

Degas's Sculptures Re-examined: The Marketing of a Private Pursuit

Joseph S. Czestochowski

Recognized as one of the most important artists of the nineteenth century, Degas is extremely popular with the general public. Renoir, his contemporary, called him “the greatest living sculptor.”¹ He was one of the most accomplished and influential sculptors of his age, which may explain why scholars continue to speculate about when and how his sculptures were made, and their place within the context of his times.

During his lifetime, Degas exhibited only one piece of sculpture. In 1881, his masterpiece *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* (cat. 73) was shown in the sixth exhibition of impressionist art in Paris. This piece was to have been exhibited the previous year in the fifth exhibition; instead Degas presented only an empty case, perhaps simply because the sculpture was not ready. Conceptually and technically revolutionary in its stark naturalism—he used clothing and doll’s hair—*Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* greatly surprised viewers and critics alike, resulting in frequent public comments of “vulgar” and “low,” as well as the inevitable comparisons to the very popular waxworks at Madame Tussaud’s Museum in London and the Musée Grévin in Paris.² One observer commented, “The terrible realism of this statuette makes the public distinctly uneasy, all its ideas about sculpture, about cold lifeless whiteness, about those memorable formulas copied again and again for centuries are demolished.”³ The artist—until the end of his working life in about 1912—vigorously continued to make sculptures, but, perhaps because of the reception of the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen*, he did not again publicly exhibit another piece of sculpture. For Degas, sculpture became a private pursuit.

Degas was by no means a recluse. On the contrary, he was very aware of contemporary artists as well as of complex casting methods and other techniques. As both Camille Pissarro (1830–1903) and Mary Cassatt (1844–1926) noted, Degas constantly sought technical innovations in his work; embracing either unconventional procedures or new combinations of traditional techniques. Many people visited Degas and commented on the numerous sculptures in his studio and on his obsession with making sculpture.⁴ It is apparent that he derived tremendous pleasure from these sculptures and the physical process of making them. We still know little of Degas’s motivation in making his sculptures, but they do appear to be conceptually unique works

of art and an extension of his drawing. Some sculptures he preserved in glass cases and his collections of both his work and that of other artists “constituted a working archive from which new works could be generated.”⁵ Many of his sculptures have not survived, a result of the extreme fragility of his mixed media (a combination of pigmented wax with a nondrying modeling clay called plastilene that he usually applied over a wire armature with fillers of cork, rope, sticks, or similar found objects in his studio), neglect, or simply because they were failed experiments; all situations described by the artist himself.⁶

Degas’s obsession with making sculpture was matched only by his insatiable technical experimentation and reworking of compositions, his feeling that they were never complete. Between 1900 and 1903, perhaps at the instigation of his close friends, he cast three wax sculptures in plaster—*Woman Rubbing Her Back with Sponge* (cat. 28), *Dancer Looking at the Sole of Her Right Foot* (cat. 40), and *Spanish Dance* (cat. 45).⁷ This casting may have occurred after his good friend and sculptor Albert Bartholomé (1848–1928) introduced him to the foundry owner Adrien-A. Hébrard (1865–1937) and perhaps the Milanese caster Albino Palazzolo (1883–1973). Hébrard and Palazzolo had worked together from the early 1900s and were well known in Parisian artistic circles.⁸ As early as 1904 Rodin turned to Hébrard to cast the first large bronze of his *Thinker* for exhibition at the Saint Louis World’s Fair (Louisiana Purchase Exposition). Several years later in 1907, Hébrard, in association with the Petit Palais, posthumously cast in bronze the small terracotta and plaster models left in Jules Dalou’s studio when he died in 1902.⁹ Degas repeatedly spoke of having other plaster casts made of his own work, but only those pieces and two plasters of the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* made by Palazzolo later in the 1920s were actually completed.

Contemporary accounts record Degas’s frequent comments and apparent aversion to casting his sculptures in bronze, which, he felt, was too permanent, and would not allow him to make changes. Degas might also have been influenced by the association of bronze with monumental sculpture as the “medium for eternity” or funerary art.¹⁰ But, in spite of being captivated by the spirit of experimentation, evolving technology, and the physical process, he never entirely abandoned the idea of casting in bronze.

In June 1919 a series of letters from Joseph Durand-Ruel (1862–1928), the son of Degas’s long-time dealer and executor Paul Durand-Ruel (1831–1922), to Royal Cortissoz (1869–1948), the art critic for the *New York Herald Tribune*, documents that more than 150 wax

sculptures and sculpture fragments, many in poor condition and deteriorating naturally, were scattered over three floors of his apartment at 6 boulevard de Clichy in Montmartre, where he had lived since 1912.¹¹ The official posthumous studio inventory prepared by Paul Durand-Ruel and Ambroise Vollard between December 1917 and January 1918 records only eighty pieces.¹² Of this number, Joseph Durand-Ruel considered thirty sculptures to be quite fine, thirty to be sketchy, and about thirty to be valueless fragments. To eliminate any potential questions of authorship, Durand-Ruel immediately hired the photographer Gauthier (dates unknown), to document the artist's original "unaltered" sculptures as found in the studio. Between 29 December 1917 and 28 March 1918 Gauthier completed seventy-two multiple views of fifty-three sculptures, perhaps the final number that Durand-Ruel originally felt were important, required documentation, and should be cast. We know nothing further about the fate of the other sculptures remaining in the studio after Degas's death or about what must have been many others that had either disintegrated over the years or been destroyed by the artist.¹³

Today, these photographs by Gauthier, first published in 1991 by Anne Pingeot in her definitive catalogue of Degas's sculpture,¹⁴ are our best record documenting the sculptures exactly as made by Degas and left in his studio, before changes by other hands. From these photographs, also included in this publication, it is apparent immediately that the existing original wax and mixed-media sculptures were stabilized to varying degrees by other hands in preparation for the initial casting process. The most notable change was the elimination of the armatures that for Degas were an integral part of each composition.¹⁵ For more than thirty years, the wax sculptures, forgotten by everyone other than the foundry, were presumed to have been lost in the casting process. Then, in 1955, six years after the Hébrards purchased all the reproduction rights to the sculptures from the Degas heirs, the so-called discovery of the wax models was announced. They were exhibited in 1955 in New York and, in preparation, these wax originals were again stabilized by Palazzolo.¹⁶

Writing in *ARTnews* in late 1955, Jean Adhémar, the well-known art historian, said: "No one realized, however, that all the wax figures by the master's hand were still in existence. Mr. Palazzolo, who worked in Hébrard's foundry, is responsible for their preservation."¹⁷ Adhémar proceeded to describe the method used by Palazzolo to accomplish what one may presume to have been the heirs' overriding goal of preserving Degas's very fragile creations.

