



**NINETEENTH-CENTURY EUROPEAN PAINTINGS
AT THE STERLING AND FRANCINE CLARK ART INSTITUTE**

VOLUME ONE

Edited by Sarah Lees

With an essay by Richard Rand
and technical reports by Sandra L. Webber

With contributions by Katharine J. Albert, Philippe Bordes, Dan Cohen,
Kathryn Calley Galitz, Alexis Goodin, Marc Gotlieb, John House,
Simon Kelly, Richard Kendall, Kathleen M. Morris, Leslie Hill Paisley,
Kelly Pask, Elizabeth A. Pergam, Kathryn A. Price, Mark A. Roglán,
James Rosenow, Zoë Samels, and Fronia E. Wissman

Nineteenth-Century European Paintings at the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute is published with the assistance of the Getty Foundation and support from the National Endowment for the Arts.



The Getty Foundation



Produced by the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute
225 South Street, Williamstown, Massachusetts 01267
www.clarkart.edu

Curtis R. Scott, Director of Publications
and Information Resources
Dan Cohen, Special Projects Editor
Katherine Pasco Frisina, Production Editor
Anne Roecklein, Managing Editor
Michael Agee, Photographer
Laurie Glover, Visual Resources
Julie Walsh, Program Assistant
Mari Yoko Hara and Michelle Noyer-Granacki,
Publications Interns

Designed by Susan Marsh
Composed in Meta by Matt Mayerchak
Copyedited by Sharon Herson
Bibliography edited by Sophia Wagner-Serrano
Index by Kathleen M. Friello
Proofread by June Cuffner
Production by The Production Department,
Whately, Massachusetts
Printed on 135 gsm Gardapat Kiara
Color separations and printing by Trifolio, Verona

© 2012 Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute
All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Distributed by Yale University Press, New Haven and London
P. O. Box 209040, New Haven, Connecticut 06520-9040
www.yalebooks.com/art

Printed and bound in Italy
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute.

Nineteenth-century European paintings at the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute / edited by Sarah Lees ; with an essay by Richard Rand and technical reports by Sandra L. Webber ; with contributions by Katharine J. Albert, Philippe Bordes, Dan Cohen, Kathryn Calley Galitz, Alexis Goodin, Marc Gotlieb, John House, Simon Kelly, Richard Kendall, Kathleen M. Morris, Leslie Hill Paisley, Kelly Pask, Elizabeth A. Pergam, Kathryn A. Price, Mark A. Roglán, James Rosenow, Zoë Samels, Fronia E. Wissman.

volumes cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-935998-09-9 (clark hardcover : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-0-300-17965-1 (yale hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Painting, European—19th century—Catalogs. 2. Painting—Massachusetts—Williamstown—Catalogs. 3. Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute—Catalogs. I. Lees, Sarah, editor of compilation. II. Rand, Richard. III. Webber, Sandra L. IV. Title. V. Title: 19th-century European paintings at the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute.

ND457.S74 2012

759.9409'0340747441—dc23

2012030510

Details:

TITLE PAGE: John Constable, *Yarmouth Jetty* (cat. 73)

OPPOSITE COPYRIGHT PAGE: Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot, *Bathers of the Borromean Isles* (cat. 89)

PAGE VIII: Pierre-Auguste Renoir, *Woman Crocheting* (cat. 267)

PAGE X: Claude Monet, *Seascape, Storm* (cat. 222)

PAGE XII: Jacques-Louis David, *Comte Henri-Amédée-Mercure de Turenne-d'Aynac* (cat. 103)

PAGE XVI: William-Adolphe Bouguereau, *Nymphs and Satyr* (cat. 33)

PRECEDING PAGE 2: Jean-Léon Gérôme, *Snake Charmer* (cat. 154)

of people. Rather than giving a detailed architectural view, Boudin captures the impression of busy French street life. KAP

PROVENANCE James Reid Wilson, Montreal (d. 1914); probably Stevens Art Gallery, Montreal;² [Knoedler, New York, sold to Clark, 21 Apr. 1945]; Robert Sterling Clark (1945–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS Williamstown 1956a, no. 84, pl. 1; Williams-town 1990b, no cat.; Rouen 2010, pp. 320–21, no. 91, ill.

