Melville’s Prints: The Melville Chapin Collection

Robert K. Wallace

Two brothers, Melville and Bart Chapin, have preserved a significant number of the engraved prints that continue to surface from Herman Melville’s collection of art. In a recent essay, I documented and interpreted thirty-seven prints preserved in the E. Barton Chapin, Jr., family collection. Here I will do the same for twenty-one prints being preserved by Melville Chapin and his wife Elizabeth Parker Chapin. These prints, like those in the Bart Chapin family collection, include an important group of engravings after paintings by Claude Lorraine. They also include important new engravings after paintings by several other artists whom Melville was already known to have collected: landscapes after Watteau, Berchem, and Cuyp, and marine scenes after Calcott and Stanfield. The Melville Chapin collection also includes prints after many artists not previously known to have been collected by Melville. These include exquisite engravings by Stefano della Bella and Jean-Pierre Norblin, characteristic landscapes by M. Hobbema, L. Francia, and T. Creswick; and conventionalized compositions by F. Zuccarelli and John Russell. All of these prints increase our knowledge of Melville’s taste in the visual arts and of his imaginative range; several are truly exceptional for their visual beauty and for the insight they provide into Melville’s life as a writer and collector.

The most striking group of prints in the Melville Chapin collection are seven engravings after paintings by Claude Lorrain. Arthur Steedman, immediately after Melville’s death in 1891, had indicated that engravings after Claude were a “specialty” among the “notable collection of etchings and engravings” that Melville had “gradually” accumulated in his home at 104 East 26th Street in New York. Yet no engravings after Claude had appeared among the 201 engravings from Melville’s collection that were documented at the Berkshire Athenæum in 1966—or among the 44 engravings that surfaced in the William Reese collection in 1978.

2. I am grateful to Melville and Elizabeth Chapin for making their prints available for scholarly research and reproduction, and to the New Bedford Whaling Museum and the Faculty Benefits Committee of Northern Kentucky University for help in acquiring photographs of the prints to be reproduced.
3. Steedman’s observations on Melville’s print collection appeared in the obituary he wrote for the New York Tribune (October 1, 1891) and the entry he supplied for Apperson’s Annual Encyclopaedia in 1891, both reprinted in Merton M. Seals, Jr., The Early Lives of Melville (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974), 64, 132.
1993. The first prints after Claude to surface from Melville’s collection were two marine scenes from the Priscilla Ambrose collection in 1993. These were followed by five landscapes from the Bart Chapin family collection in 2000. The seven prints after Claude Lorrain in the Melville Chapin collection are of exceptional interest in poetic, aesthetic, and art-historical terms. Two of them are in frames that appear to have been provided by Melville himself. As a group, they allow us to understand, for the first time, what Stedman meant when he wrote, more than a century ago, that engravings after Claude were a “specialty” within Melville’s collection.

Like most of the prints currently owned by direct descendents of Melville, those in the Melville Chapin collection were preserved by Herman’s widow, Elizabeth Shaw Melville, by their daughter Frances Melville (Thomas), and by one of her four daughters, in this case Jeannette Ogden Thomas. Jeannette Ogden Thomas was born in 1892, the year after Melville’s death. Sixty-two years later, as Mrs. E. Barton Chapin, she donated six prints from her grandfather’s collection to the Berkshire Athenaeum (where they joined several hundred that her sister Eleanor Melville Metcalf had donated in 1952). After the death of Jeannette Chapin in 1974, the remaining Melville prints in her possession, some lightly inscribed verso with her initials “J. O. T.,” were divided among her sons E. Barton, Jr., and Melville. With twenty-one prints in the Melville Chapin collection now added to thirty-seven that recently surfaced from the Bart Chapin family collection, we can begin to appreciate Jeannette Ogden Thomas’s crucial role in preserving prints from her grandfather’s collection. Her legacy makes available essential materials for reconstructing Melville’s collection as a whole. These fifty-eight new prints bring to 413 the number of individual prints that have now been documented from the “notable collection of etchings and engravings” mentioned in the Stedman obituary.

The discussion of the Melville Chapin collection below follows the sequence of categories into which the prints are divided in the inventory at the end of the essay. The addendum to the inventory lists additional prints in the collection that may have belonged to Melville but for which conclusive evidence is lacking. These are analogous to the “rabble of uncertain, fugitive, half-fabulous whales” that Ishmael append to his listing of authentic whales in the “Cetology” chapter of Moby-Dick. They can now be added to other prints whose status within Melville’s collection remains “uncertain” or “fugitive.”

6 Nos. 4-8 in the “Bart Chapin” essay.
7 For prints from Melville’s collection that have been preserved by the two other Thomas daughters, Frances Cutbrett Osborne and Katherine Gassaway Binnian, see the “Ambrose” essay.
8 For a convenient list of all published inventories of prints from Melville’s collection, from 1885 through 2000, see Archival Box II in the “Bart Chapin” essay, 64.
10 Other than prints of “uncertain” status are listed in addenda to the “Bart Chapin” essay (38-95) as well as in Robert K. Wallace, “Melville’s Prints: David Metcalf’s Prints and Ticks,” *Harvard Library Bulletin* NS 8 (Winter 1997): 3. The “fugitive” prints are those that Melville is alleged to have owned, but that have not yet been located or documented; these include engravings after Rembrandt, Poussin, and Murillo, plus a depiction of the “Bacque Minerva.”
CLASSIC CLAUDE LORRAINE

Of all the engravings after Claude Lorrain that have surfaced from Melville’s collection in recent years, none is more beautiful, more interesting, or more evocative than The Enchanted Castle (figure 1). Engraved by F. Vivares and William Woollett after Claude’s 1664 painting Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor, this engraving is a landmark in both English literary history and art.

history. Woollett completed the image in 1782 after the death of his teacher Vivares. The quality of this large, atmospheric, in-folio engraving brought Woollett himself immediately to the forefront of fine-art engravers in England. This engraving also solidified Claude Lorrain’s reputation in late eighteenth-century England as the greatest of the classical Italian landscape painters. Claude’s classical inspiration for the painting had been Psyche’s banishment from the Palace of Amor in Apuleius’s The Golden Ass. When Woollett entitled the engraving The Enchanted Castle, he drew attention away from the figure of Psyche in the foreground of Claude’s composition. So evocative was Woollett’s title, and so influential was his engraved landscape image throughout the nineteenth century, that The Enchanted Castle remains the name by which Claude’s Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor is generally known today. The painting remained in private hands from 1782, when Woollett published his engraving, until 1981, when it was acquired by London’s National Gallery. In 1991 the London Blue Guide characterized The Enchanted Castle as “perhaps the most famous of the artist’s works and a supreme example of his late style.”

Claude’s painting began to make English literary history in 1818 when John Keats, inspired by Woollett’s engraving, composed a verse epistle to his ailing friend J. H. Reynolds. Keats specified the pictorial source of his poetic imagery when he wrote to Reynolds, “You know, I am sure, Claude’s Enchanted Castle, and I wish you may be pleased with my remembrance of it.” Keats had only seen the Woollett engraving when he wrote the epistle to Reynolds, but a London exhibition gave him an opportunity to see the original painting before he composed “Ode to a Nightingale,” published in July 1819. Claude’s painting is widely credited with having provided “fresh inspiration” for “the famous lines about the bird’s song, heard in ancient days”:

The same that oft-times hath
Charm’d magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in fairy lands forlorn.  

Just as Keats’s placement of “forlorn” humanizes the emotion of the “magic casements” of his poetic “fairy lands,” so does Claude’s placement of the figure of Psyche deepen the emotion of the magic castle in the painted landscape. Woollett’s engraved image is very large, 16 × 22 inches, so the Psyche in Melville’s engraving is a striking presence even within the larger landscape setting. Looking at her sitting in isolation before the castle, Melville would be able to envision not only the “magic casements” immortalized by Keats but also the sea-goddess whom Wordsworth had depicted as “Sole-sitting by the shores of old romance.” William Hazlitt, the first English critic to identify the solitary figure in Woollett’s The Enchanted Castle as Psyche, was also the first to connect that same Psyche with the Wordsworthian figure who is “Sole-sitting by the shores

---

11 Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor is no. 162 in Marcel Roethlisberger, Claude Lorrain: The Paintings (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961). Subsequent catalog numbers from this source will be cited parenthetically in my text.


of old romance." Hazlitt was one of Melville’s major guides to modern English poetry as well as to classical landscape painting, as attested by the annotations he made in Hazlitt’s *Table Talk*, acquired in 1846, his *Lectures on the English Poets*, acquired in 1862, and his *Criticisms on Art*, acquired in 1870.  

Melville was born in August 1819, the month after Keats published “Ode to a Nightingale.” He died in September 1891, a few months after he had published “After the Pleasure Party,” his own most evocative ode to melancholy, in *Timoleon*. Melville’s poem explores the psyche of Urania, a virginal female astronomer who is depicted in a classical European landscape setting. The poem’s subtitle—“Lines Traced under an Image of Amor Threatening”—frames Urania’s inner life in the context of classical painting and mythology. The latter context is further personalized with an italicized message from Amor, the Roman god of love (Eros in Greek mythology). The opening lines of the narrative persuade us to establish an atmosphere of classical meditation quite similar to that depicted in the engraving of *The Enchanted Castle*:

Behind the house the upland falls
With many an odorous tree—
White marbles gleaming through green halls,
Terrace by terrace, down and down,
And meets the starlit Mediterranean sea.  

In this seaside landscape setting, “After the Pleasure Party” explores Urania’s erotic psyche in mythological dimensions comparable to those evoked in Claude’s *Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor*. This is not the place for a complete analysis of Melville’s complex poem, or of Claude’s enchanted landscape, but we may survey some of their common ground, psychological as well as topographical, before considering other dimensions of meaning that *The Enchanted Castle* would have had for Melville as a reader, writer, and collector.

Melville’s poem relates most richly to his engraving of *The Enchanted Castle* in (a) its seaside setting and (b) its exploration of the psyche of the lone woman. These two elements fuse in the poem when we join Urania, “Rapt in her vigil,” beside the “starlit Mediterranean sea.” Urania in Greek mythology was the female muse for astronomy. Melville’s Urania is a female astronomer, alone in her vigil beneath her beloved stars. The burden of her vigil is to expose the solitude of the human psyche in its sexual dimension, a dimension at once deeply individual and broadly universal. Urania has herself repressed the claims of Amor in following her astronomical calling. A chance encounter, in which a male companion was attracted to a young woman beside their carriage, has given her a sudden vision of what she has missed. The poem presents her personal vigil in a way that makes it the reader’s own. Urania asks “Nature,” with regard to human sexuality,
Why hast thou made us but in halves—
Co-relatives? This makes us slaves.
If these co-relatives never meet
Self-hood itself seems incomplete.

Her personal anguish is given an extra edge by a pun on dicing (either slicing the self or rolling the dice):

And such the dicing of blind fate
Few matching halves here meet and mate.

She then poses a pointed question as to the causality of her predicament:

What Cosmic jest or Anarch blunder
The human integral clove asunder
And shied the fractions through life's gate? (Collected Poems, 219)

Whatever the cause may be, the poem depicts the human condition as fractionated and cloven asunder, especially in its erotic dimension, thereby paralleling the diagnosis being made concurrently in the early 1890s, though by other means, by Sigmund Freud in Vienna.  

Urania's question about the causality of the cloven condition of the human psyche ("What Cosmic jest or Anarch blunder?") applies directly to the situation of Psyche in the story by Apuleius that inspired Claude's painting. The "Cosmic jest" that has separated Psyche from the Enchanted Castle originated with Venus, a goddess so envious of the young woman's beauty that she transported her from her human home to a lonely crag and instructed Amor, her son, to torment her. When Amor, instead, fell in love, he brought Psyche into his Enchanted Castle, where they enjoyed nights of pleasure until she violated a prohibition against seeing who he was. Her "Anarch blunder" is lighting the lamp with which to see her sleeping paramour, from which oil drips and wakes him. Amor casts her from the Castle, which vanishes as a dream. Most Renaissance painters who depicted the story chose the moment in which Psyche violates the vow by holding up the candle to see Amor. Claude, instead, in his 1664 painting, depicts her outside of the Palace/Castle. He paints her meditative figure in such a way that we cannot be certain whether we are seeing Psyche before she has entered the Castle (not yet knowing what "Cosmic jest" has wafted her there from the lofty crag) or after she has been cast from the Castle (as a result of her "Anarch blunder"). Claude's deeply meditative Psyche figure might also be seen as a psychological amalgam of her cumulative experience, rather than as the illustration of a particular narrative moment. However one sees her, her posture and situation speak directly to the psychic complexities, and Cosmic questioning, of Melville's 1891 poem. Melville places Urania, as had Claude Psyche, in a seeming "Paradise," a

17 Freud likewise also drew upon classical mythology when diagnosing the condition of human sexuality, as indicated by the crucial separation between Psyche (the soul) and Eros (desire) in his understanding of the "cloven" human "integral."