In accordance with what was then the customary way of preserving the original wax model, Palazzolo made a flexible gelatin mold of the wax, which was then used to make a duplicate wax, saving unharmed the artist's original models.¹⁸ The duplicate wax was then used to cast by the *cire perdue* or lost-wax method a *modèle* or master bronze cast, which was then compared with the originals for surface detail and color. The process was repeated with the *modèle* bronze cast being used to make a new gelatin mold that was then used to make other wax casts. Finally, it was from those wax casts that the Hébrard serialized casts were made. In all this, it is important to keep in mind that any existing Degas bronze sculpture, be it one of the serialized bronzes or one of the bronzes marked MODÈLE, has been made from a duplicate wax. Arthur Beale, the Director of Conservation at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, has convincingly hypothesized that each gelatin mold made from a *modèle* bronze could be used to make on average six wax casts before beginning to lose its shape and surface details.¹⁹ This conclusion is important because, as in the graphic arts, the "impression" of each authorized serialized cast would possess individual differences in surface quality. Put simply, the first bronze made from the mold would have much better surface detail than would the fifth as the mold begins to wear out. It is relevant to keep in mind that every bronze was made according to contemporary standards, that each existing bronze was made from duplicate wax models, and that, over the years during which the casts were made, the individual surface details varied considerably. The wax sculptures have sustained further conservation in the years since they were purchased in 1956 by Paul Mellon and subsequently donated to several museums. To sum up, what remains today is not a complete picture of Degas's sculptural work, and the extant works are yet to disclose all their secrets.²⁰

Almost eight months after Degas died in September 1917, a contract (see the appendix to this volume) to cast the sculptures in bronze was signed on 13 May 1918 between the artist's heirs and the foundry owned by Adrien-A. Hébrard. This was a monumental and extremely expensive undertaking, as the cost of bronze was very high following the war. The contract authorized that the number of casts be strictly limited to only twenty-two examples of each of the sculptures, with only twenty of those casts available for sale and numbered from two to twenty-one, with the first and presumably best set (to be stamped "Degas" and numbered one) reserved for the artist's heirs and another set (to be similarly stamped "Degas" and a special mark) reserved for the Hébrard Foundry. It was not until the 1990s and the comprehensive catalogue by

Anne Pingeot that the actual contract was first published and we became aware of the exact provisions and strict limitations. In the same publication Anne Pingeot described her exhaustive examination of the Hébrard archives.²¹

By 1921, several sets of sculpture were completed. Hébrard, even though he was not an heir, marked his set HER (for *héritiers*) and marked the sculptures that were destined for the heirs HER.D (for *héritiers Degas*) instead of the numeral 1 as required by the contract. In addition, because not all of the heirs wanted their sculptures, Hébrard supposedly purchased back about half or more of their share and, in subsequently marking those sculptures presumably HER as well, created duplicates.²²

Hébrard also made, and kept for himself, a second set of sculptures not authorized by the terms of the 1918 contract. These sculptures, marked MODÈLE, were not publicly acknowledged until 1976, several years after the death of the caster Palazzolo. Late in life, at the age of eighty-seven, Palazzolo himself, who had retired to Italy, also “released” an unknown number of sculptures, supposedly all test casts, marked AP (founder’s initials), FR MODÈLE (founder’s model; cat. 40), FR (founder; cats. 40, 47, 55), and a number of other exceptions to the 1918 contract. An explosion in Italy shortly before Palazzolo’s death in 1973 destroyed many remaining documents about the castings that might have helped explain these differences. In the early 1990s several people including Guy Loudmer, who was in charge of Palazzolo’s estate, examined more than twenty Degas bronzes in Italy, including a single P series sculpture (the complete set had been acquired in 1930 by the Musée du Louvre) and subsequently in 1993 Loudmer sold a group of eleven pieces at Drouot in Paris (there were eight casts marked AP; one marked MP; one marked both HER and AP).

We know from the Hébrard archives analyzed by Anne Pingeot that, before 1936, the distribution of Degas’s bronzes consisted of very few complete sets: A, B, D, and P. The E set (designated “Atelier”) is also listed as complete, but in fact only *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* and *Grande Arabesque, First Time* were actually released, in 1925 and 1935 respectively. At the same time, this record informs us that sculptures were individually sold from 1921 onward from what must have been the Hébrard designated sales series: F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, and O. The Hébrard archive records only 567 sculptures by 1936, far fewer than the 1,606 contractually authorized in 1918.²³

In addition to those casts, the following sculptures have now been located: a number of unlettered casts (about twenty-two sculptures, excluding the *Little Dancer*), casts with only numbers or letters (about five), multiple casts with the same letter (about thirty-six sculptures), a number of casts marked AP (about nineteen) by Hébrard's chief caster Albino Palazzolo, the enigmatic plaster cast with a signature stamp of *Spanish Dance* (cat. 45), and about thirteen other casts that cannot be matched to existing casting records.²⁴ For the indisputable star of Degas's sculptures, the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen*, there remain known two plaster casts made by Palazzolo, one MODÈLE cast, thirteen lettered casts (those with the letters K, L, N, O, Q, R, and T have not been located), eleven unlettered casts, two casts marked HER, and one cast marked HER.D, for a total of thirty known casts, excluding the original wax and mixed-media statue in the National Gallery of Art, Washington.²⁵

With the looming political crisis in Europe interest in the sculptures waned dramatically in the 1930s. Hébrard's best sales partner, the influential dealer Alfred Flechtheim (1878–1937), closed his galleries in Germany in 1934,²⁶ the Hébrard Foundry went into liquidation in 1937, and Adrien-A. Hébrard died the same year; the original foundry building was soon torn down. Few details about the Hébrard Foundry liquidation survive and nor is there any existing record, either public or private, of large numbers of Degas sculptures being sold as part of the remaining inventory to settle debts. In 1949, Nelly Hébrard (1904–1985) purchased all the remaining production and reproduction rights to the sculptures from the remaining Degas heirs in both France and the United States.²⁷ Though her company Lignes et Couleurs, based in Tunis, the Galerie Blanche in Stockholm, and later M. Knoedler & Company in New York, she began marketing the sculptures aggressively. This sequence of events is critical to our understanding of the casting history of the Degas sculptures.

By 1995 Sara Campbell had identified, through auction and dealer records (including those of the Hébrard Foundry, as recorded in Pingeot, and others), a total of about twelve hundred serialized casts—considerably more than the Hébrard archive's records, in 1936, of 567 sculptures.²⁸ Campbell's total excludes the additional MODÈLE set of about another seventy-three sculptures because they were not part of the original contract. Another forthcoming catalogue records more than 1,380 casts and, similarly, excludes the MODÈLE set but does include about twenty known sculptures unmatched to existing cast records. In itself, this comparison between the Hébrard records of 1936 and the evidence obtained subsequently leads one to conclude that

the sculpture casting continued for much longer than the time between the initial period of production in the 1920s and the liquidation of the foundry in the late 1930s. From other distinguished scholars we know that in the mid-1960s the letter punch HER was still in the possession of the Hébrard heirs, as was the “Degas” signature punch. It is clear that, for practical economic reasons, the sculptures could not profitably have been cast and then warehoused in advance of a potential sale. These facts, together with Nelly Hébrard’s purchase of production rights from the Degas heirs in 1949, the casting of *Schoolgirl* (cat. 74) in the 1950s, and the retention of the MODÈLE set by Hébrard, which, although mentioned by Palazzolo to Adhémar in 1955, was not publicly known until three years after Palazzolo’s death in 1973, would lead one to conclude that the casting continued for some considerable time.

