



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

VOLUME TWO

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. Rogl an, James Rosenow, Zo  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: Camille Pissarro, *The Louvre from the Pont Neuf* (cat. 253)

OPPOSITE COPYRIGHT PAGE: Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, *Jane Avril* (cat. 331)

PRECEDING PAGE 474: Pierre-Auguste Renoir, *Onions* (cat. 280)

PAGES 890–91: Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, *The Women of Amphis* (cat. 3)

EXHIBITIONS London 1977a, p. 20, no. 20, ill., as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Mexico City–Caracas 1979, no. 8, as *Alfredos de Ransgate?*; Tokyo–Kyōto 1986, p. 122, no. 39, ill., as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Toronto 1995, no cat.; Williamstown 2007a, no cat.

REFERENCES Butlin and Joll 1977, vol. 1, p. 262, no. 479, vol. 2, pl. 484, as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Wilton 1979, pp. 292–93, no. P479, as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Butlin and Joll 1984, vol. 1, no. 479, vol. 2, pl. 480, as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Leger Galleries 1992, p. 142, ill., as *Shipping off Ramsgate*; Wilton 2001, pp. 81–83, no. 23, ill., as *Off Ramsgate (?)*; Williamstown–Manchester–Glasgow 2003–4, p. 128.

TECHNICAL REPORT The support is a moderate-weight canvas having a weave of 16 threads per cm. It has been wax-lined to a canvas having a weave of 16 x 19 threads per cm. An older glue lining may have been replaced by the present, rather dry wax lining, and the tacking margins have long been missing. The six-member stretcher likely dates to the earlier lining. There may be pinholes in all four corners. There is vertical wrinkling in the center of the ocean, as well as overlapped paint. There are vertical splits in the paint in the right foreground and a plowed-up lip of paint along the lower edge from early framing pressure. The paint in the hulk on the left horizon looks abraded, but this could be an intentional wiping technique by the artist. There are many inpainted losses in the green water in the left foreground, as well as old dislodged paint that presents an uneven surface. Some chipping paint seems to be due to interlayer cleavage problems. In 2009, new flaking in this same area was consolidated with Beva 371, and losses and abrasions were filled and inpainted as needed. In ultraviolet light, some of the earlier retouchings look like they are lying below the new varnish, and some fluorescence in the green water may indicate residual old varnish. The surface reflectance is fairly even.

The ground is an off-white commercially applied layer, which shows through in many areas of the image. Infrared viewing of the image suggests that the form in the lower right was sketched with brown ink and a brush, based on its resistance to the oil-based ground layer. The shape or orientation of this detail is also somewhat different than the final image. There is evidence of a possible wreck sketched in to the right of the small figural group, and possibly a small sail on the horizon above the left child. The shape of the pinkish sail is more defined in infrared than in normal light, possibly due to a loss of detail glazes from overcleaning. There are some simple curved diagonal lines along the central horizon. The filled losses in the lower left are also visible in infrared light.

Much of the paint is thin and vehicular, except in the sky, sea foam, sail, and figures. Most impastos are very soft with low rounded profiles, except one odd paint chunk at the far right behind the figures and a second thick deposit at the left top edge. The nearly transparent ship was painted over the finished sky. Some amber-colored pigment in the lower right has broken into islands, possibly indicating high resin content. The paint application in the left clouds looks like

smooth palette-knife work. Black ink or watercolor may have been used in the hulk's broken mast and the shadows in the water below the hull.

1. BJ 385.
2. Christie's 1865, p. 24, no. 205.
3. Wilton 1979, p. 18.
3. Murray 1858, p. 199.
5. BJ 51.
6. BJ 78.
7. Wilton 1979, pp. 355, 387–88, nos. 489 and 757.
8. Wilton 1979, p. 467, nos. 1391 and 1397.
9. Turner 1856, p. 39.
10. London 1977a, p. 20. At the time of the exhibition, Joll did not identify the source of the suggestion that the ship is grounded on Goodwin Sands; he did cite his informant (though not by name) in his and Martin Butlin's catalogue raisonné (Butlin and Joll 1984, vol. 1, p. 292).
11. BJ 475.
12. BJ 478.
13. BJ 386.
14. Wilton 2001, pp. 82–83.
15. A landmark in this interpretation of Turner was Lawrence Gowing's 1966 exhibition, *Turner: Imagination and Reality*, at the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