REFERENCES Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 1963, no. 2, ill.; Schmit 1973, vol. 3, p. 325, no. 3468, ill., as *Rouen. La Rue Saint-Romain*.

TECHNICAL REPORT This small panel, 0.6 cm thick, judged to be poplar wood during a 1982 examination, has the grain running vertically. There is a slight concave warp along the left side of the picture and a dent in the lower right corner. An old check near the top edge was stabilized with adhesive in 1982. The panel has narrow chamfers along the back edges, which remain despite the panel being thinned in preparation for cradling. The varnished mahogany cradle, which fits within the chamfers, has four fixed members with beaded edges and five sliding bars which are all still movable. When the painting was tested for the 1982 cleaning, solvent sensitivity was noted on many dark colors. Patchy ultraviolet light fluorescence reveals the partial cleaning done at that time. There are scattered small retouches and some frame abrasion along the upper edge.

The off-white ground was applied in one or two layers. The underdrawing, which may be charcoal, is not particularly discernible, being visible only along the spire or turret at the end of the street. A greenish wash, visible in low magnification in many passages, may have been used to lay in the various forms. The paint is a combination of thick opaque strokes and scumbles, only some of which are wet-into-wet, indicating that perhaps more than one sitting was used to complete the picture. The painting was signed after the paint had set. Slight paint adjustments can be seen in the turret and rooflines at the end of the street, and in two figures in the crowd whose head positions were lowered by applying gray paint over sections of their red and green hats.

1. Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.1914.
2. A letter in the curatorial file from F.D. Chapman, Esq., Montreal, states that the works in Wilson's collection were divided among the four heirs of his estate. A label on the back of the painting indicates that the picture was at one time with Stevens Art Gallery, owned by Frank Stevens and located on Drummond Street in Montreal. It is unclear whether Wilson purchased the painting from Stevens or it ended up at the gallery after Wilson's death.

William-Adolphe Bouguereau

French, 1825–1905

33 | *Nymphs and Satyr* 1873

Oil on canvas, 260.4 x 182.9 cm
Lower left: W-BOVGVEREAV-1873
1955.658

“Really I know of no picture of a big composition which is finer in America.” “And what a beautiful picture for drawing paint & composition!!!!” “One likes it better each time one sees it.” “The ideal of female loveliness in the nude & admirably composed—Line marvellous—Bouguereau at his best was a superlative artist!!!!”¹ These few remarks regarding William Bouguereau's large painting *Nymphs and Satyr*, culled from Robert Sterling Clark's voluminous diaries, attest to the collector's keenness of eye and independence of vision. His criteria for buying a work of art were few: good craftsmanship, above all; good value for his money; and Francine's approval. That the subject matter and scale of *Nymphs and Satyr* departed from the small, intimate landscapes, still lifes, and genre scenes that formed the bulk of his collection did not constitute for him an anomaly. It was a good painting, it was available, and so he bought it.

At 2.6 meters tall and 1.8 meters wide, *Nymphs and Satyr* is the largest painting in the Clark's collection and depicts four nymphs—water-loving creatures—attempting to drag a satyr—a creature of the forest—into a woodland pool. The recent thinning of the varnish layers (see Technical Report) allows the viewer to see the painting as the artist intended. Most significantly, light is now a major component of the picture. Sunlight falls through foliage on a shoulder here, an arm there. These highlights combine to create a luminous arabesque that encircles the faces in the middle of the composition. Bouguereau's masterly skill in depicting flesh is displayed to the full here. Palpably conveyed are the force in the nymph's fingers behind the satyr's head, the pressure of another nymph's thumb on his arm. His hands, too, merit scrutiny: the right one, if not reaching for at least extending toward the breast of the foremost nymph, as much as the left one, gilded by light. Details previously obscured by the varnish are now better seen. Three nymphs at the far right are twinned by their reflections in the water, and the pelt over the satyr's



shoulder whips out behind him, the skin underside toward the viewer. Underlying this technical finesse is a firm sense of structure. The limbs of the actors are carefully disposed: upraised arms at right and left provide a pinwheel dynamism to the solidly planted legs below. The arms of the nymphs and the satyr form a horizontal vector that directs attention away from the satyr and toward the nymphs, who, it should be noted, are more playful than in earnest. A final note of artificiality is the silky swath of coy drapery that winds through the middle of the painting.