The history of the casting is not only inconsistent and extremely confusing, but also chaotic. A great deal could and has been said since the event, but John Rewald (1912–1984) best summarizes the apparently premeditated reappearance of the MODÈLE set: “This, like the ‘discovery’ of the original waxes, is an unexpected event, a supplement to an edition that was not quite as strictly limited and not quite as consistently marked as we had been led to believe. Hébrard, of course, did not realize that his casts would become subject to close scrutiny.”²⁹

It appears that, after 1918, with the Degas contract in hand, Hébrard dramatically expanded his activities as a commercial dealer. From this time until his death in 1937, Adrien-A. Hébrard and his daughter Nelly managed the entire marketing and sales of Degas’s sculpture. Already in the 1920s, Hébrard, busy with his work as editor and owner of *Le Temps*, was delegating much of the responsibility for the management of the sculptures to his daughter, who in 1932 was designated head of the company established solely to market the Degas sculptures. The first public exhibition of the Hébrard serialized bronzes occurred in May 1921 at the Galerie A.-A. Hébrard. The inauguration was accompanied by considerable fanfare, with the French president and a distinguished list of luminaries in attendance. In May Hébrard and the Degas heirs offered the Musée du Louvre a complete set of sculptures with the provision that they be displayed in a special room. This gift was accepted by the Louvre on 9 June 1921 with the added provision, similar to one attached to the 1916 Rodin donation, that the special exhibit would not extend beyond a period of twenty-five years. Through no fault of the museum, the donation was never concluded. Perhaps not surprisingly, the allure of Louisine Havemeyer (1855–1929), her wealth,

and the influence of her friend Mary Cassatt resulted in the sale of the promised set, marked A, to Havemeyer in October of that year.

Hébrard promptly organized, with varying degrees of critical and financial success, a series of other exhibitions: in 1921 (the series is unrecorded) at the Galerie Bernheim-Jeune & Co. in Zurich; of series A, lent anonymously by the owner Louisine Havemeyer, in 1922 at the Grolier Club in New York from 26 January to 28 February; and of series B at the Durand-Ruel Galleries (the exclusive United States agent for the Degas estate) also in New York, 6–27 December; in 1923 (the series is unrecorded) at the Leicester Galleries, London, and at the Second International Biennial in Rome from November 1923 to April 1924; in April and May 1924 at the Galerie Georges Petit in Paris; of series B in October and November 1925 at the Ferargil Galleries in New York; in 1926 at the National Gallery of Art in Prague, 1–26 April; in 1926, 1927, and 1929 in several cities in Germany at the galleries of Alfred Flechtheim and Justin K. Thannhauser (1892–1976), that in 1926, accompanied by the first critical catalogue, which was written by Curt Glaser; and, of series P in 1931, at the Musée de l'Orangerie, Paris.³⁰ The subsequent documentation surrounding the sculptures was further complicated when Hébrard's simple one-page catalogue for the exhibition in 1921 used a numerical order different from the numbers inscribed on the base of the sculptures when cast in the foundry. This new sequence, by subject, was then used for most of the subsequent early exhibitions because they were orchestrated entirely or in partnership with the Hébrard Foundry.

Between 1919 and the mid-1930s, complete sets of sculptures found their way to only two museum collections: that of the Metropolitan Museum in 1929 — series A (except the unlocated and never donated cats. 19 and 41) which had been bought by Louisine Havemeyer in 1921 and exhibited at the museum from 1923; and that of the Musée du Louvre in 1930—series P, acquired from Degas's heirs by their abandonment of reproduction rights and with Hébrard assuming partial cost of the casting materials.³¹ Other groups of sculptures were documented in the Hébrard archives as going to Alfred Flechtheim (partial series F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O), to the painter dealer Walther Halvorsen and immediately to Durand-Ruel Galleries, New York (Series B), and again through Walter Halvorsen to the very influential Justin K. Thannhauser, who on 12 August 1929 acquired more than sixty sculptures (series D only). Curiously, another set, series E, was designated for the “Atelier,” and perhaps remained unlettered. However by 1935 only two examples of series E (cats. 18 and 73), including the *Little Dancer, Aged*

Fourteen, had been sold;³² no other mention of the other seventy-one sculptures exists during this time.

Four pieces from the Durand-Ruel/Ferargil Galleries series owned by Frank Crowninshield (1872–1947), the distinguished collector and founder of both the trend-setting magazine *Vanity Fair*,³³ and with others, of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, were exhibited at Smith College in November–December, 1933. Two years later, thirty-five sculptures were exhibited in New York at the gallery that Jacques Seligmann (1858–1923) had established in the 1920s and that was run by his son Germain Seligmann (1893–1978). The elder Seligmann, in partnership with Ambroise Vollard, and the firms Durand-Ruel and Bernheim-Jeune, had purchased sixty-nine lots from the Degas estate sales, and in November 1932 exhibited four B series sculptures in Paris as being from the A.-A. Hébrard Collection. With two exceptions (18/E and 47/O), the sculptures in the Seligmann exhibit were all part of the same dealer inventory previously exhibited in the 1920s at Durand-Ruel Galleries and F. Newlin Price’s Ferargil Galleries. Of the seventy-two sculptures exhibited in 1925, nine were sold individually to collectors, including Arthur B. Davies (1862–1928), the highly popular Ferargil artist and a catalyst of the 1913 Armory Show. In addition, a group of thirteen sculptures was acquired by Jules E. Mastbaum (1872–1926), the theatre magnate and founder of the Philadelphia Rodin Museum.³⁴ Within a very short time, Mastbaum acquired more than 124 sculptures by Rodin and, after seeing the masterpiece *Gates of Hell*, was the first to commission two casts for his museum and for the Rodin Museum in Paris. Another significant group of twenty-three sculptures went to Mary Quinn Sullivan (Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan; 1877–1939), a prodigious collector who was closely linked over the years to Arthur B. Davies and to Ferargil Galleries. Together with Abby Aldrich Rockefeller (1874–1948) and Lillie P. Bliss (1864–1931), Mrs. Sullivan was on the committee that hired Alfred H. Barr Jr. as the first director of the Museum of Modern Art. Her collections, including the Degas sculptures were sold in 1937 (thirteen sculptures), 1939 (nine sculptures), and 1940 (one sculpture);³⁵ after being displayed in the 1935 exhibition at the New York Jacques Seligmann Gallery. Many of the same sculptures surfaced again several years later with another close associate in the trade. From June 1929 to 1942, Ferargil tried to sell its allocated inventory of thirteen sculptures, eventually selling two to Kraushaar Gallery in 1928 and 1931, donating one to the Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, and selling four at Parke-Bernet in 1942. Consignments in the 1930s to the Earl Stendahl

Gallery in Los Angeles were unsuccessful and between 1949 and 1952 Ferargil was still attempting to sell two remaining sculptures.

The only other important activities during the 1930s consisted of an exhibition of sculptures in Cairo, Egypt,³⁶ and of others from the collection of Justin K. Thannhauser in 1931 at his Berlin gallery, in 1934 in Buenos Aires, and in 1939–1940, in collaboration with John Rewald, as part of a large exhibition of French sculptures at Amsterdam's Stedelijk Museum. This exhibit, and other similar projects organized by the French government as a way of moving important collections out of France because of the threat of war, was held as the Thannhausers themselves were preparing to leave France for New York, via Lisbon.