18 These rival possibilities are effectively discussed in Levey, ""The Enchanted Castle" by Claude," 815-17.
“bower of balm,” yet one in which she “finds” no “balsamic peace” (“After the Pleasure Party,” 216). Melville’s Urania shares with Claude’s Psyche a strain of melancholy that Claude depicted only in his later landscapes. Each figure embodies that solitary state in which the human soul is severed from the wholeness and fullness to which it is doomed to aspire, fated to dream of the Castle whose magical casements forever loom unattainable whether we have known them once (Psyche) or not at all (Urania).

Matching the psychological ambiguity in Claude’s painting is its atmospheric ambiguity. In the 1887 book on Claude Lorrain that Melville added to his personal library, Owen John Dulka drew attention to Claude’s use of “the charming classical fable of Psyche.” He identified The Enchanted Castle as one of two “Psyche compositions” painted in 1664. He describes this one as a “silvery twilight scene, in which the most prominent object is a noble pile of buildings raised high on a rock above the sea-shore.” Art critics in the twentieth-century differ as to whether the “silvery twilight scene” depicts the coming of morning or of night. They tend to agree, however, that much of the enchantment of this landscape comes from its “silvery light,” expressive of “the magic character of a divine scene” (Roethlisberger, 385). Woollett’s 1782 engraving has masterfully preserved Claude’s “silvery light” in the process of converting the pigments on the canvas into the silvery ink on the paper. Melville had been keenly attentive to Claude’s magical depiction of light when he saw several of his paintings at the Sciarra Gallery in Rome in 1857: “All their effect is of atmosphere. He paints the air.” He took special notice of twilight effects, applying the word “gloaming” to the “scenes between dusk and dark of Claude.” In Clavel in 1876, Melville began to incorporate such atmospheric effects into his own poetry, most notably in twilight scenes that correspond closely to those by Claude and Rembrandt in engravings he collected. His closest poetic counterpart to the “silvery light” with which Woollett has rendered Psyche’s twilight meditation in The Enchanted Castle, however, occurs in the waning moments of Urania’s “Rapt vigil” in “After the Pleasure Party.”

Urania’s “starlit” vigil becomes a twilight one as the stars “do wane” with the break of day. Her twilight scene, no less than Psyche’s in Claude’s painting, is “silvered.” We see this only in retrospect, however, when “Light breaks—truth breaks!”—and the scene is “silvered no more” (219-220). In Woollett’s engraving, as in Claude’s painting, Psyche is positioned in the stasis of her “silvery twilight scene” forever. In Melville’s poem, Urania steps forth into the day that will dawn after the stars “do wane.” In “Nature” she finds this answer to her troubling questions about the human psyche:

Light breaks—truth breaks! Silvered no more,
But chilled by dawn that brings the gale
Shivers yon bramble above the vale,
And disillusion opens all the shore. (220)

---

19 Owen John Dulka, Claude Colère Lorrain (New York: Scribner and Welford, 1887), p. 66 (Scales, no. 192). The painting is listed as The Enchanted Castle, or Psyche in Dulka’s catalog of Claude’s paintings (Appendix C, 127).
21 These are discussed, and illustrated, in the “But Chapin” essay, 12-15 and 28-31.
The “chill” of the “disillusion” that “opens all the shore” takes the emotion of the poem beyond both the temporal and psychological frame of Claude’s “silvery twilight.” The psychology of this shore-side revelation is very similar to that of “Pausilippo,” another of the poems that Melville published in *Tiholoon* in 1851. The narrator of this poem, like Melville himself when he visited Pausilippo, the Bay of Baiae, and Lake Avemus on excursions from Naples in 1857, is extremely sensitive to the glories of the classical past, when the word “Pausilippo” truly denoted “surcease from pain.” Now, however, his own consciousness of past classical glories serves, ironically, only to “invite . . . / A dream of years serene, / And wake, to dash, delight” ([Collected Poems, 244](#)). J. M. W. Turner had imbued the shores of Lake Avemus with similarly ironic consciousness in his 1834 painting *The Golden Bough*, contrasting the ruins of a once glorious past with the “Fallacies of Hope” that they inspire in a modern mind and eye. Melville would have seen *The Golden Bough* at London’s Vernon Gallery in 1849 and again in 1857. He acquired two separate engravings after the painting, one engraved by T. A. Prior in 1851, the other by J. T. Willmore in 1856. On this magic, classic, tragic ground, Melville’s late landscape poems commune deeply with *The Enchanted Castle, The Golden Bough*, and other engravings he collected after paintings in the Claudean landscape tradition.²²

Urania’s ultimate fate in Melville’s poem is undisclosed. Composing a narrative poem, rather than painting a moment frozen in time, Melville had the option of revealing as much as he wished to about the ultimate fate of Urania’s psychic state. Instead, he writes: “One knows not if Urania yet / The pleasure-party may forget.” Nor does one know if yet her “turbulent heart and rebel brain . . . lived down the strain” from the “Amor” whom she had “sighted.” Hope might seem to be offered in a powerful statue of Urania seen “late in Rome . . . Fixed by an antique pagan stone / Colossal carved.” But even this magnificent manifestation of the “Helmeted woman” and the “armed Virgin” seems unable to overcome Amor’s force.

For never passion peace shall bring,
Nor Art inanimate for long
Inspire. Nothing may help or heal
While Amor incensed remembers wrong. (221)

Melville’s Urania, “silvered no more” as she steps out of her vigil into the light of breaking day, is a modern counterpart to Claude’s silent Psyche, “fixed” in the “silvery twilight” of Renaissance retrospection. Each feels the cloven condition in which “Self-hood itself seems incomplete / And such the dicings of blind fate / Few matching halves here meet and mate.”

---

²² See the “Ambrose” essay for an interpretation of “Pausilippo” in the context of the Claudean landscape tradition as represented by engravings that Melville collected after Claude, Turner, Herman van Swanevelt, and Richard Wilson. 25-31. The “Hart Chaupin” essay interprets Melville’s late landscape poetry in the context of five additional engravings after Claude, five Claudean landscapes by Gabriel Pérèle, and additional engravings after Wilson and Turner, including Melville’s second copy of *The Golden Bough*, 12-20 and 35-40.
Melville’s “silvery” copy of Woollett’s The Enchanted Castle is one of two framed engravings in the Melville Chapin collection. Both frames appear to have been provided by Melville himself, and the second encloses an engraving that is a perfect mate to the first. Cephalus and Procris (figure 2) is another “silvery” engraving after a late landscape by Claude Lorrain. It was engraved by John Browne, a London colleague of Woollett, in 1779. This folio engraving after Claude not only matches the Woollett engraving in size, date, and place of production; the painting it reproduces also dates from the same year: 1664. Claude’s Landscape with Cephalus and Procris reunited by Diana (Roethlisberger, no. 163) was the last, purest, and most meditative of four separate paintings in which Claude illustrated the mythological story of Cephalus and Procris from Ovid’s Metamorphosis. As with his Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor in the same year, he reduced his subject to its simplest, most evocative elements. Here, too, Claude has given his own personal twist to a well-known story; he is the only painter to have

included the figure of Diana in the lovers’ reunion, an element not present in his Ovidian source.23 In the first half of Ovid’s story, Procris had sought refuge with Diana the huntress, the goddess of chastity, after Cephalus, her husband, had falsely suspected her of infidelity. When Procris is finally prepared to return to her husband, Diana presents her with a dog and a spear. Procris presents these to Cephalus in the reunion as Claude depicts it. Diana herself stands between the two lovers, with a young boy holding the spear on one side, and deer in a shady glade on the other. This shady glade would seem to be even more a “bower of balm” than Psyche’s seaside bower, also enlivened by deer and stags.

After this stately moment of reconciliation, the one Claude chose to fix on canvas, Ovid’s story enacts a tragic reversal of its beginning, for now it is Procris who will doubt her husband’s fidelity. She will hide herself in foliage to observe him and he, hearing a rustling noise, will dart the divine spear, finding his lover’s heart. This denouement is absent from Claude’s painting, but it would have been present in the painter’s mind, and in the collective mind of his audience, giving added poignancy to the depicted moment of reconciliation. Claude’s inclusion of Diana herself gives the fateful reunion an added interpretive edge, augmenting her divine complicity in the tragic destiny of the pointed spear. On the plot level, Cephalus and Procris would seem to be the opposite of Melville’s Urania, for they have dared to love. In the moment depicted by Claude, they even seem to embody the rare good fortune of two “matching halves” that do manage to “meet and mate.” Yet such is “the dicing of blind fate” that these reunited “human integers,” too, will soon be “cloven asunder,” enacting their own irreversible intersection of “Cosmic jest” with “Anarch blunder.” Claude presumably thought deeply about how the Cephalus and Procris story related to the Psyche and Amor story as he painted them both in 1664. So, presumably, did Herman Melville, as he published a similar psychological story in “After the Pleasure Party” in 1891, probably with each of these late, framed, Claudean meditative landscapes hanging on his wall. In each of these “silvery” engravings, as in that “starlit” vigil whose poetic protagonist is “silvered no more,” the rich promise of human sexuality is undone by human fallibility in conjunction with divine cupidity.

Brownie’s Cephalus and Procris, like Woollett’s The Enchanted Castle, was a landmark in the history of English engraving, one that also solidified Claude’s English reputation. Each of the 1664 paintings from which the engravings were later made signaled Claude’s movement into the pure, poignant, meditative mode that was to be his crowning achievement as a landscape painter. For the next twenty years, Claude’s late landscape style was to be “remarkable for its sober and haunting beauty.” Until his death, Claude “continued to create deeply moving pictorial images of nature and man . . . in compositions of grand simplicity conjoined with muted light and color and thematic material that embodies universal human concerns.”24 Much of the poetry that Melville composed in the last twenty years of his life was similarly sober, haunting, simple, muted, and universal. His framed engravings of both The Enchanted Castle and Cephalus and Procris gave him inti-

24 Russell, Claude Lorrain, 79.
mate access to pictorial compositions whose landscape ethos, mythological imagination, and psychological complexity resonate strongly with such late poems of his own as “After the Pleasure Party,” “Pausilippo,” and “Art.” In the last-named poem, also published in Timotheou in 1891, Melville pondered “what unlike things must meet and mate” in the creation of “Art.” The contrary elements specified as his “unlike things” relate as richly to the prints he had collected as to the novels and poems he had written:

A flame to melt—a wind to freeze;
Sad patience—joyous energies;
Humility—yet pride and scorn;
Instinct and study; love and hate;
Audacity—reverence . . .

On the level of pure technique, Woollett’s Enchanted Castle offered one unique, indelible image of “unlike things” that “meet and mate” in the “Art” of engraving: pigmented shapes painted on canvas with a brush—silvery inks pressed into receptive paper from engraved lines cut into copper. Before Woollett could engrave the painting, of course, Claude had to create it, in this case a magical canvas in which all of the “unlike things” in the heart of Melville’s poem “must mate, / And fuse with Jacob’s mystic heart, / To wrestle with the angel—Art” (Collected Poems, 231).

In 1938, American art historian Frank Mather, Jr., recalled a visit he had made in 1902 to the apartment in which Herman Melville’s widow, Elizabeth (and their daughter Bessie), had preserved many of the books and engravings that Melville had treasured in the New York home in which he had written his late poetry. Mather remembered being especially struck by the “silvery prints after Claude and Poussin” he had seen “on the walls.” The two framed prints after Claude now in the Melville Chapin collection were probably among those “silvery” prints “on the walls” in 1902. Hanging with them was probably the large, framed, “silvery” print after Nicholas Poussin now in the Bart Chapin family collection, Landscape with a Man Washing his Feet at a Fountain, engraved by W. Pether in London in 1766. The brothers Chapin, by preserving these framed prints and another ten unframed prints after Claude from Melville’s collection, have helped us to flesh out not only Stedman’s 1891 observation about Claude being a “specialty” of Melville, but also Mather’s 1938 recollection of the “silvery prints after Claude and Poussin . . . on the walls” of his widow’s apartment. In doing so, they have also brought us much closer to the former novelist who was, during the last twenty years of his life, writing poetry that we are only now beginning to read with the requisite breadth of understanding, enriched by our own understanding of not only the books but the prints he collected.