342 | **Rockets and Blue Lights (Close at Hand) to Warn Steamboats of Shoal Water** 1840

Oil on canvas, 91.7 x 122.3 cm
1955.37

One of the most important works of his final decade, *Rockets and Blue Lights (Close at Hand) to Warn Steamboats of Shoal Water* presents a theme that dominated Joseph Mallord William Turner's entire career. Inaugurating the final phase in Turner's life-long treatment of maritime subjects, *Rockets and Blue Lights* is a key statement of the epic confrontation of nature and industrialism. Moreover, Turner's engagement with scientific theories of color encourages the viewer to connect the artist's personal technique with the chemical process driving the advanced technology of steam power—the transformation of physical states.

Any discussion of this work, however, must take into account its present appearance. Over the years the painting has suffered considerable damage, to the point that much of the surface now visible is in fact the



342

lower layers of Turner's paint, which he would have completed with additional paint and glazes to produce the final work (see Technical Report).¹ Although Turner, particularly in his later work, often used materials and methods that have proven unstable over time, the poor condition of *Rockets and Blue Lights* is particularly pronounced. Some sense of the extent of the damage can be gained by comparing the painting with several reproductions and photographs made at different periods. The earliest of these is a chromolithograph produced by Robert Carrick in 1852, when the painting was owned by William Day, the owner of the lithographic company Day & Son. Although this print is not a direct reproduction of the painting—as Day commented, he chose Carrick as “an artist able to interpret the subtlest beauties and intentions of Turner”—it nonetheless records the printmaker's perception of certain key details in the painting.² The earliest photoreproductive illustrations appear in the Christie's sale catalogue of 1896 and in Sedelmeyer's catalogue of the same year.³ These images all reveal that the plume of steam and smoke

at the right of the canvas emanates from a small but distinct steamboat whose deck is populated by numerous figures. The boat, the figures, and much of the plume are no longer present in the painting. The dark mass of the central boat, along with other details in the water and sky, appears similarly diminished when compared with the early images.

A purported incident, the dramatic story of the painting being hit by a train on its way to the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857, might seem partly to account for its compromised condition. It is clear, however, that this incident can be traced to a misremembered anecdote that William Day described in a letter written more than forty years later to the then-owner James Orrock. In this letter, Day wrote that John Naylor, who owned it at the time, was hesitant to send his contribution to the Manchester show by rail, so instead had his paintings transported by a special van. Day then recounts the irony of the accident in which this specially fitted van was hit by a train at a level crossing.⁴ The correspondence of the Executive

Committee of the Art Treasures Exhibition reveals that, while other works in Naylor's collection were requested and lent, *Rockets and Blue Lights* was not among them.⁵ Moreover, in an exception to their general policy, the Executive Committee agreed to insure Naylor's paintings "against all travelling risks and risk of fire within the Building."⁶ If the wreck had indeed taken place at that time, Naylor would certainly have filed a claim. While this story thus cannot account for the painting's present condition, some other form of accident, whether unintentional damage while in an owner's possession or mishandling in a conservation studio, is likely to have occurred. During its 2002 treatment, the decision was made not to attempt to reconstruct Turner's lost surface, but to leave the painting in its unresolved state.

Although the painting's troubled conservation history has rendered sections of the canvas difficult to read today, contemporary reviews indicate that, even when it was freshly painted, viewers found the work difficult to interpret. In fact, responses to Turner's later works prefigure the equally uncomprehending responses to abstraction in the twentieth century. Turner's increasingly abstract depiction of the natural and man-made world caused conservative critics to respond not just with perplexity but even with animus when the painting was first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1840. At the annual exhibition, *Rockets and Blue Lights* was shown along with six other paintings, including *Slave Ship (Slavers Throwing Overboard the Dead and Dying, Typhoon Coming On)* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston).⁷