Further exhibits of Degas bronzes were held at the Buchholz Gallery in New York. The exhibits were organized by the prominent dealer Curt Valentin (1902–1954), who in addition to being the representative of Picasso, was active not only in presenting modern sculpture to the American public but also in marketing the Degas sculptures. Before coming to the United States from Germany in 1937, Valentin had had a long association with the sculpture. From about 1927, as director of Alfred Flechtheim's gallery in Berlin, he had organized several comparable exhibitions. For the exhibit in 1943 he offered mostly works from the same B series that had been exhibited earlier in New York at Durand-Ruel, and then at Ferargil Galleries, and then at the Jacques Seligmann Gallery, and included loans back of the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* from the Jacques Seligmann Gallery and from the collectors Edward Warburg and Herman Shulman in New York and Connecticut, respectively. An exhibit at the same gallery in 1945 involved Valentin's good friend from the mid-1920s, Justin K. Thannhauser, and featured once again the B and some D series sculptures, supplemented by eleven sculptures from the A series that had been lent by the Metropolitan Museum of Art to replace examples sold from the gallery over the years, examples that apparently were not easily replaced on the market. Curiously, less than ten years later, the gallery sale organized by Valentin's executor Ralph Colin included a number of the same bronzes that were still unsold.³⁷

Justin K. Thannhauser was an important figure not only for his interest in Degas, but also because of his tremendous activities with nineteenth- and twentieth-century art. From 1926 onwards, Thannhauser was collecting and selling over sixty Degas bronzes at the Galerie Thannhauser in Munich, through a Lucerne branch run by his nephew Siegfried Rosengart (1894–1985), through his Berlin gallery from 1927 to 1937, and in New York from 1941 until

his return to Bern in 1971. After the death of his son during the war, Thannhauser abandoned his plans for a gallery in New York, selling a large number of works at Parke-Bernet in April 1945 that included five Degas sculptures. Thannhauser's significant art works were placed on permanent view in their own wing of New York's Guggenheim Museum in the 1960s. In addition to three superb sculptures (cats. 19, 20, 46) given to that museum, his Degas sculptures found their way into numerous museum collections, including The Art Institute of Chicago (cat. 27), Yale University Art Gallery (cats. 32, 36), Toledo Art Museum (cat. 56), Los Angeles County Museum of Art (cats. 1, 60), Fogg Art Museum at Harvard University (cat. 16), Cincinnati Art Museum (cats. 5, 33), Minneapolis Institute of Arts (cat. 37), and the Memorial Art Gallery at the University of Rochester (cat. 17) among others. One work (cat. 14) still remained with Mrs. Thannhauser for many years after her husband's death. Justin Thannhauser exerted a tremendous influence by organizing international exhibitions of these sculptures well beyond his considerable involvement with Curt Valentin and the Buchholz Gallery.³⁸

It was not until the mid-1940s, almost twenty-five years after Curt Glaser had produced a catalogue for Alfred Flechtheim's gallery, that John Rewald completed the first systematic catalogue of Degas's sculpture. Soon after the Second World War, international interest in art was renewed. A major Degas exhibition at the Cleveland Museum of Art in early 1947 included thirteen sculptures lent by the Metropolitan Museum, the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* (marked HER.D and purchased from Degas's niece) lent by the Virginia Museum, and other mostly D and one B series sculptures from Alfred Flechtheim's friends J. K. Thannhauser and Curt Valentin. The success of this exhibition, together with the scholarly attention being paid to Degas, was a significant catalyst to the revived marketability of the sculptures. In the following year, 1948, Nelly Hébrard, perhaps prompted by her sale of an S series *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* cast to the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, orchestrated another major exhibit—a complete set of sculptures (all, except the *Little Dancer* just noted, from the previously unreferenced R series and *Dressed Dancer at Rest*, cat. 51, from the H series in the Hébrard archives) at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen, the National Gallery in Oslo, and her affiliated Galerie Blanche in Stockholm. In fact, during the late 1930s and 1940s sales interest in Degas sculptures seems to have been largely restricted to the *Little Dancer*. Interestingly, the catalogue for the 1948 exhibition was the last that included the numbering system established by Hébrard in 1921. In the spring of 1949 Nelly Hébrard was able to sell a set to the Ny Carlsberg Foundation, fulfilling her father's

original placement goals and, as already indicated, to purchase the remaining rights to the sculptures from the Degas heirs. Finally, in 1949 the great collector and museum benefactor Max Kaganovitch (1891–1978) held a critically acclaimed exhibit of Degas works at his gallery at 99 boulevard Raspail.³⁹

The next major series of exhibitions occurred in the 1950s, led initially by several dynamic dealers in London and Paris. In 1950, only a year after the distinguished Gerald Corcoran (1908–1998) had acquired the venerable Lefevre Gallery, which had been established in London in 1926 by Alex Reid, the gallery hosted a large loan exhibit of Degas's sculptures. John Rewald tells us that the Lefevre acquired two complete sets of the sculptures in the early 1950s. These were eventually split up and sold individually, many to dealers. The next year the Lefevre Gallery again joined forces with Max Kaganovitch in Paris to exhibit a nearly complete set of sculptures (Q and perhaps several bronzes from the earlier O series) at the Kunstmuseum in Bern. Unfortunately, the exhibit was not a financial success. Only two works were sold as, initially, the Lefevre Gallery wanted to keep the set intact. At the same time as the Kunstmuseum exhibit, Lefevre's competitor Marlborough Fine Art in London acquired with John Rewald's expertise, and finally sold in November, a nearly complete set— with six exceptions (cats. 4, 15, 19, 28, 40, 73), four being to replace sculptures sold in the 1930s and 1940s—for the newly formed Museum of Art in São Paulo, Brazil. The sale was proudly noted in the 1951 Marlborough exhibit catalogue, which was written by John Rewald. The catalogue also noted that other examples of the sculptures were available for sale. Unfortunately, many of the London clients who purchased other individual sculptures from Marlborough were also clients of Lefevre Gallery. After the Bern exhibit, a number of other sculptures also from Max Kaganovitch traveled to the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam and some continued to other museums, among them the Tate Gallery in London and the Royal Scottish Academy in Edinburgh.

In 1955 the Knoedler Gallery in New York announced the so-called discovery and exhibition of Degas's original wax and mixed-media sculptures. The announcement was a complete surprise because it had been thought, since the 1920s, that the original Degas models had been lost in the casting process. These originals were also exhibited in March 1956 at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, together with, for the first time, the Hébrard serialized cast sculptures. Almost immediately they were purchased by Paul Mellon, and today are in the collections of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., the Virginia Museum

of Fine Arts in Richmond, the Musée d'Orsay in Paris, and the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge.

A revised edition of John Rewald's complete catalogue of the sculptures was published in 1956 by Abrams in New York. An indication of Degas's enhanced reputation as a sculptor is clearly indicated by the appearance, as co-author, of the distinguished artist-photographer Leonard von Matt (1909–1988). Rewald had not only established the public perception of Degas as an important twentieth-century sculptor, but also presented the generally accepted views that had prevailed since the late 1910s. His scholarship contributed to a revival of interest in the marketability of the sculptures. Unfortunately, significant details surrounding the sculptures were not shared with Rewald when he prepared his book. He was not informed until the mid-1950s that the original waxes had not been destroyed in the casting process, and he did not know until the mid-1970s that the nearly complete set (except cats. 1, 13, and 73) of casts marked MODÈLE even existed. By the 1970s he was poignantly aware that the Hébrard Foundry had never listed or recorded all the sculptures cast and that it had not adhered to the contract as closely as was believed. These cumulative events, the additional scholarly attention, and an overall change in collecting patterns and taste became a tremendous catalyst for the new appreciation for these bronzes. The sculptures had been the subject of several significant studies by a highly respected scholar; they had been exhibited at a number of important museums and had been acquired by an equally significant number of museums for their permanent collections; and, with exhibits continuing through the 1960s and 1970s at various commercial galleries and museums, collectors among the general public had grown far more receptive to these pieces. Unfortunately that did not help New York's much smaller Gallery Chalette, where in October 1955 a group of twenty-five sculptures from Galerie Max Kaganovitch in Paris was exhibited. Two *Horse with Jockey* sculptures were sold to Knoedler Gallery for about \$2,500 each, but eighteen that earlier traveled to Amsterdam were returned to Paris in mid-November after the exhibit closed.⁴⁰

