars. If you would like to have copies of all six issues of The CRSA Newsletter, mail a check for \$20.00 to the treasurer.

Officers are:

President: **Gail Levin** (Baruch College and Graduate Center, City University of New York, Box E-1020, 17 Lexington, New York, NY 10010)

Vice-President: **Barbara Buhler Lynes** (Maryland Institute, College of Art; National Gallery of Art, Georgia O'Keeffe Foundation) 27 Warrenton Rd., Baltimore, MD 21210-2924

Treasurer: **Roberta K. Tarbell** (Rutgers University, Camden), 504 Beech Tree Lane, Hockessin, DE 19707-1149. e-mail: rtarbell@AOL.com