The painting had hung for almost twenty years in the bar of the Hoffman House Hotel, on Broadway at Madison Square in New York City. Edward S. Stokes, the owner from 1882 to 1901, used it as a trademark both for his hotel and for cigars.² Clark had first been shown the canvas in 1934, when he went to Manhattan Storage to see about cellaring his wine there. At that time, recognizing it as the picture that had hung in the Hoffman House bar, he thought its rightful place was “in a good museum or in some public building.”³ Several years later, when the picture became available through the attorney of an estate, Clark considered buying it to present to La Rochelle, Bouguereau’s hometown.⁴ Once he owned the painting, Clark exhibited it to raise money for the Fighting French Relief Committee, for twenty-five cents admission.

The painting’s early twentieth-century provenance and long residence in Manhattan Storage are not easily explained. Research to date has not clarified how the painting came to be in the possession of Daniel J. Leary, from whose estate Clark bought the picture. Leary’s father, James, had been a major stockholder in the Hoffman House Hotel Company and had for a time been named one of Stokes’s executors. Stokes had been a litigious man, and his estate was encumbered by litigation,⁵ and Leary and his family followed suit, leaving the precise ownership history of the painting unclear.⁶ The painting may have languished in storage because of ongoing legal complications or because its size and subject matter made it unsuitable for hanging in a private home.

Bouguereau’s name was synonymous in his day, as in ours, with paintings of voluptuous female nudes. His paintings of clothed figures, often young girls, have been criticized for their sentimentality and not-so-veiled sexuality. Regardless of the subject, Bouguereau’s works are characterized by his superb technique, smooth to the point that the brushstrokes are almost invisible. The contemporaneous term was

leché, “licked.”⁷ In part, this effect was obtained by his “simple and direct” style. “Tones are obtained without over-painting or glaze. No attempt is made at extreme richness or quality. That which expresses in the simplest and clearest manner his idea, is the method employed.”⁸ Bouguereau’s facility was criticized during his lifetime. The same, even touch fashioned everything he painted—flesh, foliage, water. Worse than this “fixed and stereotyped suavity of touch for all subjects and all textures,”⁹ according to Frank Fowler, was the artist’s avoidance of real life. “He made *pictures* of things, not characteristic impressions which were felt as human situations humanly observed. . . . And as the end is merely pictorial, there was little need of Bouguereau exhausting himself on intense preoccupation and study of the myriad aspects of the natural world under varying conditions.”¹⁰

If Bouguereau’s intent had been to present the viewer with “a page of life,”¹¹ then Fowler’s criticism would be justified. Bouguereau, however, was not interested in the life he saw around him but in the subject matter and ideals of history painting and its offshoot, picturesque genre. A major painting such as *Nymphs and Satyr*, exhibited in the Salon of 1873, was the result of numerous graphite sketches, of both individual figures and the group, plus a small painted study.¹² Such assiduous preparation was typical of Bouguereau’s approach, following the training he received at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris. Using this method suited his temperament and vision, and it made him rich and successful. Fowler’s criticism would have baffled the artist. If nothing else, Bouguereau’s paintings found ready buyers. John Wolfe of New York bought this one on 26 June 1873, at the end of the Salon that year, and took it to New York, where it joined his collection that was weighted toward anecdotal genre painting.