To be sure, scholars readily acknowledge wide differences in the surface details on the serialized bronzes, and clearly more than one *modèle* can technically exist. An individual bronze will be distinguished by the degree of surface detail, the patina and the extent that it approximates the marvelous color of the original wax model, and the manufacturing mold cut lines readily visible in the sculptures. Future analysis may well determine subtle differences in the metal formulae in

spite of the continued involvement through the years of Albino Palazzolo as caster. In much the same way that print connoisseurs differentiate among particular impressions of multiple prints, these very important differences in the cast sculptures made over a long period of time will be further defined by future studies.⁴¹

Issues surrounding Degas's motivation in creating his wax sculptures, the links between his two- and three-dimensional works, his role in the art of the twentieth century, stylistic comparisons made between the sculptures and works in other media to establish a chronological sequence, or the application of contemporary standards concerning multiples to the work of earlier times are really not relevant issues here. Contemporary standards are not always applicable retroactively; especially when at the time what really mattered was the image and not how it was produced.⁴² Such standards followed strictly might have caused us to remain unaware of many creative achievements that we now know after many years merely from copies or similar interpretations. Here, we are dealing with a situation that is in fact quite distinct. The overriding goals, while initially financial, were surpassed by the heirs' mission to preserve the work of one of the century's most important artists. It takes only a few moments of looking at any of these sculptures to appreciate what Degas really accomplished. Eliminating economic considerations, one perceptive critic in commenting about the artist's paintings in terms readily applied here, perhaps best expressed the reason that these sculptures appeal to our sensibilities and are important to the history of creative expression: "So essential was movement to Degas that he used it as his principal means of conveying the emotive perception of humans and animals. . . . What matters in the picture is not the light, as in Impressionism, but the rhythm created by the horses and the mood that the rhythm inspires. There is a sense of purpose, of impending drama. The race is to start slowly."⁴³ Equally perceptive are the comments made by two conservators and scholars at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., who have spent many years studying these sculptures: "It can be argued that [they] represent the height of Degas's experimentation in both technical and aesthetic realms. That these extraordinary sculptures fashioned from ephemeral materials have endured is yet another gift of genius, and far from blemishing Degas's reputation as he lamented, they comprise some of the finest sculptures created."⁴⁴

Notes

In the preparation of this essay, I am indebted to Ann Dumas and Charlie Millard, and especially to Anne Pingeot for her encouragement, scholarship, and friendship.

1. Ambroise Vollard, *Renoir—An Intimate Memoir* (New York, 1925), 39.
2. Contrary to numerous contemporary claims that the sculpture was polychromed to resemble flesh, it actually was not tinted at all but possessed a rich mahogany color. Charles W. Millard, *The Sculpture of Edgar Degas* (Princeton, N. J., 1976), 63 n. 36. Also see Richard Kendall, *Degas and the Little Dancer* [exh. cat., Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha] (New Haven, Conn., 1998), 41–42; and Martine Kahane, “Enquête sur la *Petite Danseuse de quatorze ans* de Degas,” *48/14 La Revue du Musée d’Orsay* 7 (autumn 1998): 48–62. The important role of color in nineteenth-century sculpture is best addressed in Andreas Blühm, *The Colour of Sculpture 1840–1910* [exh. cat., Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam] (Zwolle, 1996).
3. Translated and cited by Fronia E. Wissman, “Realists among the Impressionists,” in *The New Painting: Impressionism 1874–1886*, edited by Charles S. Moffett [exh. cat., Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.] (San Francisco, 1986), 342, 351 n.42.
4. Degas’s creative process and his relentless fascination with experimentation and compositional refinement can readily be seen in his graphic arts, where in his 1879–1880 drypoint *Leaving the Bath* (Adhémar 49) he created twenty-two states of the subject. Degas’s technical inquisitiveness is further indicated by his printing of color proofs on his own press for his friend Camille Pissarro by the late 1870s. Also see Sue Welsh Reed and Barbara Stein Shapiro, *Edgar Degas: The Painter as Printmaker* [exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts] (Boston, 1984), 124–140. In his sculpture, the same situation is repeated with the six variations of *Dancer Looking at the Sole of Her Right Foot* (including cats. 40, 59, 67, 69), three variations of *Dancer Putting on Her Stocking* (cats. 29, 52, 70), and the two variations of *Dancer Holding Her Right Foot* (cats. 23, 68) among other similar sequences. His access to sophisticated technical casting expertise is addressed by Arthur Beale in “Little Dancer Aged Fourteen: The Search for the Lost Modèle,” in *Degas and The Little Dancer* (New Haven, Conn., 1998); Patricia Failing, “Authorship and Physical

Evidence,” *Apollo* 142 (August 1995): 55–59; Richard Kendall, “Who Said Anything about Rodin? The Visibility and Contemporary Renown of Degas’ Late Sculpture,” *ibid.*, 72–77; and Shelley Sturman and Daphne Barbour, “The Materials of the Sculptor: Degas’ Techniques,” *ibid.*, 49–54. See Alice Michel, “Degas et son modèle,” *Le Mercure de France* (16 February 1919):628 for a contemporary account of the plaster statues in the large display cabinet in Degas’s Victor Massé apartments.

5. Degas’s motivation in creating his sculptures was precisely the question posed to the artist over several days in 1897 by the famous journalist François Thiébauld-Sisson, whose account of the interview is reproduced in the appendix to this volume. Gary Tinterow, “Degas’s Degases,” in Ann Dumas et al., *The Private Collection of Edgar Degas* [exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art] (New York, 1998), 86. After Degas’s death, something of a sensation was created when the public learned that, as a result of a frugal life-style and very successful sales, his estate consisted of nearly eight thousand works of art, which were sold in a series of eight auctions (five of his own works and three of his collections) during 1918 and 1919. Included were more than twenty paintings and eighty drawings by Ingres, thirteen paintings and two hundred works on paper by Delacroix, numerous important works by Gauguin, Corot, El Greco, Van Gogh, Cézanne, and Manet, and comprehensive print holdings that indicated the special attention he paid to multiple states. Degas had hoped that these and many other works would one day become the nucleus of a public French museum.
6. See Daphne S. Barbour and Shelley G. Sturman, “The Horse in Wax and Bronze,” in *Degas at the Races* [exh. cat., National Gallery of Art] (Washington, D.C., 1998), 180–207.
7. Of the three plasters, *Woman Rubbing Her Back with a Sponge* is in the collection of the National Gallery of Art, and the other two are in private collections (Millard, in the *Sculpture of Edgar Degas*, 35, notes the collection of the Hébrard heirs, and in 1996, they were published by the Lefevre Gallery in London). Kendall observes that the plaster *Spanish Dance* has the same “Degas” signature stamp found on the serialized sculptures cast after 1919. This fact and the extant sculptures’ subtle differences from the related Gauthier photographs raise the possibility that another cast of the same sculpture exists. See Richard Kendall, *The Lost Plasters of Sculptures by Edgar Degas* [exh. cat., Lefevre

Gallery] (London, 1996). The Vollard inventory of Degas's sculptures (see below, note 12) includes only two works in plaster (numbers 7 and 70), while Gauthier photographed three works in plaster. Joseph Ternbach, the conservator of the Mellon Collection, has observed that the wax of *Horse Walking* (cat. 11) shows evidence of plaster casting and that other original sculptures might share similar characteristics (Failing, "Authorship," 59).