The Reverend John Eagles, whose 1836 attack on Turner's technique had spurred the young John Ruskin to come to the artist's defense, continued his 1840 review in a similar vein. Four years before, Eagles had not only critiqued Turner's *Juliet and Her Nurse* (Colección de Arte Amalia Lacroze de Fortabat, Buenos Aires)⁸ and *Mercury and Argus* (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa)⁹ for their "childish execution," but also chastised the Royal Academy Hanging Committee for including the latter.¹⁰ In his 1840 article, Eagles extended his indictment of the institution that admitted Turner's works, claiming that "these absurd extravagances disgrace the Exhibition not only by being there, but by occupying conspicuous places."¹¹

Eagles's denigration of the painting as being "without form and shape" was echoed in the reviews of the *Athenaeum* and the *Art Union*.¹² Although the art critics of both journals commented ironically upon

the title of *Rockets and Blue Lights* and other works by Turner, the former's response was particularly virulent. The *Athenaeum* reviewer noted that the viewer could decipher the subject matter of the visually ill-defined canvas only by knowing its title. Without such a guide, according to this critic, *Rockets and Blue Lights* and *Neapolitan Fisher-Girls Surprised Bathing by Moonlight* (The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino)¹³ would seem to be "spoiled canvasses upon which a painter had been trying the primitive colours."¹⁴ When the painting was shown again a year later at the British Institution, the *Art Union* commented that the painting "would be equally effective, equally pleasing, and equally comprehensible if turned upside down."¹⁵

Even while defending Turner's works, John Landseer recognized the force of these reviews in his self-published *The Probe*. After quoting the most colorful of these passages, Landseer counters that the popularity of the more "literal" Clarkson Stanfield (1793–1867) should not preclude an appreciation of the more "imaginative" or "visionary" Turner.¹⁶ The negative response to *Rockets and Blue Lights* must be understood in the context of the reception of Turner's later works. Although his career had been punctuated by controversial paintings, the works he exhibited at the Royal Academy from the 1830s were generally seen to be a radical departure from the qualities that had contributed to Turner's reputation as an artistic genius. Both Eagles and the *Art Union* allude to Turner's earlier works as counterpoints to the "freaks and follies" and "wildest caprices" of his later career.¹⁷

Although these contemporary critics interpreted the swirling indistinctness of the surf, steam, and warning rockets as indications of Turner's lack of control and random application of color, later scholars have brought to light the theoretical basis of *Rockets and Blue Lights*. In particular, they see the painting as evidence of the artist's knowledge of Goethe's highly influential *Farbenlehre*, which was translated into English by Sir Charles Eastlake in 1840. As James Hamilton has observed, *Rockets and Blue Lights*, together with *Slave Ship*, represents Turner's experimentation with the warm/cold and light/dark juxtapositions proposed by Goethe.¹⁸ Furthermore, Turner had learned from his study of the work of the seventeenth-century French painter Jean-Antoine Watteau how white paint could be used to manipulate perspective.¹⁹ Thus, the swathes of white that encircle the steamboat project the threatened ship forward.

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Turner's application of color theory to his work is in his pairing of color scales not only within a single canvas, but also between two paintings, in order to establish a connection. In the case of *Rockets and Blue Lights*, the cool blues are paired with the hot reds of *Slave Ship*. The theory that the two paintings were exhibited as pendants was first proposed by John McCoubrey in his extended analysis of *Slave Ship*. While McCoubrey emphasizes the paintings' "chromatic" relationship,²⁰ Hamilton argues that the subject matter reinforces the contrasting color scheme. According to Hamilton, *Rockets and Blue Lights* stands as a positive account of the advances in coastal safety, whereas *Slave Ship* depicts an episode from the recent, shameful history of the slave trade.²¹ The juxtaposition of past and present is embodied by the types of boats depicted—the spindly, listing masts in *Slave Ship* seem fragile compared to the smokestack of *Rockets and Blue Lights*, which rises in the center of the canvas.

Nevertheless, both paintings give form to the myriad invisible dangers of the sea, from weather to hidden rocks. Throughout his career Turner made nautical life his subject, and within this general category of seascapes, the shipwreck plays a prominent role.²² The theme of the shipwreck was a favorite one in English Romantic painting, especially with the increased importance of naval power to the island nation's prosperity.²³ Strictly speaking, however, *Rockets and Blue Lights* is not a painting of a shipwreck. Rather, Turner's approach in this work is one of suspended judgment; not only has the fate of the steamboat been left in limbo, but Turner's ultimate verdict on the benefits of industrialization embodied by that boat is also ambiguous.