Because of the importance of the painting, it was included in Earl Shinn’s survey of American collections at the end of the nineteenth century. Writing as Edward Strahan, Shinn grudgingly paid respect to the French painter in describing the work in detail:

The Bouguereau in the Wolfe collection is so unexpectedly fine an exception that one is tempted to drop the lance which habitual prejudice puts into the hand of anybody who is taken to admire a Bouguereau. It is the “Satyr and Nymphs” (5 x 10 feet,) painted in 1873. Four or five life-size women of the woods

have caught a goat-faced satyr at a disadvantage, and are pulling him into the water by the arms, the ears and the horns. Here are forms of real rounded relief and precipitate action, a wonderful achievement for Bouguereau; here are real windy, balancing trees to form a dark relief for them; the whole combination of life and spirit being so striking that the eye, in high good-humor, is ready to bear witness that the skins of the people are really palpitating and compressible in this case—not Bouguereau parchments scraped down with a razor. The foremost woman is particularly well designed; she really seems to be moving spiritedly away from the spectator, as her polished back leans toiling towards the victim she has seized; her elastic feet grasp the bank along which she climbs, and the light, attracted and cajoled by the long wedge of tempting white flesh, slides gaily down to the eye along the ivory incline of her form, from the head that leans into the background, over the slippery back of her limbs, with their rounded, straining muscles. The trouble with the picture is that the people are ladies, not Mænads or Bacchantes. Their undressing is accidental or prurient, not ignorant. Look at any of their faces, and you feel that they need not insult your reason by pretending not to know how to write modern French and read the fashion-newspaper.¹³

Shinn, like Clark, focused on the foremost nymph (“marvellous nude especially the back of one”¹⁴) and, like other critics, saw in the models contemporary French women (“thin and elegant like ‘Parisiennes de high life’”¹⁵). But how else, one wonders, could they look?

Despite the painting’s popularity, what it means is open to question. It could be as simple as the scenario suggested by the verses from the Roman poet Statius (c. 45–96 C.E.) that appeared in the Salon catalogue: “The water was too deep for him. / He’d never learned to swim; his shaggy hide / would soon get waterlogged.” As a joke, the nymphs are going to give the satyr a dunking. Yet, given satyrs’ reputation for concupiscence, the nymphs’ intent could well be to reverse the traditional roles of the sexes. Usually, satyrs are depicted as the sexual aggressor. Earlier lines in Statius’s poem describe the satyr as “sure of consummation,” “inflamed,” “loom[ing] above his



Fig. 33.1. Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (French, 1827–1875), *The Dance*, c. 1868. Limestone, 430 x 298 x 145 cm. Musée d’Orsay, Paris

prey” (2.21–23).¹⁶ Bouguereau did not hew closely to Statius’s story. Judging from the triumphantly upraised arm of the nymph at the upper right, the satyr is a prize the quartet will share with the nymphs seen at the farther side of the water at the right. This is one of the few paintings by Bouguereau to treat overt sexuality between adults. When Stokes bought the picture, he realized that he could use it to good advantage in the Hoffman House Hotel. By hanging *Nymphs and Satyr* in his bar, he offered his patrons an unparalleled object of fantasy wish fulfillment, one, moreover, made acceptable both by its classicizing subject and by its academic imprimatur.¹⁷

Early in the painting’s genesis, the artist experimented with a horizontal composition.¹⁸ The sketches exploring this orientation show female figures that are more forceful, more muscular, and more intent on their task than the nymphs in the final version. Rather than truly pulling and pushing the satyr, as they are shown

in the sketches, the painted nymphs gesture in dance-like poses. Shortly after Clark bought the painting he wrote in his diary about the “influence of Carpeaux—Same coiffure & faces very much resembling those of Carpeaux in ‘La Danse.’”¹⁹ Clark’s astute visual memory linked a piece of sculpture decorating the lower right façade of the Opéra in Paris by Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux (fig. 33.1) with his painting. In both works, nude female figures circle a male figure; in both, an upraised arm expresses triumph and forms a visual pivot around which the group revolves. Carpeaux’s sculpture, with the other works decorating the façade of the Opéra, was first seen by the public on 25 July 1869.²⁰ Between then and when Bouguereau began preparing for his huge canvas, probably sometime in 1872, he would have seen Carpeaux’s figures countless times. Faces and hairstyles aside, Bouguereau’s nymphs and satyr are perhaps an unconscious echo of Carpeaux’s exuberant group.