At the same time, as noted by Daphne Barbour, a conservator at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., letters indicate that around 1903 Degas sought advice for the repair of a wax sculpture traveling to America. Barbour has convincingly argued that another work, the wax *Study in the Nude for the Dressed Dancer* (cat. 56) was cast, rather than being modeled, and in a very sophisticated manner. She has suggested another important qualification: This sculpture model is dated to 1878–1879, many years before Degas's work with the mold makers; the work that survives is likely a reworked cast after an earlier version that no longer exists. *Study in the Nude* is therefore the only known sculpture cast by the artist. It also demonstrates Degas's complex activities with casting sculptures well beyond his own attempts to make a plaster cast of such works as Hortense Valpinçon (1862–1936). See Daphne Barbour, "Degas's Little Dancer: Not Just a Study in the Nude," *Art Journal* 54 (summer 1995): 28–32 and n. 4; and Beale, "Little Dancer Aged Fourteen," 101–102.

8. Adrien-A. Hébrard was an important figure in the craft of bronze casting, primarily through the expertise of his foundry manager Albino Palazzolo. They were involved with the bronze casting of works by, among others, Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (1827–1875), Jules Dalou (1838–1902), Rembrandt Bugatti (1885–1916), and later, Emile-Antoine Bourdelle (1861–1929) and Richard Guino (1890–1973). See Robert Stoppenbach, *Homage to A. A. Hébrard: Sculpture by Bourdelle, Bugatti, Carpeaux, Degas* (London, 1982).
9. The Petit Palais had acquired the artist's sculptures. For details about the sculptor Jules Dalou, see Andrew Ciechanowiecki, *Dalou* (London, 1964); and Maurice Dreyfous, *Dalou, sa vie, son oeuvre* (Paris, 1903).
10. Ambroise Vollard, *Degas (1834–1917)* (Paris, 1924), 112; and Theodore Reff, "The Morbid Content of Degas' Sculpture," *Apollo* 142 (August 1995): 65. In an interesting

letter written to Paul Durand-Ruel in 1903, Mary Cassatt remarks, “I have just received a letter from Mrs. Havemeyer about the statue (*Little Dancer*). She will have nothing but the original, and she tells me that Degas, on the pretext that the wax has blackened, wants to do it all over in bronze or plaster with wax on the surface.” Translated and reprinted in Nancy M. Mathews, *Cassatt and Her Circle* (New York, 1984), 287–288.

11. Anne Pingeot, 000 n.13 in this volume. Degas’s friend Paul Lafond (*Degas*, 2 vols. [Paris, 1919], 2:66, cited in Barbour, “Degas’s Little Dancer,” n. 20) perhaps best explains the delay in the 1920s casting of the *Little Dancer*, describing it at the time of the artist’s death as a ruin, the arms having broken off from the body and lying at her feet. This description similarly raises the prospect that the sculpture was already stabilized before Gauthier took his photographs.
12. Durand-Ruel’s inventory of Degas’s sculptures, originally published by Caroline Durand-Ruel Godfroy in Anne Pingeot, *Degas, Sculptures* (Paris, 1991), 192–193 is also included in the appendix of this volume. See also Caroline Durand-Ruel Godfroy, “Behind the Scenes: Durand-Ruel and the Degas Sales,” in Dumas et al., *Private Collection*, 263–269.
13. Millard, *Sculpture of Edgar Degas*, 26.
14. Pingeot, *Degas, Sculptures*, 153–190.
15. See Pingeot, *ibid.*, 185, for Gauthier’s photograph of *Seated Woman Wiping Her Left Hip* (cat. 54) that is without the head that appears in the serialized cast; and John Rewald and Leonard von Matt, *Degas Sculpture: The Complete Works*, rev. ed. (New York, 1956), cat. 71.
16. For the first photographic record of Palazzolo stabilizing these sculptures, see “Degas’ Waxes,” *Dance Magazine* 30 (January 1956): 42.
17. Jean Adhémar, “Before the Degas Bronzes,” *ARTnews* 54 (November 1955), 35. This article includes the first allusion to the existence of a master set of bronze casts (Adhémar, 70).
18. In fact, Arthur Beale (in his technical introduction in *Metamorphoses in Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, edited by Jeanne L. Wasserman [exh. cat., Fogg Art Museum], Cambridge, Mass., 1975) clearly demonstrates that the casting method that Palazzolo used, creating durable bronze models as masters for the production molds, was not unusual.

19. See Beale “Little Dancer Aged Fourteen,” 97–108; and Arthur Beale, “Degas’ Little Dancer: What Technical Analysis Tells Us,” *International Foundation for Art Research (IFAR) Journal 2* (spring 1999): 14–18.

The Chrysler Museum cast of *Dancer Looking at the Sole of her Left Foot* (cat. 40) donated by Walter P. Chrysler Jr. may well be an illustrative example. Although it was catalogued in Campbell (“Degas’ Bronzes—Introduction and a Catalogue,” *Apollo* 142 [August 1995]: 30), scholars have over the years raised questions about various aspects of this sculpture including the quality of the surface that lacks either the “crispness” or “detail” of other casts and the “imprecision” of the foundry stamp. These qualities have also been associated with forgeries and so-called second generation *surmoulage* or “after casts.” This distinction requires further study in view of the following facts: Arthur Beale’s analysis that the Norton Simon modèle of the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* (cat. 73) is actually such a cast (see Beale, “Little Dancer Aged Fourteen,” 98–99), the fact that for at least three sculptures the extant plasters could generate bronze casts of the same size, and the acknowledged continued casting of popular sculptures after 1949 by Nelly Hébrard and Albino Palazzolo.

20. A detailed discussion of the waxes is not possible in this brief overview. They will, however, be thoroughly discussed in a catalogue raisonné of the collection being prepared by the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.
21. Pingeot, *Degas, Sculptures*, 196–197, and in the appendix to this volume.
22. Eight duplicates are now known. John Rewald (“Degas’s Bronzes—An Afterword,” in *The Complete Sculptures of Degas* [exh. cat., The Lefevre Gallery] London, 1976, 7) indicates that Hébrard did cast a complete set for himself marked HER, and we know from Sara Campbell (“Degas’ Bronzes,” 6–48) that almost forty of these remain to be located. Interestingly, the Hébrard archives recorded by Pingeot (*Degas, Sculptures*) indicate the notation of “Atelier” affiliated with the E series of sculptures. This set with the exception of two sculptures, has no sales history before 1936 and may have been the official unmarked Hébrard Foundry set at that time.
23. See the appendix to this volume for a complete inventory by the series letter and number originally prepared by Anne Pingeot from the Hébrard archives in 1991 and updated herein. Interestingly, according to these archival materials, which may not be complete,

Hébrard cast the following numbers of bronzes before 1936: A-73; B-72; C-0; D-72; E-1 (2 now known); F-48; G-48; H-33; I-24; J-24; K-17; L-17; M-13; N-8; O-40; P-73; Q-0; R-0; S-4 or more; and T-1. Surprisingly, the records indicate that already by this time the Hébrard Foundry consigned duplicate casts of both 60/G and 60/H, Degas's beautiful *Grande Arabesque*. The B and E series casts were the only sets available for exhibitions from late 1921 through the 1930s. Sales of individual sculptures from these exhibitions were made from the following series: F (since 1921), G (since 1921), H (since 1921), I (since 1922), J (since 1923), K (since 1922), L (since 1923), M (since 1924), N (since 1925), and O (since 1926).