26 For a color reproduction of Pether’s “silvery” engraving of Poussin’s Landscape, see plate 2 in the “Bart Chapin” essay. This Poussin and the two framed Claudes in the Melville Chapin collection are likely to be among the “silvery” engravings after these painters that Mather saw “on the walls” because of 411 engravings that have now been cataloged from Melville’s collection of art, only six are folio engravings in frames that Melville appears to have supplied, with the three in the two Chapin collections being the only ones after paintings by Claude or Poussin.
Melville’s ownership of the framed engravings of The Enchanted Castle and Cephalus and Procris provides new insight into the way his activities as a reader, writer, book collector, and art collector were related. Consider The Enchanted Castle as an example of Woollett’s work as an engraver. Melville’s print collection included two other classical landscapes that were engraved by Woollett: Morning and Evening, after paintings by Herman van Swanevelt, a Dutch disciple of Claude Lorrain in Italy. Morning and Evening showed Melville what Woollett could make of Claude’s disciple; The Enchanted Castle showed what he could make of Claude himself. Melville also owned an engraved portrait of Woollett that J. K. Sherwin had executed in Woollett’s own style. For an expert description of Woollett’s engraving technique, as imitated in Sherwin’s engraving of Woollett himself, Melville could turn to the copy of The Wonders of Engraving that he acquired in 1875. Author Georges Duplessis explains that Woollett’s “bolder” lines are “cut with a very large graver which deeply penetrates the copper, leaving large grooves far apart from each other into which the ink is plentifully absorbed.” Duplessis goes on to say that Claude inspired Woollett’s best engravings, for Woollett “was irresistibly attracted by the grand and masterly disposition of the forms, the deep infinite horizons, and the beautiful scenery of the landscapes.” Similarly, “Claude was never better understood than by Woollett. . . . The beautiful gradations and fine proportions of his plates are unsurpassed; no predecessor obtained such varied results by the aid of the graver alone. The distant horizons, lit up by the last ray from the setting sun, are accurately designed, and are perfectly distinct although so far away.” The engraving of The Enchanted Castle gave Melville the best possible example of Woollett’s meeting and mating with Claude, as celebrated by Duplessis.

Melville’s copy of The Enchanted Castle also preserved the work of François Vives, Woollett’s teacher and colleague, who had died before their joint work on the engraving was completed. Vives, in the words of Duplessis, “rendered Claude Lorrain’s works with almost as much skill as Woollett. . . . The judiciously distributed light, affecting each object differently . . . is transmitted to copper with remarkable accuracy. It would appear impossible for art to render the sun, especially with no resources at its command but black ink and white paper, and yet his rays seem to inundate these engravings by Vives. . . . A man of ingenuity and resource, he arranged his shadows so that those parts meant to be in the direct rays of the sun were scarcely covered by light strokes, and by being placed in juxtaposition with condensed lines were thrown up with extraordinary brilliancy by the shadows which surrounded them” (Duplessis, 192). This technical explanation of Vives’ ability to render the glow of the sun “with no resources but black ink and white paper” gave Melville another very specific example “what unlike things meet and mate / . . . / To wrestle with the angel—Art.” Melville marked an extended passage about both Vives and Woollett in the essay on “Copper-Plate Engraving” in his copy of The Works of the Eminent Masters. The passage he marked begins with the assertion that “Vives must be

27 Woollett’s engravings after Swanevelt were published in 1787 by Elizabeth Woollett; they are reproduced as figures 6 and 7 in the “Ambrose” essay. Sherwin’s engraving of Woollett is figure 8 in the same essay.

considered the founder of the English school of landscape engraving” even though “he was a native of France.” Vivares “was followed by Woollett in the same department, whose works were models in beauty of execution and of style for landscape. Like Vivares, he carried his plates a considerable way with the point, and gave them the necessary depth with the graver, touching them up in the more delicate parts with the dry point. His works have all the delicacy and clearness of the French masters, with all the spirit and taste of Vivares.” 28 In the “art” of Woollett’s collaboration with Vivares in The Enchanted Castle, such “unlike things” as “delicacy” and “spirit,” and French and English, had come to “meet and mate.”

Melville’s copy of The Enchanted Castle also enriched his experience of reading William Hazlitt. Hazlitt’s familiar essays on both literature and painting were an inspiration for Melville from the time he acquired an edition of Table Talk in 1846. Hazlitt’s art criticism became especially influential after Melville acquired his Criticisms on Art in 1870. During the last two decades of Melville’s life, his reading of books, collecting of prints, and writing of poetry reached a level of thought and expression for which Hazlitt was an intellectual model. Melville heavily marked Hazlitt’s assertion, in the essay on “The Marquis of Stafford’s Gallery,” that “there are only three pleasures in life pure and lasting, and all derived from inanimate objects—books, pictures, and the face of nature.” 29 Melville not only made Hazlitt’s three pleasures his own; he found his own unique way of integrating them. Hazlitt’s admiration for the landscapes of Claude Lorrain permeates his Table-Talk essays. For him, the ability to appreciate the paintings of Claude is a measure of the cultivated mind. Hazlitt refers specifically to The Enchanted Castle in his delightful essay “On the Ignorance of the Learned,” where he reserves his highest scorn for the kind of person who might have “a print of Rubens’s Watering-place or Claude’s Enchanted Castle” on his walls “without his once perceiving them.” 30 Melville entered the words “Enchanted Castle / Claude” along with the number “14” on the back flyleaf of his copy of Hazlitt’s Criticisms of Art. These annotations refer to the passage in which Hazlitt asserts that the two Claudes in the collection of Mr. Angerstein, “famous as they are,” are not equal to The Enchanted Castle. Elsewhere, Melville marked the passage in Criticisms of Art in which Hazlitt declares: “The name of Claude has alone something in it that softens and harmonizes the mind. It touches a magic chord.” Hazlitt then invites the paintings of Claude to “pour all your enchantment into my soul, let it reflect your chastened image, and forget all meaner things” (122). In Melville’s copy of The Enchanted Castle he had direct access to the “magic chord” that Claude had “touched” in Hazlitt’s “enchanted soul.”


30 Appropriately, Melville’s copy of The Works of Eminent Masters was given to the Harvard College Library by Mrs. E. Barton Chapin, to whom we are also indebted for the preservation of his copy of The Enchanted Castle.

31 William Hazlitt, Criticisms on Art (London: Templeman, 1843), 40-41. I am grateful to William Reese for the opportunity to examine this and other annotations that Melville made in this volume.

Hazlitt’s intense admiration of Claude’s painted landscapes, in Melville’s reading on art, was countered by John Ruskin’s intense antipathy to those same paintings. Ruskin was Melville’s exact contemporary, born in 1819. The first volume of his Modern Painters, published in London in 1843, turned English art criticism on its head by elevating the landscapes of Turner and denigrating those of Claude. Melville differed from Ruskin in admiring, as had Turner, the paintings of Claude. He shared, however, Ruskin’s deep admiration for Turner, as attested by his having collected twenty-six engravings after paintings by Turner. Although most of his engravings after Turner are seascapes, Melville also collected engravings of several of the landscapes in which Turner had responded to Claude, the most beautiful and powerful of these being J. T. Willmore’s 1856 engraving after The Golden Bough. This is one of only a few folio engravings that survive today in Melville’s own frame, so it is likely that Turner’s Golden Bough hung in Melville’s home along with Claude’s Enchanted Castle. Given the extent to which Melville had followed the critical dispute between Ruskin and Hazlitt in relation to Claude and Turner, his ownership of framed, folio engravings of both The Enchanted Castle and The Golden Bough is extremely significant. In Dullea’s generation, the art-historical dispute over Turner’s relation to Claude gravitated to the question of whether Turner’s admiration for Claude had been tainted by “a baser spirit, that of rivalry” (Dullea, 44-45). The paragraph devoted to this issue is the only one that Melville marked in his copy of Dullea’s book, suggesting that the Turner-Claude relationship may have contributed to the juxtaposition of such ‘unlike things’ as “Audacity—reverence” in his poem “Art.”

MORE CLAUDE LORRAIN, EARLY TO LATE

When Lewis Mumford made a passing allusion to Melville’s print collection in his 1929 biography, he indicated that “Claude and Turner were their masters in landscape.” The framed engravings of The Enchanted Castle and Cephalus and Procris help to confirm that assertion with regard to Claude. So do the five unframed engravings after paintings by Claude in the Melville Chapin collection. Smaller in size and later in date than the folio prints that Woollett and Browne engraved in 1782 and 1779, respectively, these engravings are from nineteenth-century Germany and England. They show that Melville was able to pay close attention to the evolution of Claude Lorrain’s landscape style from the early ventures in the 1630s to the mature meditations of the 1660s.

Extremely interesting from multiple points of view is Melville’s copy of A. H. Payne’s nineteenth-century engraving entitled Landschaft / Landscape, after a painting by Claude in Berlin’s Royal Museum (figure 3). This engraving reproduces another Landscape with Cephalus and Procris reunited by Diana, Claude’s first treatment of the subject, a painting from the mid-1630s (Roethlisberger, no. 243). This early landscape was Claude’s “first picture with an uncommon mytho-

31 Melville’s reading of Hazlitt and Ruskin in relation to Claude and Turner is discussed at length in the section on “Claude, Wilson, and ‘Panathippe’” in the Ambrose essay, where Willmore’s engraving of The Golden Bough is seen as the culmination of the Claudean landscape tradition as represented in Melville’s print collection, 23-33.
32 See the section on “Claude, Turner, and ‘Art’” in the Ambrose essay, 41-47.
33 Lewis Mumford, Herman Melville (New York: Literary Guild, 1929), 136.
logical theme.” In it, Claude already departs from his Ovidian source by including Diane with Cephalus and Procris in the reunion scene (Roethlisberger, 512). This engraving allowed Melville to compare Claude’s handling of these three principal figures, the spear, and the dog in this early version with his deployment of the same elements thirty years later in the painting engraved by Browne. In this early version engraved by Payne, Claude presents a full lateral view of the Diana’s dog, helping us to imagine the part of the dog’s body that is obscured by Procris’s flowing robes in the later version, where Browne had only the sleek head and a curled tail to work with. The “most extraordinary motif” in the landscape setting of the early version, as Roethlisberger points out, is created “by the two rough, dead tree trunks crossing each other”; these “anticipate the tragic outcome of the lovers’ reunion” (512). In 1845 Payne’s nineteenth-century engraving became more poignant than it had been in Melville’s day, when Claude’s original canvas was destroyed by bombs that fell on Berlin’s Royal Museum.

A related nineteenth-century image from a German collection is W. French’s engraving of Die Flucht nach Ägypten / The Flight into Egypt (figure 4), after the painting in the Dresden Royal Gallery. Claude painted this scene in 1647, during his middle period, giving very close attention to a variety of figures and motifs throughout the canvas (Roethlisberger, no. 110). After taking in the expansive landscape gleaming in the morning light, streaming with flowing waters, your eye is drawn to a shepherd piping to his shepherdess in the foreground. Behind them, at the far left, deep in the grove of trees, you might make
out Claude’s inspiration for the title of the painting: an angel leading the Holy Family on its flight into Egypt. Dullea contends that this is one of many paintings by Claude in which “the incident by which the work is known might be omitted without any appreciable loss” (71). When French’s engraving was published in Payne’s *Royal Dresden Gallery* in New York in 1857, the letterpress description emphasized the atmospheric effects for which Claude’s Italian landscapes were so highly valued: “Over the distance, in which a city and Roman aqueduct are visible, floats a mist, which the rays of the Sun transforms to a veil of gold. A broad stream flows through the valley, and forms a number of small cascades over the rock foreground; on [one] bank of the stream, are seen a few ruins, and rustic dwellings; and on the [other], a beautiful meadow agreeably broken by trees and bushes expands itself before us; near which, under the shadow of a group of Pines, the holy family are seen guided by an angel on the flight, from which the composition derives its name.” When looking at such a composition, “instead of gazing on a flat surface, the eye seems to range over immeasurable space, till it is again drawn to contemplate the warm and genial foreground. In painting the effects of atmosphere and light; in investing the objects of earth with the hues of heaven, Claude is confessedly, the first and greatest painter, of all times and countries.”