Scholars have drawn attention to Turner's interest in color theory and optical devices. No one has recognized, however, that the vortex of surf, steam, and warning lights encircling the steamboat replicates the circular view through the telescope held by the figure that Eagles described as looking "a little cindery."²⁴ While Hamilton has identified this figure as the artist himself, in more general terms, this compositional device links the audience depicted on the canvas to the viewers of the painting. By equating the viewing of a painting with the witnessing of the event itself, Turner claims the artist's power to render lived experience into painted emotion. Turner's blurring of the lines between event and representation of the event culminates with *Snow Storm, Steam-Boat off a Harbour's Mouth Making Signals in Shallow Water, and Going by the Lead.*

The Author was in This Storm on the Night the Ariel Left Harwich (1842; Tate Britain, London),²⁵ in which the title establishes Turner's bona fides as an adventurer.²⁶ Moreover, the literal blurring in his later works that the critics reacted so strongly against was central to Turner's challenge to conventional representation.

The initial critical vitriol directed at the painting was not replicated by collectors of Turner. *Rockets and Blue Lights* is distinguished by its presence in some of the most prominent collections of modern British art of the nineteenth century. Charles Birch, John Naylor, and Henry McConnel were from the Midlands and the North (Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester respectively) and they had similar collections, often buying works from each other. In fact, McConnel's purchase of *Campo Santo, Venice* (1842; Toledo Museum of Art)²⁷ in 1863 and *Rockets and Blue Lights* in 1864 was part of his attempt to replace a pair of Turners that he had sold to Naylor in 1849.²⁸

Even during his lifetime, Turner occupied a central place in the pantheon of modern British painters. Although his later works, such as *Rockets and Blue Lights*, were often met with incomprehension, their critical history points to the constant experimentation with technique and representation that mark Turner's career. The outcome of the battle between the forces of nature and technology remains ambiguous in *Rockets and Blue Lights*, but Turner's confidence in his technical powers of representing the struggle is never in doubt. EP

PROVENANCE [Thomas Griffith, London, in 1843];²⁹ Charles Birch, Harborne, Birmingham (by 1850, sold to Day); William Day (1850–52, possibly sold to Birch); Charles Birch (from 1852, sold to Naylor); John Naylor, Leighton Hall, Welshpool (by 1856, sold to Agnew's, 1863);³⁰ [Agnew's, London, in 1863, possibly sold to Graham]; John Graham (1863–64, sold to Agnew's); [Agnew's, London, in 1864, sold to McConnel];³¹ Henry McConnel, Cressbrook, Derbyshire (1864–d. 1871); Trustees of the estate of Henry McConnel (1871–85); Mary McConnel Worthington, his daughter, by descent (1885–86, McConnel sale, Christie's, London, 27 Mar. 1886, no. 77, as *Rockets and Blue Lights, Warning Ships off Shoal Water, Calais*, sold to Agnew's); [Agnew's, London, from 1886]; Sir Julian Goldsmid, London (his sale, Christie's, London, 13 June 1896, no. 54, ill., sold to Agnew's); [Agnew's, London, in 1896]; [Galerie Sedelmeyer, Paris, from 1896]; James Orrock, London (by 1900–1901, sold to Yerkes); Charles T. Yerkes, New York (1901–10, his sale, American Art Association, 5 Apr. 1910, no. 75, sold to Duveen); [Duveen Brothers, New York, 1910–14, sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, in 1914, sold to Eastman]; George Eastman, Rochester (1914–16, returned

to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, in 1916, sold to Schwab]; Charles M. Schwab, New York (1916–after 1928); [Knoedler, New York, sold to Clark, 31 Dec. 1932]; Robert Sterling Clark (1932–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS London 1840, no. 419, as *Rockets and blue lights (close at hand) to warn steam-boats of shoal-water*; London 1841, no. 112, as *Blue Lights (close at hand) to warn Steam-boats of shoal-water*; Birmingham 1850, no. 123, lent by Birch;³² London 1896, no. 122, as *Blue Lights to Warn Steamboats off Shoal Water*, lent by Goldsmid; London 1899a, no. 20;³³ Cardiff 1913, no. 27, as *Rockets and Bluelights*, lent by Duveen; New York 1914, not in cat.;³⁴ Youngstown 1917, no. 1, lent by Schwab; New York 1928b, no. 11, ill., lent by Schwab; Williamstown 1955, no. 37, pl. 24; Williamstown 1958b, pl. 74; Williamstown 1988a, no cat.; Williamstown–Manchester–Glasgow 2003–4, pp. 43–50, 153–54, fig. 27.