The only known complete set, seventy-three works of the P series, was acquired by the Musée du Louvre in 1931. Four other collections are almost complete. The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York holds the A series, which has a provenance date of 1921, except for Bronze numbers 19 and 41, which are unlocated. The Museu de Arte de São Paulo, Brazil, holds the S series, which has a provenance date of the late 1920s or 1930s, except for Bronze numbers 4/E, 15/L, 19/I, 28/C, 40/C, 73 (unlettered), 28/S (which remains unlocated), 4/S, 15/S, 40/S (which were sold in 1939 by Nelly Hébrard to the museum in Cairo), and 19/S (sold 1951 by Hébrard). The Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen acquired the R series, except for Bronze numbers 51/H and 73/S, in the spring of 1949 from Nelly Hébrard. The Norton Simon Museum in Pasadena holds the MODÈLE series, except for Bronze numbers 1, 13, and 73.

24. The numbers of multiple casts with the same letter includes at least thirteen S series casts including 19/S and another cast of 40/S that left France in 1951, while the others left between 1992 and 1995. The two S sculptures were not included in the group acquired by Marlborough Fine Art and subsequently the Museu de Arte de São Paulo. Instead the museum received casts from the I and C series respectively. This confusion perhaps indicates a high level of activity by Nelly Hébrard and her invigorated Degas sculpture enterprise.

As documented by the unlettered cast of *Spanish Dance* (cat. 45), Hébrard may have used some of these sculptures as gifts. This sculpture was owned by Mme. Serrière, who was the director of Galerie A. A. Hébrard in Paris until 1933. She commented to the

purchaser that “Hébrard made a few casts of this sort for several sculptures to give to his friends” (oral communication).

Unidentified casts exported from France and currently unmatched to existing records comprise casts from 1955 to 2000.

25. Campbell, “Degas’ Bronzes,” 6–48. Beale in “Degas’ Little Dancer,” 15 convincingly demonstrates that the *Little Dancer* cast marked MODÈLE was actually made from one of the Hébrard serialized casts, being about 2 percent smaller than the MODÈLE casts.
26. The influential role of Alfred Flechtheim in the marketing of Degas’s sculptures deserves greater attention. Through his galleries in four major German cities, Flechtheim sold more bronzes than any individual affiliated with Hébrard. For more information, see A. Vomel, “Alfred Flechtheim, Kunsthändler und Verleger,” *Imprimatur* v (1967): 90–113; *Alfred Flechtheim: Sammler, Kunsthändler, Verleger* [exh. cat., Kunstmuseum] (Düsseldorf, 1987); and P. Springer, “Alfred Flechtheim: Ein Kunsthändler,” in *Avantgarde und Publikum*, edited by H. Junge (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 1992), 79–92.
27. The Hébrard Foundry liquidation is noted in Pingeot, *Degas, Sculptures* and again in her essay in this volume, 000 n. 47. The Hébrard purchase of reproduction rights from the Degas heirs in 1949 is noted in Anne Pingeot, “The Casting of Degas’ Sculptures: Completing the Story,” *Apollo* 142 (August 1995): 63.

This of course leaves unresolved the sequence of ownership for the original wax models: Were they acquired in 1949 by Nelly Hébrard from Degas’s heirs, through her father’s estate or the liquidated company in the 1930s, or were they just long considered by all including John Rewald as casualties of the casting process? Perhaps one important catalyst for Nelly Hébrard may have been the huge commercial success of Picasso’s editioned bronze casts after the Second World War. For more information, see the catalogue accompanying the exhibition *Picasso Sculptor/Painter* at the Tate Gallery, London, February–May, 1994 and a concurrent article in *Museum Management and Curatorship* 13 (March 1994): 3–8.

It is equally important to realize that Nelly Hébrard in 1949 settled any remaining potential claims from the New Orleans branch of the De Gas Family, by sending the Musson family ten sculptures from the HER.D series. With the exception of one sculpture

donated to the New Orleans Museum of Art, *Walking Horse* (cat. 10), these sculptures were all sold in 1950 to the E. [Elkan] & A. [Albris] Silberman Galleries in New York. Silberman immediately sold four sculptures to the Art Institute of Chicago (*The Tub*, cat. 26; *Woman Seated in an Armchair*, cat. 43; *Spanish Dance*, cat. 45; *Dancer Ready to Dance*, cat. 57); one remained with a Silberman family member (*Dancer Holding Her Right Foot*, cat. 23); *Horse Galloping on Right Foot* (cat. 47) went to an Ohio collection and was between 1949 and 1963 in the Toledo Museum of Art; *Woman Seated in an Armchair Wiping Her Neck* (cat. 44) went to Walter P. Chrysler Jr. *Arabesque over Right Leg, Left Arm in Front* (cat. 1) and *Dancer Holding Her Right Foot in Her Right Hand* (cat. 68) were also part of this group of HER.D sculptures, which represent the earliest examples from this series in the United States. For more information see *Degas and New Orleans*, edited by Jean Sutherland Boggs [exh. cat., New Orleans Museum of Art] (New Orleans, 1999); and Peggy Mengis, “One Gem Remains of Degas Legacy,” 16 April 1950, De Gas—Musson Archive, Tulane University Library, New Orleans.

28. Campbell, “Degas’ Bronzes,” 6–48.
29. Rewald, “Degas’s Bronzes,” 8. In addition, one individual who was actively involved in the trade with the sculptures described the series designations to an important client, “... twenty-two casts were made of the seventy-two, and were given serial letters, twenty running from A to T; the twenty-first the letters HER.D (for the heirs of Degas); the twenty-second without letters (for the founder).” These comments, made in the mid-1950s, may well describe the prevailing casting practice and explain the existence of those casts without letters or similar inscriptions.
30. While a complete series of sculptures was exhibited at Galerie Bernheim-Jeune, sales of the sculptures made after the exhibit, according to the Hébrard archives, consisted of casts 4/I, 11/G, 15/J, 28/G, 30/F, 40/H, 42/F, 47/G, 53/F, and 69/G. The same pattern followed the 1923 Leicester Galleries exhibit in London with the sales of casts 3/F, 14/G, 16/H, 16/I, 29/F, 30/G, 40/I, 47/K, 49/F, 56/F, 56/G, 62/F, 66/G. Similarly, while Alfred Flechtheim exhibited a complete set that John Rewald noted to the foundry, Flechtheim made sales of casts from the following series: F (eight casts), G (fifteen casts), H (twelve casts), I (five casts), J (three casts), K (three casts), L (three casts), M (three casts), N (one cast), and O (thirty-nine casts). Flechtheim did not have a complete set of sculptures.

Clearly, the Hébrard Foundry used a master set of sculptures designated differently over the years for exhibition purposes, while sales were consistently made from series set aside specifically for individual sales (F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, and O).