Claude’s mastery of atmospheric effects in a marine setting is evident in W. Floyd’s 1859 engraving *The Sea-Port* (figure 5), after Claude’s 1637 *Harbor Scene*

in England’s Royal Collection at Windsor Castle. This is one of Claude’s sun-drenched seaport scenes whose atmospheric effects were to influence Turner’s solar seaports two centuries later. Melville collected two other solar seaports after Claude, Embarkation of the Queen of Sheba and View of a Sea-Port during a Sun-set, each engraved by Richard Earlom for the English edition of Claude’s Liber Studiorum in the mid-1770s (figures 1 and 2 in the “Ambrose” essay). Floyd and Earlom produced their vivid solar effects by entirely different means, one having created his 1839 Sea-Port as a line engraving in steel, the other having executed his Sheba and Sun-set seaports as mezzotints on copper. All three engravings provide unforgettable evidence of the solar glow of Claude’s seaport style that Turner tried to emulate. The influence is clearly seen in Melville’s engraving of Turner’s Regulus leaving Carthage by S. Bradshaw, published in London’s Art-Journal in the same year as Floyd’s engraving of Claude’s Sea-Port. The shape of the harbor and the brilliance of the sun indicate the care and intensity with which Turner’s 1837 Regulus canvas had directly challenged Claude’s 1637 Harbor Scene. The reverence and the audacity with which Turner challenged Claude are
equally clear when the two 1839 engravings are seen side by side, as they were in the exhibition of *Marmite Prints from Herman Melville’s Collection of Art* that originated at the New Bedford Whaling Museum in June 1999.17

A second seaside engraving from England’s Royal Collection brings us back to the period of Claude’s late meditative, mythological style that we have already seen in figures 1 and 2. *Claude’s Coast View with the Rape of Europa* (figure 6) was painted in 1667, three years after his *Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor* (Roethlisberger, no. 136). This painting was Claude’s fourth version of same subject (as had also been the case with the 1664 version of *Cephalus and Procris reunited by Diana*). Claude’s literary source for the *Rape of Europa* was, again, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Each of his four paintings depicts the shoreline from a similar angle. This last of the four is more restrained in tone and in its depiction of the figures. When E. Radclyffe’s engraving was reproduced in London’s *Art-Journal* in 1839, the accompanying commentary called the painting, in Buckingham Palace, “one of the most beautiful works of Claude for richness of color and luminous qualities.” The unsigned writer objected only that the figures with which the painter has populated this seacoast are no better than “those of his successor, rival, and far greater artist, our own Turner” (296). Melville had many engravings after Turner with which he could test this compound assertion, including his two engravings after *The Golden Bough*, which also features mythological figures near the shore. Viewers could make their own comparisons of such depictions by Turner and Claude in the 1999 exhibition of Melville’s *Marmite Prints*, whose final section on “Meditation and Water” juxtaposed Willmore’s 1836 version of *The Golden Bough* with Radclyffe’s 1839 version of *Europa*.18

The fifth unframed engraving after Claude (figure 7) reproduces a lesser-known image than the previous four. Its relative obscurity is itself a measure of Melville’s passion for collecting prints after Claude. E. Joubert etched this *Pastoral Landscape* in 1835 for the sale catalog of the Coesvelt Collection in London, whose contents were auctioned off in 1836. Joubert produced a rather simple outline engraving of a pastoral scene with boats sailing on a lake. It reads more like an abstraction, than a reproduction, of the painting. As such, it brings to mind a passage that Melville wrote in his Mediterranean journal while sailing among the Sporades Islands in 1857: “A fine sail upon the whole. But the scenery is all outline. No filling up. Seem to be sailing upon gigantic outline engravings” (NN *Journals*, 97). Since 1914 the painting from the Coesvelt collection has been at the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Strasbourg. In 1962 Roethlisberger was unable to assign it to a definite period in Claude’s career, attributing the canvas to an unknown seventeenth- or eighteenth-century Italian imitator of Claude (no. 275).

---

17 The two solar seaports are reproduced together on page 3 of the exhibition catalog by Robert K. Wallace (New Bedford Whaling Museum, June 1999-January 2000); they are nos. 1, 2 in the catalog inventory. The exhibition traveled to the South Street Seaport Museum in New York (May-November 2000).

18 The two engravings, nos. 43 and 46 in the catalog, are reproduced together on p. 12. In this exhibition, Radclyffe’s 1839 engraving of Claude’s *Europa* was temporarily reunited with Radclyffe’s 1835 engraving of Claude’s *The Beacon-Tower* from the Bart Chapin family collection (no. 3 in the “Bart Chapin” essay). This was a happy example of “matching halves” that “meet and mate” (in the words of “After the Pleasure Party”).

DELLA BELLA AND WATTEAU

One of the more intriguing prints in the Melville Chapin collection is a small oval portrait of a young man with a camel (figure 8). The only identifying information on the print is “J. S. Küsten,” a name I was unable to locate in reference books available to me locally. I had begun to despair of learning much more about this image until I showed it to Marjorie Cohn, Curator of Prints at the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University. She immediately identified the composition as an etching by della Bella, one of nine “Persian heads” that the artist had etched in an oval format in Paris in 1649–50. Stefano della Bella (1610–1664) was born in Florence, but he made his artistic reputation in France, just as his contemporary Claude Lorrain (1600–1682), born in France, made his in Italy. Duplessis places della Bella in the French School in Melville’s copy of The Wonders of Engraving, judging the “small subjects” that he so “prettily conceived and delicately executed” to be worthy of the “highest praise” (250).

Figure 8: J. S. Küsten, after Stefano della Bella, Untitled portrait of young man with camel (from the etching Esclave tenant un chameau par la bridle, 1649). Collection of Melville Chapin. Photo: Imaging Services, Harvard College Library.
Della Bella was an extremely versatile and fluid artist for whom etching on copperplate was the equivalent of drawing on paper. He excelled in ornamental drawings and cartouches, but was also proficient in costume, animal, battle, theatrical, and topographical scenes in addition to portraits both real and fanciful. In figure studies he assimilated the style of Callot, and in landscape those of Rembrandt and Jan Both, but he made these influences very much his own. His own inventive etchings were to influence artists as varied as Piranesi in Italy, Perelle in France, Watteau in Flanders, and Sweanevelt in the Netherlands. Anthony Blunt indicates that della Bella's artistry was much appreciated in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, but that by the nineteenth century his "delicate, somewhat mannered draughtsmanship and his exquisite skill as an etcher would have seemed frivolous and almost rococo." In nineteenth-century America, della Bella would have been very little known throughout Melville's lifetime. In fact, the first major recognition given to della Bella's work in the United States was in an exhibition mounted at the New York Metropolitan Museum in 1968 (followed in 1971 by an American reprint of Alexander De Vesme's 1966 catalogue raisonné of the artist's work). Melville's acquisition of della Bella's "Persian head" (with camel) at some unknown date in the nineteenth century put him well ahead of his time as New York collector. Its Near Eastern subject relates well with the "Persian tile" that Melville brought back from his Mediterranean journey in 1857, a Qajar tile in which a princely figure on a white horse is overshadowed by "the fabulous bird Huma."

In De Vesme's catalogue raisonné of della Bella's art, the double portrait that Melville collected is listed as no. 101, *Esclave tenant un chameau par le bride* (Slave holding a camel by the bridle). Its companion etching, equally inviting, is entitled *Esclave négre tenant la bride d'un cheval* (Negro slave holding a horse by the bridle). De Vesme notes that the head of the horse in the companion etching is dressed with the plumes of an ostrich. The head of the camel in Melville's engraving has no plumage beyond the camel-hair coat of its own body. This allows della Bella to apply to the camel one of his most innovative techniques as a seventeenth-century etcher: "making strikes of shading define a form by their ends, instead of bowing it with a drawn outline" (De Vesme/Massar, 14). The form of this camel's head is literally depicted by the ends of the camel hairs, not the body beneath. Equally remarkable about this portrait is the spatial relation between the camel's head, the man's head, and the camel's breast and hump. Here we see della Bella's gift for catching living figures in a tableau that implies both past and future action.

---

39 Della Bella influenced other artists as well; I mention these four because Melville collected etchings by, or engravings after, each of them.
42 The title is reproduced as figure 9 in the "David Mische" essay, where it is discussed in the context of Melville's interest in Near Eastern culture. Melville's Qajar tile is nearly identical to the one acquired by New York's Metropolitan Museum in 1881 (and reproduced as no. 36 in the 1991 exhibition catalog *Persian Tiles*, ed. Stefano Carboni and Tomoko Masaya).
43 These two etchings complete De Vesme's listing of della Bella's suite of "Persian heads": *Plusiern sites offreis à la persienne* (nos. 181-92).
Melville first attended closely to camels and their human companions on his visit to the Near East in 1856-57. A camel he saw at Smyrna struck him as “a most ungainly creature.” Yet he was fascinated by “his feathery-looking” hair, his “crain-like neck,” and his “way of turning his head so that his face & tail face you together.” In Cairo, Melville was greatly intrigued by a “donkey boy” and his donkey, devoting an entire paragraph to their interaction (NN Journals, 69, 77). In Clarel, the epic 1876 poem set in the Holy Land, Melville’s treatment of camels, horses, and their human companions moved even closer to the freedom and delicacy of della Bella’s etched portraits. One extended example enlives “The Fight of the Greeks” in Book 2. A camel and her rider are introduced in comic terms: “Lurching was seen / An Arab tall, on camel lean.” Soon, however, they become the source, rather than the butt, of the humor. When Nehemiah reaches up with a Christian tract for the edification of the Arabic rider,

The lofty nomad bent him o’er
In grave regard. The camel too
Her crane-like neck swerved round to view;
No more to camel than to man
Inscrutable the ciphers ran.
But wonted unto arid cheer,
The beast, misjudging, snapped it up,
And would have munched, but let it drop;
Her master, poling down his spear
Transfixed his page and brought it near,
Nor stayed his travel. (NN Clarel, 2:13: 14-15, 32-41)

Melville endows this camel with a near-human personality, as he does also the horse of the Druze guide in Clarel, and he depicts both animals as decidedly female in gender (as opposed to the male camel and the male donkey in the 1856 journal entries noted above).44

The engraver who reproduced Melville’s copy of della Bella’s 1649 etching of the Persian head with camel was Johanna Sibilla Katselin (1650-1717). Born in Augsburg to a family of engravers, J. S. Katselin (as she was also known) was one of the outstanding female engravers of her age. Her virtuoso technique was well suited to the meticulous designs she reproduced from artists such as Callot and della Bella. She effectively engraved della Bella’s image of the Persian head and camel in reverse, substituting her own name in the place of his. Good Frenchman that he is, De Vesme calls attention to the fact that one nineteenth-century German authority mistakenly listed the Persian heads in her engravings after della Bella as Parisian (mistaking “persienne” for “parisienne”). Even more

44 The account of the relationship between the Druze guide and his mare appears to border on the erotic when she reveals “full eye of flam / Tempered in softness, which became / Womanly sometimes, in desire / To be caressed” (“Guide and Gard,” NN Clarel, 2:7, 57-60), but Melville’s tender touch here is not so different from della Bella’s in the engravings of Persians with horse and camel.
bizarrely, he notes, the same source mistook one of della Bella’s Persian heads as Kitelin’s own self-portrait. 45

Antoine Watteau (1684–1721), like della Bella, combined elegant draftsmanship with psychological acuity. These qualities are admirably rendered in two late-nineteenth-century engravings after Watteau that have previously been documented as being in Melville’s collection. L’Île Enchantée (The Enchanted Isle) and Pincette (figures 2 and 3 in the “Rece” essay) were engraved for French journals in 1870 and 1882, respectively. The engraving after Watteau in the Melville Chapin collection, The Fête Champêtre by Peter Lightfoot (figure 9), was published in London in 1846. The painting itself, then in the possession of John Hilditch, was a close variant upon a lost painting by Watteau, known only by an engraving, Gathering near a Fountain with a Statue of Bacchus (1716). 46 Lightfoot’s English engraving lacks the sheer sensuality of Melville’s two French engravings

45 De Vere/Masur, 77. De Vere attributes both mistakes to Nagler’s nineteenth-century biographical dictionary, but the former also occurs in Leblanc’s nineteenth-century French-language dictionary.

46 Illustrated as no. 143 in John Sunderland and Ettore Camesasca, The Complete Paintings of Watteau (New York: Henry M. Abrams, 1968). The authors indicate that the original painting, engraved by Colchin in 1727, has been lost; they consider the painting in England, reproduced in Lightfoot’s engraving, to be an inverted variant.
after Watteau, but it does effectively convey, in the female figure at the far left, one special feature of this artist’s art, the supple eroticism of the back of a young woman, elegantly dressed and seen from behind. In Lightfoot’s engraving, this distinctive effect is echoed in the very young girl on the ground to the immediate right of her elder. 17

Lightfoot’s engraving of Watteau’s *The Fête Champêtre* is exactly the kind of pleasure party to which Melville alludes in the title of his poem “After the Pleasure Party.” The deep erotic undertone in Watteau’s treatment of such a scene makes all the more poignant Urania’s awakening to a consciousness of the erotic life she has missed. It is in exactly such a setting as Watteau has painted—“When after lunch and sallies gay, / Like the Decameron folk we lay / In sylvan groups” (Collected Poems, 218)—that Urania breaks off her painful memories from the pleasure party itself and plunges into the “starlit” vigil about the human psyche in which “Few matching halves here meet and mate.” Her inner thoughts and feelings are all the more excruciating as part of a “sylvan group” for whom amorous pleasure is the name of the game. Watteau’s pleasure party provides the social focus, Claude’s Psyche the inward focus, for Urania’s waking day, that endless day, “Silvered no more,” in which “One knows not if Urania yet / The pleasure-party may forget.”