REFERENCES *Art Union* 1840, p. 73; *Athenaeum* 1840, pp. 400–402; *Eagles* 1840, p. 384; *Spectator* 1841, p. 139; *Literary Gazette* 1841, p. 92; *Art Union* 1841, p. 29; Burnet and Cunningham 1852, p. 119, no. 207, p. 122, no. 12 (2nd ed., p. 104, no. 209, p. 107, no. 12); Thornbury 1862, vol. 1, p. 381, no. 213 (rev. ed., pp. 579, 597, no. 213); *Art Journal* 1870, p. 286; Redford 1888, vol. 1, p. 428, vol. 2, p. 122; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1896, p. 128, no. 100, ill.; Roberts 1897, vol. 2, pp. 86, 290; Wedmore 1900, vol. 2, p. 258, ill.; Bell 1901, pp. 140–41, no. 223; Armstrong 1902, vol. 2, pp. 121, 147, 228, ill. opp. p. 158; Webber 1903, vol. 1, pp. 103–5; Macfall 1911, p. 33; Rawlinson 1913, vol. 1, p. 415; Townend 1923, p. 86; Falk 1938, p. 250; *Arts Magazine* 1955, p. 15; Frankfurter 1955, p. 31, ill.; Comstock 1955, p. 305, ill.; Seiberling 1959, p. 41, pl. 1; Finberg 1961, pp. 379, 505–6, nos. 535, 538; Urquhart 1963, p. 294; Gimpel 1963, p. 109 (English ed., p. 94); Butlin and Rothenstein 1964, p. 60, pl. 113; New York 1966a, p. 38; Lewis 1966, p. 21, ill.; Lindsay 1966, pp. 185, 200; Agnew's 1967, p. 33; Polley 1967, p. 31; Reynolds 1969a, p. 179, fig. 155; Reynolds 1969b, p. 76, fig. 14; Cordingly 1974, p. 120, pl. 70; Spencer 1975, pp. 184, 202, pl. 11; Morris 1974–75, p. 98, no. 200, fig. 67; Spaeth 1975, p. 198; Andel 1977, p. 5, ill.; Butlin and Joll 1977, vol. 1, pp. 216–17, no. 387, vol. 2, pl. 361; Wilton 1979, p. 285, no. P387, ill.; Chaet 1979, pp. 225–26, fig. 192; Gage 1980, pp. 267, 297; Bachrach 1981, p. 9; Brooks 1981, pp. 34–35, no. 13, ill.; Clay 1981, p. 208, fig. 385; Wilton 1980, p. 153; Faison 1982, pp. 319–20, fig. 253; Mukherjee 1982, p. 42, ill.; Butlin and Joll 1982, p. 207, no. 448, ill.; Dunstan 1983, p. 32, ill.; Butlin and Joll 1984, vol. 1, pp. 238–39, no. 387, vol. 2, pl. 392; Feldman 1985, p. 210, ill.; Gilbert and McCarter 1985, p. 43, fig. 51; Whittingham 1985b, p. 33; Rodner 1986, pp. 466, 469, 472, fig. 5; Treuherz 1986, p. 41, fig. 6; Gage 1987, p. 230, fig. 314 (chromolithograph after the painting); Hermann 1987, p. 24; Wilton 1987, pp. 208, 242 (rev. ed., p. 242); Nicholson 1988, pp. 46–47, fig. 3; Lukacher 1990, p. 126; Phoenix–Indianapolis 1993, pp. 119–20, ill.; MacDonald 1995, p. 53, under no. 176; Allen 1996, ill.; Kern et al.