Clark’s coup of 1942 continues to unsettle the viewer. Art historians frequently use Bouguereau as a foil against which to play the non-academic Impressionists, acting as if popularity were a sign of bad art. Bouguereau, though, was a keen student of public taste. Carroll Beckwith explained in 1890:

*The spirit of the severe classic period is too cold and abstract for Bouguereau’s more amiable artistic nature. Le juste milieu, among extremes of temperament and method, is the course of this able master. Here may lie the secret of his great popularity. The public does not like the jar and shock of temperaments like Tintoretto or Courbet. A suave and graceful style, so harmoniously attuned to popular thought that insensibly it elevates to an atmosphere not cold enough to give a chill, yet above the commonplace, improves public taste and gains many warm adherents.*²¹

The collector, as upper class as he was, may be given the last word: “Fact is, I believe, that really at least 3/4 of the American population would really prefer a nice Bouguereau to any other kind of art.”²² FEW

PROVENANCE The artist, sold to Wolfe, 26 June 1873; John Wolfe, New York (1873–82, his sale, Leavitt & Co., New York, 5–6 Apr. 1882, no. 96, sold to Stokes); Edward S. Stokes, New York (1882–d. 1901); James D. Leary, New York (probably 1901–d. 1902); Daniel J. Leary, New York, his son, by descent

(probably 1902–d. 1942); estate of Daniel Leary (in 1942, sold to Herbert H. Elfers, 5 June 1942, as agent for Clark); Robert Sterling Clark (1942–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS Paris 1873, no. 156, as *Nymphes et satyres*; New York 1943a, no cat.; Williamstown 1959b, ill.; New York–San Francisco 1974–75, no. 9, ill. (exhibited in New York only); Paris–Montreal–Hartford 1984–85, pp. 182–86, no. 51, ill. (exhibited in Montreal and Hartford only); Williamstown 1985b, no cat.; Williamstown 1988c, no cat.

REFERENCES Castagnary 1873, p. 92; Claretie 1873, pp. 91–92; Montifaud 1873, p. 188; Lafenestre 1873, pp. 491–92; *Revue des Deux Mondes* 1873, pp. 634–35; Strahan 1879–80, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 54, 64, ill.; Fontain n.d.; Vendryes 1885, pp. 47–49, ill. (print after the painting); *Connoisseur* 1887, pp. 46–47; Stranahan 1888, p. 405; Vachon 1900, p. 151, ill. opp. p. 4; *Masters in Art* 1900–1909, vol. 7, p. 419; Letts 1907, p. 17, ill.; *New York Herald Tribune* 1943, ill.; *New York Times* 1943, p. 50; Randolph 1943, p. 54, ill.; Crowninshield 1943, pp. 34–35, 86, ill.; Riley 1943, pp. 5, 26, ill. on cover; Cortissoz 1943; *Art News* 1943, pp. 7, 15, ill.; *Time* 1943, p. 54, ill.; Venturi 1945, pp. 162–65, fig. 37; Gammell 1946, p. 53, pl. 20; *Cue* 1948, pp. 12–14, ill.; Venturi 1950b, pp. 141–43, fig. 37; Klossowski 1960, p. 114, ill.; Canaday 1962, p. 211, ill.; Wells 1962, p. 38, ill.; Carson 1963, pp. 26–27; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 1963, no. 4, ill.; *Art Times* 1964, p. 7, ill.; Ashbery 1967, p. 46; Burolet 1967, p. 88, ill.; Merivale 1969, p. 256, no. 13, pl. 11; GBA Suppl. 1969, p. 6, ill.; Perdigão 1969, pp. 71, 73–74, ill. (3rd rev. ed., p. 84, ill.); Blunden and Blunden 1970, p. 119, ill.; Lucie-Smith 1972, pp. 120–21, fig. 128; Richardson 1973, p. 74, fig. 88 (3rd ed., p. 79, fig. 102); Gerdts 1974, pp. 103–4, fig. 6-1; Spaeth 1975, p. 197; Jullian 1976, p. 23, ill.; Macmillan 1977, p. 238, ill.; Norman 1977, pp. 46–47, ill.; Osborne 1978, p. 134, fig. 27; Harding 1979, p. 21, ill.; Banks 1979, p. 59, ill.; Croix and Tansey 1980, pp. 772, 774, fig. 21-61; Sinclair 1981, p. 11, ill.; Brooks 1981, pp. 48–49, no. 20, ill.; Trucco 1981, p. 8; Lack 1982, pp. 1, 4–5, ill.; Faison 1982, p. 322, fig. 257; Banner 1983, pp. 111, 155, fig. 12; McConkey 1983, p. 108, fig. 5; Jeromack 1984, pp. 27–28, ill.; Clark 1984, p. 123, fig. 48; Wernick 1984, pp. 129, 131, ill.; White 1984, p. 166; Horowitz 1985, pp. 173–74, fig. 11-17; Hunter and Jacobus 1985, pp. 17–18, fig. 16; Néret 1985, p. 129, fig. 142; Ocvirk 1985, p. 13, ill.; Pelfrey and Pelfrey 1985, p. 131, fig. 5.18 (rev. ed., p. 130, fig. 15.15); Brooke 1985–86, p. 145, ill.; Fichner-Rathus 1986, pp. 325–26, fig. 12-16; Lipton 1986, pp. 183–85, ill.; Pichon 1986, p. 182, ill., and ill. on cover and slipcase; D’Emilio and Freedman 1988, fig. 23; Fisher and Zelanski 1988, pp. 56, 71, fig. 1.53; Brooks 1989, pp. 6–7, fig. 5 (French ed., pp. 69, 71, fig. 7); Gammell 1990, p. 3, ill.; Tumasonis 1990, p. 60, fig. 50; Adams 1990, p. 79, fig. 29; Grateloup 1990, p. 331, ill.; Néret 1990, p. 101, ill.; King 1991, p. 427, ill.; Weinberg 1991, p. 250, pl. 260; Homer 1992, p. 36, fig. 31; Smith 1995, p. 12, fig. 4; Stokstad 1995,