**Dutch Masters and German Disciples**

The recent inventory of the Bart Chapin family collection added five new seventeenth-century Dutch paintings—Rembrandt, Ter Borch, Potter, Van der Heyden, and Jan Both—to those whose prints Melville was previously known to have collected (Berchem, Cuyp, van Everdingen, Metsu, Kiers, Netscher, van Ostade, Van de Velde, and Wouwermans). The engravings in the Melville Chapin collection introduce one new Dutch master, M. Hobbema, to the list, and bring forth new works by Berchem and Cuyp. All three of these new engravings reproduce landscapes from England’s Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace. Each was engraved for publication in *The Royal Gallery of Pictures* in 1839. Each is therefore an expression of English taste as well as of Dutch art.

Melville’s engraving of *The Water Mill* (figure 10) reproduces one of Meindert Hobbema’s best-known paintings. The Dutch realism of Hobbema’s *Water Mill* is a perfect counterpart to the Italianate classicism of Claude’s *Enchanted Castle*. Christopher White identifies Hobbema’s painting as *A Watermelk beside a Woody Lane* in his excellent catalog of *The Dutch Pictures of Her Majesty the Queen*. 18 His shorthand summary of the painting helps us to make out various details in the engraving: “On the left, the mill stream; on the right, a track leading through a wood towards cottages in the background; on the path, a man, and beside it, a scatted woman with child” (50). Melville’s 1839 engraving by T. Jeavons renders the woody lane in an especially inviting way (though it does seem to exaggerate

---

17 Curiously, this lastest of the gazed-upon girls (there is a third in the group at the center) is absent from the version of *Gathering near a Fountain with a Statue of Bacchus* reproduced in Sunderland and Canesacca, *Complete Paintings of Watteau*, 109.

18 No. 68 in Christopher White, *The Dutch Pictures of Her Majesty the Queen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Subsequent references to this source will appear parenthetically in my text.
the reflection of the mill in the stream, which may be one reason that the painting was re-engraved, with a less glaring reflection, by J. Cousen for The Royal Gallery of Art in 1858. Melville acquired a smaller reproduction of the same painting on page 57 of a book he acquired in 1891, Frank Cundall’s The Landscape and Pastoral Painters of Holland (Seals, no. 169). Cundall, in his chapter on Hobbema, notes that this Water Mill at Buckingham Palace is one of many variations that the artist painted of this same subject. Dated this canvas to 1661, he notes that Hobbema did his best painting in “the six years from 1663 to 1669” even though he lived much longer (1638-1709). His artistic career essentially ended when, in 1669, unable to make a living as a painter, he became a civil servant at the Amsterdam customhouse. Melville, after becoming a civil servant the New York customhouse for the same reason in 1865, would have identified all too closely with this biographical circumstance.

Melville’s engraving of Nicolaes Berchem’s Landscape with Figures (figure 11) is from the painting currently known as Landscape with Women Gathering Reeds, and a Milkmaid (ca. 1660; White, no. 15). White’s inventory of the figures in the landscape catches Berchem’s characteristic combination of detail and expansiveness: “On a riverbank in the foreground, three reed gatherers, a milkmaid with her churn on her head, and cattle, with further figures and animals behind;
beyond, rocks bordering the river leading to a distant view of mountainous landscape on the left” (19). All of these elements are easily seen in Melville’s 1839 engraving by J. Jeavons. In both subject and treatment, it resembles Melville’s engraving of Berchem’s Crossing the Ford by J. Cousen, now at the Berkshire Athenaeum (A 233), reproducing another painting at Buckingham Palace: A Shepherdess Carrying a Kid across a Ford (1658; White, no. 17). Hazlitt offers a keen critique of Berchem’s style in his essay on “The Dulwich Gallery,” reprinted in his Criticisms of Art: “The fault of all of Berchem’s pictures is that he continues to finish after he has done looking at nature, and his last touches are different from hers” (30). By contrast, Hazlitt finds Hobbema’s Water-Mill, in the same gallery, as perfect in its way as the Jacob’s Ladder of Rembrandt. “If a picture is admirable of its kind, we do not give ourselves much trouble about the subject. Could we paint as well as Hobbema, we should not envy Rembrandt” (29).

Melville’s print collection suggests that he had a comparable catholicity of taste. Cundall’s chapter on Aelbert Cuyp in The Landscape and Pastoral Painters of Holland emphasizes that Cuyp “well deserves the title of the ‘Dutch Claude’” (as he came to be known after Boydell published a series of prints after his paintings in London in 1769). Cuyp, like Hobbema, never left his native Holland. Nevertheless, he so imbued the realism of the Dutch landscape style with the warmth of the Italianate style that he became “par excellence the painter of sunlight” (Cundall, 80). His gift for investing Dutch realism with an Italian glow is particularly evident in Melville’s copy of Landscape, with Ruins of an Old Tower, Foresters & Dogs (figure 12). The original painting, still at Buckingham Palace, is
known today as *An Evening Landscape with Figures and Sheep* (ca. 1660; White, no. 33). White's one-sentence précis helps us to appreciate the detail, as well as the expansiveness, of Cuyp's design: "On the right, two riders talk to a shepherd who is accompanied by a girl, and his dog and flock; in the centre, a traveller on horseback; beyond, to the left, a man talks to a shepherdess with her flock; in the background, a hilly river landscape with a town." Beyond its detail, the painting has always been much appreciated for its "brightness of tone, approaching a silvery quality" (in the words of Gustav Waagen, the nineteenth-century German authority on paintings in English collections) (White, 32).

Cundall emphasizes that the landscapes of Cuyp, like those of Hobbema, were appreciated first in England. Moreover, since "all of his best works" are in this nation, Cuyp "is better represented in England . . . than in the whole of the Continental galleries, those of his native countries not excepted" (91). Melville would have had seen a fine selection of paintings by Cuyp when he visited England's picture galleries in 1849. At the Dulwich and National Galleries he would have seen the strongest collections of Cuyp in the world. One of the "gems" he saw at the Dulwich Gallery in 1849 entered his collection in the form of the engraving that his wife Lizzie gave him in 1887: Cuyp's *A Sunny Day* in the 1868 engraving by J. C. Bentley (figure 3 in the "Berkshire" essay). The original painting at the Dulwich Gallery, now known as *Cattle with Figures near a River with Mountains* (ca. 1650-55), is another of those works in which Cuyp combines the expansive luminosity of the Italian landscape style with the precision and realism of the Dutch school. As such, it was "greatly admired by Hazlitt," yet "fiercely criticized by Ruskin." Hazlitt, in his essay on "The Dulwich Gallery," not only found this sunny landscape to be "woven of ethereal hues"; he considered it to be "the finest Cuyp, perhaps, in the world."
Writing of the same painting in Modern Painters, Ruskin found it “difficult to conceive how any man calling himself a painter could impose such a thing on the public.” Melville had easy access to the full artillery of this cultural war in his library, where the edition of Hazlitt’s Criticisms on Art that he acquired in 1870 coexisted with the five-volume set of Ruskin’s Modern Painters that he acquired in 1865 (Seals, no. 431). Ruskin was as dismissive of Hobbema as he was of Cuyp, as indicated by this passage cited by Cundall: “A single dusty roll of Turner’s brush is more truly representative of the infinitude of foliage than the niggle of Hobbema could have rendered his canvas, if he had worked on it to domesday” (53).

Cundall’s 1891 book about Hobbema, Cuyp, Ruisdael, and Potter provided Melville with up-to-date information about each of these artists, for it drew upon Dutch and French sources from the 1870s, the 1880s, and even 1890. Earlier, however, in the early 1870s, when Melville is thought to have begun composing “At the Hostelry,” his ambitious but unpublished poem on the picturesque in art, he would have had to rely on other sources for information on these and other painters. As we have seen, he already had access to Hazlitt’s Criticisms on Art and Ruskin’s Modern Painters in his own library. After 1871 he also had access to a wealth of information in The Works of Eminent Masters, a two-volume compilation of illustrated essays published in London in 1854. We have already seen that this volume included the essay on “Copper-Plate Engraving” in which Melville marked an extended passage about Vives and Woollett. The essay on “Aelbert Cuyp” was embellished with six landscape engravings and a portrait engraving. This text also emphasized that English collectors were the first to appreciate Cuyp’s landscape paintings, leading to his London reputation as “the Claude Lorrain of Holland.” Beyond its celebration of Cuyp and his landscape art, the 1854 essay emphasized the essential role that popular engravings were playing in the process by which “picture galleries were now beginning to be fully appreciated by the millions” (1: 181, 186). The mid-nineteenth-century engravings that Melville acquired in books such as The Works of Eminent Masters, and in prints from such publications The Royal Gallery of Pictures and The Art-Journal, were the pictorial equivalent of Hazlitt’s and Ruskin’s critical writings. These visual images helped to demystify works of art and to make galleries accessible to an expanding middle-class audience not yet imagined when Earlon, Browne, Vives, and Woollett were producing English engravings after Claude from private collections in the 1770s and 1780s.

The journals that Melville kept during his visits to London in 1849 and 1857 do not record any visits to the paintings in the Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace. The engravings he collected, however, did bring him face to face with an impressive variety of Dutch master images from that collection. In addition to the engravings of Hobbema’s The Water Mill, Berchem’s Landscape with Figures, and Cuyp’s Landscape, with Ruins of an Old Tower, Foresters & Dogs now in the Melville Chapin collection, his engravings of Dutch masters from Buckingham

---

Palace also included Rembrandt's "Noli me tangere," Vander Heyden's The River-Bank, Potter's The Shooting Ponies, and Wouwermans' The Battle Field (nos. 18-21 in the "Bart Chapin" essay). From the unknown date at which he began "At the Hostelry" in the 1870s through the publication of Clarei in 1876 and Timoleon in 1891, Melville continued to expand and refine his appreciation of Hazlitt's "pure and lasting" pleasures: "books, pictures, and the face of nature."

One of the more difficult engravings to identify in the Melville Chapin collection was a small untitled landscape etching in the manner of Rembrandt (figure 13). After searching in vain through Rembrandt's own etchings, I would hardly have known where to turn without guidance from a single word written, apparently in Melville's hand, on the verso of the print: "Norblin." Jean-Pierre Norblin de la Gourdaine (1745-1830) was born in France, but he was trained in Germany. He studied at the Royal Academy in Dresden, where he assimilated Rembrandt's style in etching, as can be seen in Melville's print. After winning the Grand Prize from the Dresden Academy in 1871, he worked in Poland from 1772 to 1804, where he was court painter to Prince Stanislaus-Auguste. Le Blanc's inventory of Norblin's artistic œuvre contains one item in its short "Paysage" section that clearly corresponds to Melville's print: an etching identified as La Basse-cour (The Farm-Yard) and dated 1777. The striking contrast of subject matter between Norblin's 1777 etching of a farm yard and della Bella's

---

51 For the first overview of Melville's interest in Dutch painting, as well as an early consideration of the visual riches made available to him in his copy of The Works of Eminent Masters, see Dennis Berrold, "Melville and Dutch Genre Paintings," in Savage Eye: Melville and the Visual Arts, ed. Christopher Sten (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1994), 218-41.
1649 etching of a Persian camel boy shows the eclecticism of Melville’s taste (as well as his eye for etchings, the form of engraving that brings the eye of the viewer closest to the hand of the artist). One wonders how Melville might have classified his etchings by Norblin and della Bella if he had wanted to distribute them among artists of various nations in his print collection. Would he have considered Jean-Pierre Norblin de la Gourdaine’s etching of *La Basse-cour* to be French, Dutch, German, or even Polish? Would he have considered J. S. Kösten’s engraving after Stefano della Bella’s etching of *Esclave tenant un château par le bride* to be German, French, Italian, or Near-Eastern? One expects that he, like Goethe, would have cataloged the prints he collected by “school, master, and date,” but very little evidence remains from whatever his system may have been.51

In 1777, when Norblin de la Gourdaine was etching *La Basse-cour* as court painter to Prince Stanislaus-Auguste in modern-day Poland, Prince Franz of the German principality of Anhalt-Dessau was creating his garden of Wörlitz on the banks of the Elbe near Dessau. Between 1785 and 1787 he built the lakeside inn that is the subject of another relatively obscure engraving acquired by Melville, *Gasthof zu Wörlitz* (figure 14). This charming image, evidently from the nineteenth century, displays no printed information beyond its title. For some

---

51 Goethe collected more than two thousand engravings, methodically cataloging them in the manner he attributes to the protagonist of his 1799 story “The Collector and his Circle.” When I first visited the collection of Melville’s prints at the Brinkshiro Aikenau in 1985, a few small groups were enclosed by folded sheets of paper on which Melville had written a classifying phrase such as “Rubens,” “N. Poussin,” or “Busts/Anatque” (recorded in the “Herksine” essay). The enclosing sheets were no longer available when I revisited the collection in July 2000.
time, I despaired of acquiring precise information about either its subject or the artist(s) who created it. Fortunately, I happened upon the bilingual 1997 exhibition catalog from Germany entitled *For the Friends of Nature and Art: The Garden Kingdom of Prince Franz von Anhalt-Dessau in the Age of the Enlightenment.* This catalog reproduces the exact source from which Melville’s later image derives: an aquatint entitled *Ansicht des Gasthofs zu Wörlitz von dem See (View of the Inn at Wörlitz from the Lake),* published in 1801 by the Chalcographische Gesellschaft of Dessau (figure 45 in *For the Friends of Nature and Art*). This 1801 image was etched in aquatint by Christian Haldenwang (1770–1831) after a drawing by Heinrich Theodor Wehle (1778–1805). Wehle was still a student of landscape painting at the Royal Academy in Dresden when he made the drawing of the *Gasthof* that Haldenwang was to reproduce. In 1802, he traveled to Russia, where he undertook artistic expeditions to the Caucasus and Persia. Wehle died young, at age 26, and would have been only twenty when Haldenwang published the aquatint from his drawing. Wehle had depicted the *Gasthof* (which Prince Franz had built “as an inn offering accommodation to the numerous travelers to Wörlitz”) “in clear view across the lake from the *Schlosser Garten*” (*For the Friends of Nature and Art*, 116). In the subsequent engraving acquired by Melville, the view is identical, but the Haldenwang-Wehle image is now reversed from right to left. The creator of this later image was the painter and engraver whose name Melville wrote on the verso of the print: “Heydeck.”