1996, pp. 42–43, ill.; *Antiques* 1997, p. 522, ill.; Adelson 1997, pp. 45–46, fig. 2; Clark and Healy 1997, ill. on cover; Hamilton 1997, pp. 281–82, 285–86, 289, ill. bet. pp. 238–39; Rodner 1997, pp. 75–78, 82, 83, fig. 32; Allen 1998, p. 34, ill.; McCoubrey 1998, pp. 332–33, fig. 9; New York 1999, pp. 106, 108; Venning 2003, pp. 251, 265, ill.; Hamilton 2003, pp. 10–12; Greenhalgh 2003, pp. 13–15, ill.; Meslay 2004, p. 101, ill.; Wilton 2004, pp. 191–92, fig. 54; Cahill 2005, p. 72, ill.; Williamstown–New York 2006–7, pp. 26–27, fig. 12; Washington–Dallas–New York 2007–8, pp. 187, fig. 36; Madrid 2010–11, pp. 26–27, fig. 12; Gage 2010, pp. 320–21, 350–51, figs. 255, 279.

TECHNICAL REPORT The support is a linen layer of inaccessible thread count, due to a thick, smooth-surfaced off-white ground layer and the presence of a lining. The existing lining is a moderate-weight (16 threads/cm), commercially primed canvas, attached with gelatin to the unprimed side of the fabric. This lining was executed by William Suhr between 1962 and 1965 to replace two thick glue-paste linings, which he removed. His treatment also addressed widespread inter-layer cleavage, with delamination occurring between paint layers, between the paint and ground, and between layers of the ground. The ground is apparently impenetrable by adhesives, and the surface had already been damaged by heat associated with the earlier linings. Indeed, blistering from earlier treatments is still visible in the headland and the nearby waves. The painting was apparently treated in 1947 by De Wild, including some varnish removal. It seems likely that the picture also underwent at least some treatment in the early twentieth century, when it passed through the hands of several dealers and collectors. The presence of only one faint vertical stretcher crease in the center may indicate that the painting was lined early in its history, before any other creases had the opportunity to form. This suggests that the picture may have sustained losses and undergone a major restoration in the nineteenth century.

The paint layer has widely scattered wandering age cracks and a bull's-eye network from a blow to the right of the wide white reflection. Traction cracks can be seen in the transparent reddish-brown passages, possibly from the use of bitumen. There is considerable solvent erosion of details and paint strokes, probably the result of several cleanings. The transparency of the greens and browns suggest that they have a resin component, making these colors more vulnerable to solvents. There is also evidence of the partial friction cleaning, some new fills, and retouchings done by Suhr after he had completed setting down all the lifted paint from the front, reportedly with gelatin. The stretcher is a replaced six-member mortise-and-tenon design in mahogany, which may date to Suhr's treatment or to a previous, unrecorded restoration. Aside from repeated treatments for flaking, the painting seems not to have undergone major cleaning or restoration work after Clark's 1932 purchase. In 2002, the painting was treated by David Bull, New York, who removed considerable discolored varnish and overpaint, revealing original, though

damaged, paint layers. The decision was then made not to attempt to fully restore the painting; instead, as ultraviolet light examination shows, islands of original color within the large losses were toned to match the remaining lower layer of paint.

Examination of the paint surface using magnification, ultraviolet light, and infrared reflectography reveals that large portions of the upper half of the picture are now displaying Turner's underlayer of paint. This condition was not primarily caused by past over-cleaning, but by actual delamination or flaking off of the upper, final, paint layers. This includes most of the right third of the sky above the crest of the wave, parts of the central upper sky, and a considerable portion of the left sky, including the top of the pale tower and the entire area to its left. Under magnification the loss outlines are detectable in sharp-edged level changes, which are further defined where deep cracks suddenly change to thin faint ones as they pass into the thinner paint zones. Some of these large areas of loss contain islands of original paint, which appear to have been further undermined by solvents. Examination in infrared reflectography reveals that in several locations where the damages come to a focal point, or stopping area, there seem to be darkened tide lines. This suggests that the canvas may have experienced water or other liquid damage, possibly as the result of an accident or of an early cleaning or consolidation attempt.