pp. 982–83, 1017, fig. 27 (rev. ed., vol. 2, p. 985, fig. 27-7); Lewis and Lewis 1995, p. 340, fig. 14-29; White 1996, pp. 59, 85, ill.; Leppert 1996, pp. 240–43, 308n50, fig. 9.8; Wissman 1996, p. 90, pl. 58; Van Hook 1996, p. 33, fig. 12; Jeromack 1996, p. 87; Kern et al. 1996, pp. 60–61, ill.; *Dictionary of Art* 1996, vol. 10, p. 10; Brooke 1997, p. 503, pl. 3; Lubin 1997, pp. 384–87, fig. 5; Bisbort 1999, p. 17, ill.; Rubin 1999, fig. 18; Sotheby's 1999, p. 114, fig. 2; Munson 2000, pp. 199–201, ill.; Rosenberg et al. 1999, vol. 3, pp. 755–56, ill. (French ed., vol. 2, pp. 703–4, ill.); Berman 2001, pp. 46–47, ill.; Leppert 2001, pp. 270–72, ill.; Néret 2001, p. 300, ill.; Peluso 2001, p. 18-D; Cahill 2002, pp. 50–57, ill.; Gallati 2002, p. 111, ill.; Watts 2003, pp. 36–37, 179–80, fig. 4; Baldassari and Mojana 2004, pp. 107, 114, ill.; Blackburn 2004, p. 101, fig. 7; House 2004, p. 209, pl. 179; Andersen 2005, pp. 86–97, fig. 58; Cahill 2005, p. 15, ill.; McElrath and Crissler 2006, p. 91, ill.; Tulsa–Ocala–Pittsburgh 2006–7, p. 24, fig. 8; Williams-town–New York 2006–7, pp. 93–95, 105, 221, 308, figs. 85, 170; Leppert 2007, pp. 122–26, no. 3.13, ill.; Bartoli 2010, vol. 1, p. 220, pl. 111, vol. 2, p. 148, no. 1873.01, ill.; Madrid 2010–11, pp. 30–32, fig. 15.