Adolf von Heydeck (1787–1856) had been born in Dessau during the year in which the *Gasthof* was being completed at nearby Wörlitz. He spent most of his career as a painter in Italy, becoming known as Poussin-Heydeck because of his skill as a copyist and imitator of Gaspard Poussin (Dugnet). Later in life he returned to his birthplace, where he appears to have engraved *Gasthof zu Wörlitz* as one of eighteen etchings depicting his Dessau-Wörlitz homeland.

Matching the cross-national trajectories of the German-born artists who created the successive stages of the *Gasthof zu Wörlitz* (Wehle, Haldenwang, and Poussin-Heydeck) was the cross-national experience of the Prince who created the “garden kingdom” of Wörlitz and its *Gasthof.* Prince Franz von Anhalt-Dessau had envisioned his vast architectural and topographical domain as an “Arcadia on the Elbe.” He built it after the end of the Seven Years War (1756–1763), inspired by journeys he had made to the ruins of Italy and to the gardens of England with his architect, Friedrich Wilhelm Freiherr von Erdmannsdorff. With its artfully revealed vistas along the shores of the Elbe, Wörlitz was not only “the first English garden in Germany”; it came to be considered the “ornament and epitome” of the generation that created the Enlightenment culture of late eighteenth-century Germany. Melville’s print of the *Gasthof zu Wörlitz* recapitulated the process by which the art of Palladio’s Italy, filtered through the Palladian gardens of England, had shaped both the topography and the culture of Enlightenment Germany. In Haldenwang’s later career, the blending of these

---


national styles continued in the German engravings he made in emulation of Woollcott's English engravings after classical Italian landscapes. In Heydeck's much later variation upon Haldenwang's more youthful Gasthof aquatint, the English garden kingdom alongside the German river gains an added classical patina from Heydeck's extended residence in Italy and his emulation of Gaspar Poussin. This print of the *Gasthof zu Wörlitz*, no less than Melville's engravings of landscapes by Berchem and Cuyp from England's Royal Collection, provided a unique example of how Dutch and German realism could "meet and mate" with Italianate classicism.

The German who most lastingly linked German culture with Italy was, of course, Goethe (1749-1832). Goethe was an influential shaper of the eighteenth-century vision of Arcadian enlightenment to which the gardens of Wörlitz gave physical expression. From the time he moved to Weimar in 1775, he was a frequent visitor to the pleasure gardens of Wörlitz. When Prince Franz was completing the *Gasthof* for its visitors in 1787, Goethe was visiting Italy for the first time. Goethe's travels in Italy were to be a major influence on both Germany's literary and artistic culture, in part through the popularity of his own *Travels in Italy*, published as part of his *Auto-Biography* (1811-13). Goethe's many visits to Wörlitz were also reflected in his writing. The influence is especially strong in *Waherverwandschaften* (*Elette Affinities*), the 1809 novel whose fictional setting in an English garden in Germany was directly inspired by the "garden kingdom" of Wörlitz. Melville's writing was influenced by Goethe as early as *Moby-Dick*, most conspicuously in this surprising analogy for the strength of the whale's tail: "As devoted Eckermann lifted the linen sheet from the naked corpse of Goethe, he was overwhelmed by the massive chest of the man, that seemed as a Roman triumphal arch" (NN *Moby-Dick*, 376). In 1834, Melville appears to have consulted *Elette Affinities* when visiting his Shaw in-laws in Boston, since *Waherverwandschaften* is the only volume from the twenty-six volume edition of Goethe's *Werke* at the Boston Athenaeum that was checked out to coincide with his visit (Seals, no. 227, v. 14). Goethe was very much on Melville's mind when he made his own first visit to Italy in 1857, for many of the annotations he made in his own copy of Goethe's *Travels in Italy* date from that journey. In one marginal note, Melville calculates that he and Goethe were each thirty-seven years old when arriving in Rome for the first time. In another, he marks the passage in which Goethe declares that "I reckon a new-birth day,—a true new birth from the day that I entered Rome." 57

At this point we cannot be sure of the degree to which Melville may have associated his print of the *Gasthof zu Wörlitz* with Goethe's own visits there—or with Goethe's literary use of the lakes and gardens of Wörlitz in *Elette Affinities*. That he did make some such association seems likely, however. In 1830, Goethe wrote these words about his own collecting activity: "I did not collect according to whim or arbitrarily but each time according to a plan and intentionally for

---

56 The more generalized influence of Goethe's *Faust* is felt throughout the novel, and especially in the way Ahab's pact with Fedallah echoes Faust's with Mephistopheles. Melville acquired a copy of Goethe's *Auto-Biography*, including *Travels in Italy*, in England in 1849 (Seals, no. 221).

57 For a discussion of Melville's annotations in *Travels in Italy*, see the section on "Raphael, The Vatican, Billy Budd" in the "David Metcalf" essay, 12-20.
my consequential education, and I learned something from each piece in my possession." This clearly seems to have been the case with Melville as well. Among the 413 prints that I have so far discovered from Melville's collection, even those that originally seemed to be the most obscure often turn out to be highly interesting in the context of Melville's life and writing. Goethe once wrote of his own print collection that "in context each sheet becomes instructive." This, too, is true of the prints in Melville's collection. It is especially true of his copy of Heydeck's version of the Gaadof zu Wohltitz. If we look at this print in the context of Elective Affinities, published by Goethe in 1809, we see the man-made lake that becomes the tragic vortex of the entire story. We see the "the oak-trees beside the mooring place" on the one side of the lake and "the plane trees standing on the other side." Between them we see the "sheet of water" that takes the life of young Otto when Ottlie slips in the boat while trying to ferry him to the other side. Otto's accidental death, followed by the more intentional deaths of Ottlie and her beloved Eduard, brings to a grim conclusion Goethe's own most powerful examination of that "dice of blind fate" by which "few matching halves here meet and mate."

Elective Affinities is a love quadrangle whose four principals "meet" in many combinations but are unable to "mate" in a life-sustaining way. Goethe alludes explicitly to individual prints throughout the story: during one evening's entertainment, characters enact living tableaux in imitation of three Old Master prints. Goethe does not allude explicitly to Haldenwang's 1801 aquatint of the View of the Inn at Wohltitz from the Lake, but he seems to have had it in mind in his treatment of the lake scenes, for his fictional depiction of this "sheet of water" is as carefully framed by the "oak-trees beside the mooring place" as is the drawing of Wehle in Haldenwang's reproduction. When Heydeck made his mid-century engraving after Haldenwang's 1801 aquatint (or after the drawing by Wehle that inspired it), he probably had Goethe's 1809 novel in mind, too, for Heydeck belonged to that generation of German landscape artists who had gone to Italy "in the Footsteps of Goethe." One wonders if it is the natural expression of Heydeck's engraving technique or instead a conscious interpretive edge that makes the two swans who glide over the placid sheet of water in his engraving much darker, and sharper, than they are in Haldenwang's earlier, smoother image. In the context created by Heydeck's later engraving, Haldenwang's youthful aquatint suddenly becomes a relatively dreamy, idealistic lakeside scene, awaiting the sharper edge and the darker tone that first, Goethe's story, and then, Heydeck's engraving, were to bring to it. Its ghostly swans, barely visible in Haldenwang's smooth, tonal rendering of Wehle's youthful drawing, now read like a premonition of those darker and sharper mates who were to materialize decades later, edged with Heydeck's elective affinity for predecessors both artistic and literary.

---


---

56 Wehle and Haldenwang are among the artists whose drawings and prints Goethe collected, but neither the Kathof drawing by Wehle nor the 1801 aquatint by Haldenwang is among the drawings and prints currently preserved at the Goethehaus in Weimar.
Goethe had collected prints passionately up to the time of his death in 1832. Feeling that “it would be a pity if all this was to be dispersed,” he requested in his will that the thousands of prints and drawings that he had assembled never be allowed to leave Weimar, so that they would be available to posterity there. Given his commanding position in German culture at the time of his death (as well as for the previous forty years), Goethe’s wishes were followed not only by his heirs but also by Weimar authorities. His entire collection can be consulted to this day in the house on the Weimar Frauenplan in which he assembled it.61 By contrast, Melville had no standing in American culture when he died in 1891. Many prints from his art collection, like many books from his library, appear to have been “dispersed” in ways we may never be able to trace.62 Fortunately, owing to the foresight of his widow and the stewardship of their direct descendants through several generations, hundreds of his prints were preserved as a family legacy until the revival of his literary reputation made them worthy of institutional acquisition beginning in 1952 and of scholarly interpretation beginning in 1986. The 413 prints that have now been cataloged from Melville’s collection currently belong to institutional collections in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Texas, as well as to direct descendants of the author/collector in Maine, Massachusetts, Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Texas, and London, England.

ZUCCHERELLI AND THE ENGLISH SCHOOL

Just as Claude Lorrain was a French artist who made his mark in Rome and della Bella was an Italian artist who made his mark in Paris, Francesco Zuccherelli (1702-88) was an Italian artist who made his mark in London. The Venetian painter lived in London from 1752 to 1762 and again from 1765 to 1768, becoming a founder of London’s Royal Academy. He was a favorite of King George III, who acquired some thirty paintings by Zuccherelli for England’s Royal Collection in 1762. One of the largest and most prominent of these was The Waterfall, acquired by Melville in the 1858 engraving by E. Radcliffe (figure 15). Melville would have seen the original painting, more than seven feet high by five feet wide, when he visited the Royal Gallery at Windsor Castle in 1849. In 1766 The Waterfall was moved to Buckingham Palace, where it was installed as one of two prominent “chimney pieces” in the Picture Room.63 The painting is currently known as River landscape with two women seated embracing (a title that singles out a foreground feature somewhat more prominent than the waterfall by which the painting is known in Melville’s engraving). In Michael Levey’s shorthand summary, the figures in its landscape include: “The two women seated at the right foreground, on the bank of the river. Behind them, a boy lying on the

61 Gleisberg, “Goethe as an art collector,” 44.
62 Merton Seals, while cataloging more than five hundred books from Melville’s library in Melville’s Reading, notes that many other books from his library were not preserved by his family immediately after his death and may never be recovered by scholars. This is likely to have been the case with prints as well, something we must always remember as the list of prints that have been recovered from Melville’s collection continues to grow. The 413 prints about which we now know do not represent his whole collection; they are the known portion of an unknown whole.
ground fishing, and a trio of women beyond. A huntsman (?) and two dogs on
the further bank of the river. In the distance, a wide bridge and view of a
town."  