1. See Greenhalgh 2003 for a description of the conservation process undertaken in 2002.
2. See Webber 1903, pp. 103–4, for Day's description of commissioning the print. The Victoria and Albert Museum, London, holds a copy of the print, which is reproduced in black and white in Greenhalgh 2003, p. 12.
3. Christie's 1896, no. 54; Sedelmeyer Gallery 1896, no. 100.
4. Webber 1903, vol. 1, pp. 104–5. Martin Butlin and Evelyn Joll lend their authority to the story by including it in their catalogue raisonné (Butlin and Joll 1984, vol. 1, p. 238) and the story is repeated by Olivier Meslay in *Turner: L'incendie de la Peinture* (Meslay 2004, p. 101).
5. Naylor contributed seven paintings, including Turner's *Cologne, the Arrival of a Packet-Boat: Evening* of 1826 (The Frick Collection, New York; BJ 232) and "*Now for the Painter*" (*Rope*)—*Passengers Going on Board* of 1827 (Manchester Art Gallery; BJ 236) to this groundbreaking exhibition.
6. Hamilton to R. H. Grundy, 15 Apr. 1857 (Manchester Central Library General Out-Letter Book M6/2/4/3/866).
7. BJ 382–86, 388.
8. BJ 365.
9. BJ 367.
10. Eagles 1836, p. 551; reprinted in Holt 1979, p. 354.
11. Eagles 1840, p. 384; reprinted in Williamstown–Manchester–Glasgow 2003–4, p. 139.
12. Ibid.
13. BJ 388.
14. *Athenaeum* 1840, p. 400.
15. *Art Union* 1841, p. 29.
16. See Hermann 1987, p. 26. Landseer's *Probe* articles concerning Turner's work are reprinted in Hermann 1987, pp. 21–28.
17. *Art Union* 1840, p. 73.
18. Williamstown–Manchester–Glasgow 2003–4, p. 58.
19. Whittingham 1985b, p. 33.
20. McCoubrey 1998, pp. 332–33.
21. Williamstown–Manchester–Glasgow 2003–4, p. 47. Hamilton notes that Turner regularly paired paintings in this period: "In the late 1830s and the 1840s Turner's use of the pendant form became a characteristic of his art and exhibiting stance" (ibid., p. 43).
22. For a consideration of Turner in the context of the British tradition of seascapes, see Cordingly 1974, pp. 117–21. For Turner's treatment of the theme in his early career, see Birmingham 2003–4. For the representation of the sea as an aspect of Turner's interest in the sublime, see Wilton 1980, pp. 145–54. In the most recent interpretation of Turner's sea pieces, Hamilton argues that Turner treated the "inescapable horizontal" of the sea as "an extension of the stage" (Hamilton 2003, p. 8).
23. The classic analysis of this theme is Boase 1959, pp. 332–46.
24. Eagles 1840, p. 384.
25. BJ 398.
26. For an analysis of this painting, see Lukacher 1990, pp. 119–37.
27. BJ 397.
28. These were *Venice: The Dogana and San Giorgio Maggiore* of 1834 and *Keelmen Heaving in Coals by Moonlight* of 1835 (both National Gallery of Art, Washington; BJ 356 and 360, respectively).
29. In 1843, John Ruskin refers to the picture as owned by Griffith. John Ruskin to William Wethered, 12 Dec. 1843, Victoria and Albert Museum, Pye MSS, 86.FF.73.
30. Most of the early provenance comes from Butlin and Joll 1984, p. 238, who note that Naylor made an inventory of his pictures in 1856, and probably acquired this picture between 1854 (when he lent his other Turners, but not this one, to an exhibition) and 1856. See also Morris 1974–75, and a letter from the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, 10 Apr. 1973, in the Clark's curatorial file.
31. Butlin and Joll 1984, p. 238, list the painting in Graham's collection until 1864; Allen 1996 states that McConnel bought it from Agnew's in 1863.
32. Butlin and Joll 1984, p. 238.
33. Ibid.
34. Although this painting is not in the catalogue, a sketch in the back of the copy in the Clark's library showing the gallery layout indicates a painting identified as "R+BL" hung opposite Turner's *Wreckers—Coast of Northumberland, with a Steam-Boat Assisting a Ship off Shore* of 1833–34 (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven; BJ 357).