31. See Clare Vincent, “The Havemeyers and the Degas Bronzes,” in *Splendid Legacy: The Havemeyer Collection* [exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art] (New York, 1993), 77–80 and n. 15. Twelve bronzes were lent anonymously to the Metropolitan in 1923 and a second loan was made in 1925.
32. The B series remained intact from 1922 until the 1925 Ferargil Galleries exhibit. The other complete set that was designated in the pre-1936 Hébrard archives as the “Atelier” or E series set remained undocumented except for sales in both 1925 (see cat. 73/E) and 1935 (see cat. 18/E; unrecorded as sold by Hébrard) and must have been used for the exhibit in Prague, in Germany with Flechtheim and Thannhauser, and later in London. Sculptures may have later been designated the S series. No other sculptures were available for exhibition in the 1920s and 1930s; moreover, S casts were sold in 1939, and when the R set was sold in 1948, the *Little Dancer, Aged Fourteen* cast was from the S series, and was designated by Hébrard as the “Galerie” cast. This appears to be the set acquired by Marlborough Fine Art with John Rewald’s help in early 1951.
33. See *Vanity Fair* (March 1919): 50, where several sculptures were published.
34. Rodin’s famous sculpture *The Thinker* greets visitors outside the entrance to the Rodin Museum in Philadelphia. The museum opened its doors in 1929, three years after the death of Jules E. Mastbaum and has, since 1939, been administered by the Philadelphia Museum of Art.
35. See American Art Association, *Exhibition and Sale of Property of Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan*, 29 April–1 May 1937; Parke-Bernet, *Exhibition and Sale of Property of Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan*, 6–7 December 1939, and *Exhibition and Sale of Property of Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan*, 23–24 February 1940. Also see Lionello Venturi, “Notes on the Collection of Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan,” *Parnassus* 11 (December 1939): 32–33; “A Notable Auction of Modern and Other Art,” *Art News* (25 November 1939); and “Coming Auctions: Sullivan Furniture and Decorative Objects,” *Art News* (17 February 1940).

Biographical information can be found in Christine Phillips, “Mary Quinn Sullivan,” *Library School* (29 April 1960).

36. I am indebted to the research of Anne Pingeot, Nathalie Guilbaud, and Sayed Darwiche on this matter. See Geneviève Lacambre, *Ingres, Courbet, Monet, Rodin, Gauguin . . . Les Oubliés du Caire: Chefs d’oeuvre des musées du Caire* [exh. cat., Musée d’Orsay] (Paris, 1994), 139 n. 2.
37. For more information about Curt Valentin, see Perry Townsend Rathbone, *In Memory of Curt Valentin* (New York, 1954); “Curt Valentin, 52, Art Dealer Dies,” *New York Times*, 20 August 1954; W. Grohmann and R. Colin, *Artist and Maecenas: A Tribute to Curt Valentin* [exh. cat., Marlborough–Gerson Gallery] (New York, 1963).
38. On 12 August 1929, Justin Thannhauser acquired from Walther Halvorsen more than sixty sculptures by Degas excluding only catalogue numbers 3, 4, 11, 13, 22, 29, 38, 48, 58, 62, 73, and 74. The purchase was accompanied by a group of significant paintings by Cezanne, Renoir, Gauguin, and Manet. With the help of Siegfried Rosengart, his nephew and partner, Thannhauser on 18 May 1938 and 2 June 1938 transferred many art works to London (including five Degas sculptures to the Leicester Galleries) and to Amsterdam (about forty-five sculptures) for distribution to other safe locations. These works of art were collected after Thannhauser reached New York in 1941.

Thannhauser remained in contact with Halvorsen well into the 1950s, when he was living in Oslo. At the time, Thannhauser, in a letter to Halvorsen dated 9 April 1953 (private archives), recounted the purchase of numerous works in 1928 and 1929, noted the destruction of papers pertaining to his galleries in Berlin, Munich, and Paris, and attempted to reconcile his existing inventory of Degas’s sculptures against the 1929 group purchased for about \$35,000. For more information about Justin K. Thannhauser, see V. E. Barnett, *The Guggenheim Museum: Justin K. Thannhauser Collection* (New York, 1978); Vivian E. Barnett, Fred Licht, and Paul Tucker, *Guggenheim Museum Thannhauser Collection*, rev. ed. (New York, 1992); and Matthew Drutt, *The Thannhauser Collection of the Guggenheim Museum* (New York, 2001).
39. See Raymond Cogniat, “M. Max Kaganovitch: ‘La peinture que j’ai achetè á Paris,’”

Connaissance des Arts 211 (September 1921): 44–51; Sylvie Patin, “The Collector’s of Cezanne’s Early Works” in *Cezanne: The Early Years 1859–1872* [exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts] (London, 1988), 63–65.

40. When distributed, *Horse Galloping, Turning Head to Right, Feet Not Touching the Ground* (cat. 32) and the accompanying *Jockey* (cat. 36) were mismatched as follows: F (horse) with K (jockey), I with T, K with F, L with M, M with L, and T with I. This situation parallels what occurred in 1951 with the Hébrard 19/S and 40/S casts that left France in 1951, but were not included with the set of sculptures sold to Marlborough Fine Art and the Museu de Arte de São Paulo.
41. Also deserving attention are the parallels with Degas’s activity as a printmaker, especially the late series of very sculptural bathers and the intended series of nude dancers; Reed and Shapiro, *Painter as Printmaker*, xii.
42. See *ibid.*, “Prints and Reproductions, 1894–1914,” lvi–lxxii.
43. Souren Melikian, “A Magnificent New Perspective on Degas,” *International Herald Tribune*, 30 May 1998.
44. Sturman and Barbour, “Materials of the Sculptor,” 54.

Degas Sculptures book. Read reviews from world's largest community for readers. Published in conjunction with a traveling exhibition. Degas Sculptures: Catalogue by Joseph S. Czestochowski. Other editions. Want to Read saving €! Error rating book. Refresh and try again. Rate this book. Clear rating. Czestochowski, Joseph S. "Degas's sculptures re-examined: The marketing of a private pursuit." Apollo 155, no. 484 (June 2012): 11-21 (Fig. 14). Czestochowski, Joseph S. and Anne Pingeot. Degas Sculptures Catalogue Raisonné of the Bronzes. Memphis: International Arts and The Torch Press, 2002. (p. 19-21, 49-53, 58, 60, 87-95, 100-107). [identical to] Dumas, Ann et al. This anecdotal comment recounts the origins of the concept as an analytical tool, and its gradual development as an instrumental concept used in political discourse in Europe, China and the United States. This article is published as part of a collection on soft power. Suggested Citation: Suggested Citation. Nye, Joseph S., Soft Power: The Origins and Political Progress of a Concept (February 2017). Palgrave Communications, Vol. 3, 2017, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2942713> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.8>. Joseph S. Nye (Contact Author). Harvard University - Harvard

In addition, this article will comprehensively re-examine public procurement by using a systems approach as a method of inquiry. Finally, implications of the proposed public procurement system regarding future research and study will be discussed.

INTRODUCTION. In the public finance literature, government is involved in four major economic activities: (a) providing the legal framework for all economic activities, (b) redistributing income through taxation and spending; (b). providing public goods and services freely available to the public such as national defense, public safety, education, 1. This Scythian sculpture of an eagle ___ (exhibit) in the Natural History Museum. It ___ (make) from gold 2. Albrecht Durer's greatest masterpiece, Young Hare, ___ (not show) in this exhibition. It ___ (keep) in the Albertina museum in Vienna. They ___ (sell) to private collectors for a lot of money. 4. This beautiful picture of a snow leopard ___ (paint) in watercolour. Snow leopards ___ (include) in the Red Book of endangered species. 5. The Museum of Nature in Almaty ___ (visit) by hundreds of people every day. 3. Many famous paintings aren't owned by museums. They are sold to private collectors for a lot of money. 4. This beautiful picture of a snow leopard is painted in watercolour. Snow leopards are included in the Red Book of endangered species.