Zuccherelli's The Waterfall provides instructive comparisons with the land-
sapes by Claude, Hobbema, and Cuyp in the Melville Chapin collection.
Zuccherelli was deeply indebted to the landscape style of Claude Lorrain, as seen
by comparing the engraving of The Waterfall from England's Royal Collection
with that of The Flight into Egypt from Dresden's Royal Collection (figure 4
above). Zuccherelli follows Claude in deploying several groups of figures over
an expansive landscape whose flowing water is highlighted by a bright, expan-
sive sky (although he does not follow him in alluding to a Biblical story through
a conspicuous title). In its expansive topography and luminous tone,
Zuccherelli's river landscape compares with Cuyp's Landscape, with Ruins of an
Old Tower, Foresters & Dogs (figure 12 above). Cuyp's riverside scene, however,
has a specificity of treatment and a particularity of subject that contrasts in the
strongest possible way with Zuccherelli's imagined landscape of mindless ease.
A similar contrast is seen between Zuccherelli's Waterfall and Hobbema's Water Mill
(figure 10 above). Each is a vertical composition bisected by a reflective body of
water and populated by deliberately deployed human figures. Hobbema, how-
ever, conveys a specificity, a particularity, and a gravity whose graphic presence
highlights the absence of such qualities in the Zuccherelli. I emphasize these con-
trasts because they illustrate issues that were addressed in the commentary that
accompanied Zuccherelli's engraved Waterfall in London's Art-Journal in 1858
and that were likely to be operative in Melville's experience as a collector.

The 1838 commentator in the Art-Journal stressed the "conventionality" of this
landscape compared to "the landscapes of our own time." Complaining that
Zuccherelli and other painters in the Italian tradition, including Claude himself,
did not paint enough from nature in its actuality, the anonymous writer declares
that this transplanted artist should have learned more from the "free and natural
manner" of the many Dutch landscapes he would have encountered in England.
Instead, "a cold, yet graceful classicality is the prevailing character of
Zuccherelli's subjects" (364). Melville had access to a more withering critique in
Hazlitt's essay on "The Pictures at Windsor Castle," reprinted in the copy of
Criticisms of Art that he acquired in 1870. When Hazlitt visited Windsor Castle
in the early 1820s, one of the first paintings he saw was the one that is entitled
The Waterfall in Melville's 1858 engraving:

In the first room the stranger is shown into, there are two large landscapes by
Zuccherelli. They are clever well-painted pictures; but they are worth nothing.
The fault of this artist is that there is nothing absolutely good or bad in his pic-
tures. They are mere handicraft. The whole is done with a certain mechanical
case and indifference; but it is evident no part of the picture gave him any plea-
sure, and it is impossible it should give the spectator any. His only ambition was
to execute his task so as to save his credit; and your first impulse is to turn away
from the picture, and save your time.  

64 No. 684 in Michael Levey, The Later Italian Pictures in
the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, 2d. ed.
65 William Hazlitt, "The Pictures at Windsor Castle," in
Melville would have seen the same two Zuccarelli landscapes at Windsor Castle on November 22, 1849. He took even less time than Hazlitt had to register what he saw there: “Went thro’ the state apartments. Cheerlessly dammatory fine” (NN Journals, 24).\(^66\) The engraving Melville acquired of Zuccarelli’s *The Waterfall*, in addition to the contrast it provided with the riverside landscapes he acquired after Claude, Hobbema, and Cuyp, would have reminded him of the original painting that he had seen, and that Hazlitt had dismissed, at Windsor Castle.

Another image in the Melville Chapin collection that resembles the Zuccarelli in its cloying conventionality is a French engraving of John Russell’s *Les Cerises* (figure 16). Cerises are a lovely fruit, especially when converted into jam, but this image of a young girl holding a couple of berries over an open basket has a charm to which I am immune. John Russell (1745–1806) exhibited

\(^66\) Chapter six of *Melville and Turner* (“Running the Painted Gauntlet”) examined Melville’s 1849 visits to the picture galleries of England in the context of Hazlitt’s *Sketches of the Picture Galleries of England.* Whether Melville’s journal entry for November 22 was echoing Hazlitt’s withering criticism of Zuccarelli or simply expressing his own impression of the pictures at Windsor Castle, the phrase “Cheerlessly dammatory fine” brings an impressive concision to the concept of damning with faint praise.
paintings and pastels at London's Royal Academy from 1769 until 1806. He specialized in "fancy portraits of children" in which he "achieved a distinctive blurred effect by smudging the outlines with the finger and crayon, a technique he combined with striking finishing details in black." From a technical point of view, this French engraving after Russell's smudged crayon drawing is instructive to compare with Melville's copy of Auguste Péquignot's reproduction of one of François Boucher's crayon drawings of Venus (plate 4 in the "Bart Chapin" essay). Russell, however, hardly provides his engraver with as captivating a subject to work with, in spite of his recognized finesse in crayon and pastel and his authorship of the influential Elements of Painting with Crayon (1772, 1777). Among Melville's engraved portraits of children in the French style, I much prefer his copy of Manet's Boy with a Sword (figure 10 in the "Berkshire" essay).

In contrast to the kind of Royal patronage that brought Zuccherelli's Waterfall into England's Royal Collection is the much broader public for which Melville's copies of landscapes after L. Francia, T. Creswick, and A. W. Callcott were engraved. The engraving Melville acquired after Louis Francia's drawing of St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall (figure 17) was published in The Beauties of England and Wales in 1801. This twenty-five volume compilation, issued alphabetically by county between 1801 and 1813, published topographical engravings of picturesque views throughout England and Wales, accompanied by descriptive

commentary intended for a general audience. Melville appears to have been as interested in these popular depictions as he was in engravings intended more exclusively for wealthy patrons of the fine arts, for St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall now joins five other engravings from The Beauties of England and Wales that he is known to have collected. One of its co-editors, John Britton, from whose sketch Francis made the drawing of St. Michael's Mount that was engraved by J. Storer, was a key figure in the transition in English taste from the conventionalized Italianate style of Zuchereelli's The Waterfall to the picturesque English style of Francis's St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall, a transition that in turn led to the English Romantic landscape style to be perfected by J. M. W. Turner in the early decades of the nineteenth century. In Melville's collection, the latter style is aptly represented by Turner's own, much more Romantic depiction St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall. Turner has depicted the Mount from exactly the same angle as did Francis, but he has rendered the site magical and almost insubstantial through the light, shade, and motion of a passing storm. These contrasting engravings of St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall illustrate at a glance the transition from the picturesque to the Romantic in English landscape style (as was seen when they were hung side-by-side in the recent exhibition of Melville's Maritime Prints).

Melville's next two English landscapes were engraved from paintings in the Vernon Gallery. Robert Vernon had given more than one hundred sixty English paintings to the English nation in 1847, and all but a few of these paintings were engraved for publication in successive volumes of London's Art-Journal from 1849 to 1854. Vernon wanted to make the art of English painters, especially living ones, as available to the English public as were the Old Masters of other nations whose paintings had long dominated England's Royal Collection and London's National Gallery. In 1849, when Melville visited London for the first time, the Vernon Gallery had been installed adjacent to the National Gallery, enabling him to visit both collections on the same day (NN Journals, December 17, 1849). When Melville returned to London in 1857, the National Gallery had moved to Marlborough House, whose space it now shared not only with the Vernon Gallery but with the Turner Gallery (consisting of unsold paintings from the painter's private gallery that Turner had bequeathed to the British nation at his death in 1851). Melville's otherwise laconic 1857 London Journal records a stimulating visit to the "Vernon and Turner galleries," so all of the engravings that he subsequently acquired after paintings in the Vernon Gallery would have reawakened memories of his visits to that collection in 1849 and again in 1857. The two engravings from the Vernon Gallery in the Melville Chapin collection are T. Creswick's The Way to Church (figure 18) and A. W. Calcott's The Old

65 These included Clew Tor, On the River Dee, Derbyshire (no. 24 in the "Bart Chapin" essay) and St. Mary's, Strathearn; Woburn Abbey, Beds: Richard Wilson's The Chapel at Houghton Le Dale, Northall and Lanlithony Abbey, Monmouthshire (nos. 12-13 in the "Reece" essay).
66 Turner had worked with Louis Francais and Thomas Girtin in Thomas Monrow's Academy in the late 1790s. He made his first drawing of St. Michael's Mount from Francis's viewpoint in 1810, which vision later evolved into his meteorologically active painting of 1834, subsequently engraved by J. Coughlin for The Turner Gallery in 1835. The two engravings, nos. 14 and 15 in the exhibition of Melville's Maritime Prints, are reproduced together on p. 7 of the catalog.
Pier at Littlehampton (figure 19). Each shows the extent to which English landscape style in the nineteenth century had continued to move away from the artificiality of Zuccherelli's Italianate style (and the taste of Royal patrons) toward an English style infused with the "free and natural manner" of the Dutch School (and appealing to taste of a broader middle-class public).

Like Zuccherelli, Creswick shows a spacious landscape on a sunny day, but his painting is much more distinctive in treatment and intriguing in incident even though it is much smaller in size (more a "cabinet" than a "chimney" painting, less than two feet square). In *The Way to Church*, a young woman, in her Sunday

---

70 In addition to the two engravings in the Melville Chapin collection, Melville had acquired a variety of other engravings from the Venetian Gallery. These included two Italian landscapes after Turner (*Venice—the Dogana and The Golden Bough*), English landscapes after John Constable (*The Valley Farm*) and Thomas Stothard (*The Balcony*), and a literary scene after A. W. Ward (*Dr. Johnson in the Atrium of Lord Chesterfield*), all currently at the Berkshire Athenaeum.
best and framed by overhanging trees, is separated from the distant church on the steep hill by two fences, between which is a dark, shadowed space only lightly touched by the day’s bright light. As she prepares to climb over the nearer fence, her attention is drawn to the right by a sight we cannot see (or a sound we cannot hear). In its narrative implication as well as in its sense of place, this image shows how deftly English painters were beginning to graft that which was “free and natural” in the Dutch manner onto what had become conventionally harmonious in the Italian landscape tradition. The commentary that accompanied this engraving in London’s Art-Journal in 1849 allowed that Cresswick may not have “the poetical imagination of Turner” or “the Claude-like classical feeling of Callcott.” Even so, The Way to Church shows “his ardent love for the scenery of his native land, and the happiest talent for placing it on the canvas.” Moreover, this particular scene is “exquisitely engraved by Mr. Bentley” (272), thus making it available to countless readers of the Art-Journal who would not have been likely to see the painting in person.71

71 After publishing engravings of the Vernon Gallery between 1849 and 1854, the Art-Journal then published engravings from England’s Royal Collection (from 1855 to 1860) and from the Turner Gallery (1860 to 1864). In the late 1860s, and again in the late 1870s, Melville had easy access to all of the engravings that had been published in London’s Art-Journal in the library of his friend Everet Deyenkock. There he probably saw for the first time a number of the engravings he would later add to his own collection. See “Swimming through the Art Libraries of Young America,” chapter 3 of Melville and Turner.
A special essay devoted to the English landscapes of Thomas Creswick in the *Art-Journal* in 1854 emphasized his friendship with the late A.W. Callcott, a colleague at England's Royal Academy near whose home he resided. Callcott also enjoyed a hearty friendship with Turner, one of his chief colleagues as an English marine painter from the early 1800s through the 1830s. The friendly rivalry between Callcott and Turner extended from the Royal Academy to the Vernon Gallery, where each was represented by seascape as well as landscape paintings. Melville's engraving after Callcott's *The Old Pier at Littlehampton* combines seascape and landscape. Callcott sometimes based his marine subjects quite closely on Dutch subjects (as in another of his shore scenes that Melville collected), but his subject in *The Old Pier at Littlehampton* is as distinctively English as that of Francia in *St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall* or of Creswick in *The Way to Church*. Callcott exhibited this painting at London's Royal Academy in 1812. Its deeply agitated sea symbolized how profoundly he and Turner were already moving English seascape style from the more static picturesqueness of Francia, with whom they had both worked as young artists in the 1790s. In the words of London's *Art-Journal* in 1851:

> The materials of the picture are of the utmost simplicity, yet they are represented with a grandeur of effect that makes every object important. The time is evening, and the sun is breaking forth after a storm which has agitated the surface of the sea, stirring it into more than ordinary motion. A beautiful warm and watery tone pervades the whole of the work, throwing a transparent mist over the extreme distance, and reflecting on the middle distance, the high lights of the sun's rays; the foreground is perfectly true to nature, while the omission of even the least object introduced would be a loss to the entire composition. (252)

This painting of 1812 was bringing English landscape painting all the way from Zuccherelli's Italianate ethos in the 1760s and Francia's picturesque aesthetic at the turn of the century into a fully-fledged, localized, world-class, national landscape style.