TECHNICAL REPORT The support is a single piece of moderately fine-weight linen having a thread count of 25 threads per cm. A glue-paste and gum elemi linen lining was installed in 1942 by Murray of New York to stabilize the original canvas, which had ripped loose at the top and top left tacking margins. An old short vertical tear runs down from the top edge. Two old bulges in this lining had been treated by injection with adhesive, as evidenced by clusters of needle marks found in the surface. In 2012, the old lining and its adhesive layer were removed and replaced by a linen and Beva 371 lining, which corrected a number of surface deformations. The seven-member softwood stretcher appears to be original. Murray had only partially thinned the original dammar varnish, and then applied a layer of mastic varnish, which eventually turned yellow-brown and became glassy in appearance. The painting was worked on again in 1956 by Miss Testut, who probably surface-cleaned it and possibly added more varnish. The picture was varnished again for a 1984 exhibition using a synthetic resin. In 2012, the 1984 coating was removed and the remaining natural resin layers were carefully thinned. Small fills and inpainting were done around the edges and in scattered internal locations. Some corrective glazing took place in several previously overcleaned locations, including the flesh of several female figures and the white scarf running diagonally through the center.

The ground appears to be a grayish beige color and is commercially applied. Close examination and infrared photography confirmed the use of dark, probably graphite, underdrawing lines for the figures and briefer notations for foliage areas. Slight changes in some figure areas were noted between the drawing and the final paint. The figures seem to have reddish brown outlines and an underlayer of a medium-rich brown tone. The figures and the foliage are built up by applying vehicular, more opaque highlights into thin trans-

parent dark colors and shadows. The background seems to have been painted after the figures were laid in. The use of some glazing and a great deal of scumbling is detectable in the paint film, which has little, if any impastos.

1. RSC Diary, 5 June 1942; 4 June 1942; 12 June 1942, and 13 Mar. 1943.
2. Scobey 2002, pp. 43–44. Thanks to Marc Simpson for this reference.
3. RSC Diary, 9 Mar. 1934. A later diary entry (RSC Diary, 4 June 1942) records: “Asked about the Bouguereau of the Hoffman House . . . of my youth.”
4. RSC Diary, 22 May 1942.
5. *New York Times* 1892, p. 2; *New York Times* 1893, p. 8; *New York Times* 1901a, p. 8; and *New York Times* 1901b, p. 5. I thank Timothy Cahill for the first reference and Sarah Lees for the others.
6. *New York Times* 1914, p. 9. See also Randt 2006. For these citations, too, I thank Timothy Cahill, whose long-standing interest in this painting has been a source of inspiration.
7. Claretie 1873, p. 91.
8. Beckwith 1890, p. 263.
9. Fowler 1905, p. 766.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 767.
11. *Ibid.*
12. For a sampling of these preparatory works, see Paris–Montreal–Hartford 1984–85, pp. 184–91, nos. 52–61.
13. Strahan 1879–80, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 54.
14. RSC Diary, 9 Mar. 1934.
15. Claretie 1873, p. 91: “minces et élégantes comme des Parisiennes de *high life*.”
16. Staius 2004, 2.3, p. 80.
17. See Scobey 2002 for an insightful analysis of how *Nymphs and Satyr* functioned in New York during its sojourn at the Hoffman House Hotel at a time of changing sexual mores.
18. Paris–Montreal–Hartford 1984–85, pp. 187–88, nos. 54–56.
19. RSC Diary, 22 July 1942. It seems unlikely that Clark would have read Jules Claretie's Salon review, where he, too, evokes Carpeaux's sculpture; Claretie 1873, p. 92: “The whole group moreover resembles, vaguely, the famous group by Carpeaux, *The Dance*, of the new Opéra; and the satyr with cloven feet here plays the role of the young man in the piece of sculpture” (“Le groupe tout entier du tableau ressemble d'ailleurs, vaguement, au groupe célèbre de Carpeaux, la *Danse*, du Nouvel-Opéra; et le satyre aux pieds fourchus, joue ici le rôle du jeune homme dans le morceau de sculpture”).
20. Mead 1991, p. 188.
21. Beckwith 1890, p. 263.
22. RSC Diary, 5 Dec. 1924.