In the context of Melville's collection, Callcott's *Old Pier at Littlehampton* presents a native English equivalent of landscapes that Cuyp and his Dutch contemporaries had painted a hundred and fifty years earlier. Callcott's composition compares to Cuyp's *Landscape, with Ruins of an Old Tower, Foresters and Dogs* in the expanse of its landscape, its well-distributed variety of personages within the landscape, its distinctive treatment of the play of light upon different elements of the landscape (including the flock of sheep in the middle distance), and its attempt to render the distinctiveness of a particular locale. The engraving after Callcott also resembles the engraving after Cuyp as an embodiment of historical change. In Cuyp's *Landscape* the theme of transience is explicit in the *Ruins of an Old Tower* specified in the title of the print. In the case of Callcott's *Old Pier*, that theme was enacted by the passage of time between the painting of the canvas and the engraving of the print. The *Art-Journal* informed its readers in 1851 that "the 'old pier' which Callcott has here painted no longer exists" (240). In Melville's

73 Melville's copy of Callcott's *Sea Shore in Holland*, currently at the Berkshire Athenaeum, is no. 19 in the catalog of Melville's Maritime Prints. This engraving, too, was made from a painting in the Vernon Gallery; authorities differ as to whether Callcott's Dutch model was Ruysdael or van de Velde.
collection, Callcott's wooden pier joined a variety of monasteries, urban buildings, and monumental gates that, after being preserved by an artist's hand, had then been swept away by economic progress or organic decay.74

In the 1830s, English landscape artists such as Turner, Creswick, and Callcott also began to excel in the illustration of literary texts. Turner's illustrations of Samuel Rogers's Italy in 1830 and Poems in 1834 were followed in short order by Callcott's illustrations for Maria Callcott in 1835 and by Creswick's for Oliver Goldsmith in 1841. This major development in English art is represented in the Melville Chapin collection by two separate engravings that Melville acquired after Clarkson Stanfield's 1836 illustrations to Captain Frederick Marryat's The Pirate. In the mid-1830s, Stanfield was generally considered superior to both Turner and Callcott among England's marine painters. The seventeen engravings with which Stanfield illustrated Marryat's adventure story The Pirate 1836 were state-of-the-art in English maritime book illustration in 1836.75 The two engravings in the Melville Chapin collection show Stanfield's versatility in depicting Marryat's pirate ship. Sleeper's Bay; the Pirate getting under weigh (figure 20) introduces the ship to the reader in an absolutely transparent calm. The Capture (figure 21) shows her in dramatic action, attacking an Indiaman on route from Portugal to Goa. Each Stanfield engraving directs the reader to the page number of the story that inspired the image. "Sleeper's Bay," Marryat tells us, is on the west coast of Africa, and the pirate ship "had been a slaver." Calm she may

---

74 Melville's sensitivity to this theme is particularly apparent in the prints currently in the Reese Collection, among which is the 1792 engraving entitled The Gate of the Black Fleece, leading to St. Peter's Street, Carisbrook, lately taken down (no. 24 in the "Reese" essay).

75 Captain Frederick Marryat, The Pirate and The Three Cutters (London: Longmans, 1836). In addition to seventeen illustrations for The Pirate, Stanfield contributed three illustrations for The Three Cutters.
appear, but "Alas! She was fashioned, at the will of avarice, for the aid of cruelty and injustice" (59). To capture the Indiaman, "she ranged up on the quarter of the ship, and up to her main peak soared the terrific black flag, her broadside was poured into the Indiaman, and before the smoke had cleared away there was a concussion from the meeting sides, and the bearded pirates poured upon her decks" (82).

These two illustrations of The Pirate are impressive in themselves, but they are more so when integrated with nine other Stanfield illustrations of the same story that Melville collected, now at the Berkshire Athenaeum. The recent exhibition of Melville's Maritime Prints reunited these eleven prints from the Melville Chapin and the Berkshire collections, along with a twelfth engraving from the Stanfield-Marryat collaboration, now in the Bart Chapin family collection (nos. 21-32 in the catalog of the exhibition).76 In the context of Melville's life as an American writer, the twelve Stanfield engravings after Marryat relate both to his teenage years in Albany (when reading Marryat's stories helped to inspire his going to sea) and his final years in New York (when he returned to the nautical themes of his youth in writing Billy Budd, whose action is set in the English Navy in the same decade as Marryat's The Pirate).77 In the context of Melville's life as a collector of prints, Sleeper's Bay and The Capture bring us full circle from the English engravings of The Enchanted Castle and Cephalus and Proclus with which our examination of the prints in the Melville Chapin collection began.

In less than fifty years of English engraving, the prints in this collection take us from the upper-class refinement and art-historical panache with which
Woollett and Browne had reproduced Claude’s classical Italian landscapes to the middle-class ease and popular-culture enthusiasm with which Stanfield illustrated Marryat’s 1836 pirate story. Stanfield created illustrations for a contemporary story in a popular style with no pretense of appealing to an ultra-refined audience through allusions to specialized knowledge of an art-historical kind. By collecting such popular engravings, in addition to those of more art historical import that are numerically more prominent in the Melville Chapin collection, Melville again shows himself to be exceedingly catholic, as well as refined, in his taste. In this way he again resembles Goethe, who “as a collector ... remained surprisingly free of prejudice” (Gleisberg, 9).

In 1813 Goethe had turned to his print collection as a diversion from the battle then raging, in and near Weimar, to overthrow Napoleon’s occupying army. He had taken great pleasure in putting his prints “in order” by “beginning to place them according to schools and to join the various collections.” In doing so, he had discovered that “in context each sheet becomes instructive, and you have more than you believed” (Gleisberg, 11). The present essay concludes a series of essays in which I have examined “the various collections” in which prints from Melville’s original collection have survived into our own day. I now look forward to the next stage of this work, which will be to “join the various collections” in an integrated account of Melville’s entire collection, to the extent that it can be reconstructed with materials now at hand.28

ADDENDUM

After the death of Mrs. E. Barton Chapin (Jeanette Odgen Thomas), the prints then in her possession from Melville’s collection of art appear to have been divided about equally between her two sons Bart and Melville. The prints in these two fraternal collections have much in common in format (the proportion of framed to unframed engravings), national style (Italian, French, German, and English), and genre (landscape, marine, and literary subjects). The most conspicuous difference in the inventories of the two collections is in number, for I was able to document thirty-seven prints that had once belonged to Melville in the Bart Chapin family collection, but only twenty-one in the Melville Chapin collection. The primary reason for this differential is that some prints from Melville in the latter collection have been mixed with some two hundred other prints in the household collection in such a way that their exact ancestral origin has become impossible to establish. In addition, an unknown number of prints that had once belonged to Melville may be among those that have been distributed over the years among now-distant members of the extended family in a way currently impossible to trace. If the prints that had belonged to Mrs. E. Barton Chapin at the time of her death were distributed equally among her two sons,

28 I am grateful to the Harvard Library Bulletin, under the editorship of Kenneth E. Carpenter, for making room in its pages for a significant portion of this work in its first stage.
that could leave a dozen or more prints in the Melville Chapin collection, beyond the twenty-one in the present inventory of the collection, that may have once belonged to Melville.\footnote{My summary of the circumstances of the separation of Mrs. E. Burton Chapin's collection into those of her sons Burton and Melville is based upon my visits to the former collection in 1994 and 1999 and to the latter collection in 1994, 1997, and 1999, as well as upon conversations with Bart Chapin and his wife Jane and with Melville Chapin and his wife Elizabeth. I am grateful to all four individuals for helping in my attempt to sort out the history of the family collection.}

On the basis of artistic style and potential imaginative association, I have listed in the Addendum to the Inventory those additional prints in the Melville Chapin collection that may once have belonged to Melville but for which insufficient evidence currently exists to justify their inclusion in the inventory. Ishmael listed his "rabble of uncertain, fugitive, half-fabulous whales" at the end of the "Cetology" chapter in the hope that "such a list may be valuable to future investigators, who may complete what I have but here began" (\textit{Moby-Dick}, 144). My motive is essentially the same, hoping that information not currently available will allow future investigators to resolve the status of some of these "uncertain" candidates for inclusion.
INVENTORY OF PRINTS

In this inventory I have recorded all names, titles, and dates as they appear on the engravings themselves. Dimensions are presented in height followed by width. Brackets enclose additional information that I have provided.

LARGE FRAMED ENGRAVINGS AFTER CLAUDE LORRAIN

1. F. Vivares and Wm. Woollett after Claudio Gilee Laurense. *The Enchanted Castle.* From the Original Picture in the Collection of Nathaniel Chauncey, Esq. [Landscape with Psyche and the Palace of Amor, 1664.] Published as the Act directs, 12 March 1782, by Sus' Vivares, No. 13, Great Newport Street. 16½ \( \times \) 22 3/8 in. [Framed; label verso: "from Eleanor M. Metcalf"]

2. [John] Browne after Claude [Lorrain]. [Landscape with Cephalus and Procris reunited by Diana, 1664.] Published 25 March 1779 by John Boydell, Engraver in Cheapside. 17 \( \times \) 22½ in. [Framed]

UNFRAMED ENGRAVINGS AFTER CLAUDE LORRAIN


4. W. French after Claude Lorrain. *Die Flucht nach Egypten / The Flight into Egypt* [from Pastoral Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, 1647]. Dresdener Galerie. 4 1/16 \( \times \) 6 3/4 in.


7. Drawn and etched by E. Joubert after Claude Lorrain. [Pastoral Landscape, from the Collection of Pictures of W. G. Besswell.] London: James Carpenter & Son, Old Bond Street, 1835. 4½ \( \times \) 6 7/8 in.

DELLA BELLA AND WATTEAU

8. J. S. Kütken [after Stefano della Bella]. Untitled portrait of a young man with camel [after the etching *Esclavon tenant un chameau par la bride*, 1649.] 2¾ \( \times \) 3 5/8 in. [Inscribed verso "J. O. T."]; annotations verso "11" and "+"; adhesions on back of print suggest its having been mounted.]


PRINTS AFTER ENGLISH PAINTERS


STANFIELD’S ILLUSTRATIONS FOR MARRYAT’S THE PIRATE

The Melville Chapin Collection


ADDENDUM TO INVENTORY

Some of the prints in the Melville Chapin collection listed below may possibly have belonged to Herman Melville, but current information remains insufficient to merit their inclusion in the above inventory.

One American Print

A1. J. I. Pease after R. C. Woodville. Old '76 and Young '48. From the original picture in the possession of the American Art-Union. American Art-Union 1851. Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1853 by the American Art-Union in the Clerk’s Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New York. Printed by John Dalton. 7 7/16 × 9 5/8 in. [The subject is likely to have interested Melville, and his brother Allan received prints from the American Art-Union, to which he belonged, but Melville’s holdings as currently known include very few American prints, and none from the American Art-Union.]

Three Prints after Dutch Masters

A2. Lavieille after L. Marvy after A. Ostade. The Dutch Household. 6 7/8 × 5 15/16 in. [The subject would have interested Melville, as he owned a similar engraving after the same artist, now at the Berkshire Athenacum, but the title of the work is written on the cardboard frame in a hand that is clearly not Melville’s own.]
A3. Freeman after G. Terburg. Paternal Instruction. 6 7/8 × 5 15/16 in. [This would make a fine mate to an engraving after Terburg now in the Bart Chapin family collection, but the title of this one, too, has been written on the cardboard frame in a hand not Melville’s.]
A4. Wm Baillie. [No title.] From a Painting by Molinaer in the Collection of Wm Baillie, Esq. May the 3, 1774. 15¼ × 12¾ in. [The subject would relate well with other Dutch masters in Melville’s collection, but strong evidence for inclusion is currently lacking.]

One English Topographical Print

A5. James Johnstone, Edinburgh, after [John Bower, Melrose. Melrose Abbey from the South East. Published by John Bower, Melrose. 6½ × 9¾ in. [Subject fits well with English topographical prints currently in the Reese Collection, but again, strong evidence for inclusion is currently lacking.]

Four Small English Prints in a Group of Like Size


[Each of these prints has potential visual or narrative interest to Melville, but they have been preserved as part of a larger group of small engravings that do not seem to so closely match his taste. These two engravings after Leslie would match the one that is currently in the Bart Chapin family collection.]

Various Historical or Mythological Subjects

A10. Charlemagne, a portrait with a brief biography—all in French. 4 7/8 × 4 in. [Of potential interest to Melville, but with no compelling reason to include in above inventory.]
A11. Hieroglyphics of a Christian (Faith & Repentence). [A curiosity of the kind Melville may have acquired, but cannot tell whether handwriting on the face of the print is his.]
A12. Sibylla Persica—a large print with no other identifying information. [Visually would provide an excellent match for Melville’s copy of a Saint Cecilia now at the Berkshire Athenaeum, but has been preserved in the household collection with twenty-one large prints from Boydell’s Shakespeare, wrapped in pages of the New York Times from June 18, 1920, that family tradition does not associate with Melville’s collection.]
A13. T. Woolnoth after Waveman. Her Most Gracious Majesty Caroline, Queen of England. Published June 28th, 1820 by T. Woolnoth, 18 Henry Street, Pentonville [Of possible historical interest, though not so likely visually to be among the prints Melville might have collected.]