



**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)

Not only were flowers popular in horticulture, but they were also often seen in the literature of the second half of the nineteenth century as both object and symbol.³ Perhaps this was why Fantin-Latour was highly praised by the writers of his day, including Charles Baudelaire and Joris-Karl Huysmans, and is mentioned posthumously in Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time: The Guermantes Way* (1920–21), where Fantin-Latour's flower paintings are specifically referenced.

The collector Charles Ricada, depicted several times by Fantin-Latour, bought *Roses in a Bowl and Dish* directly from the artist. Ricada introduced Fantin-Latour to Gustave Tempelaere, who became his dealer in 1887. KAP

PROVENANCE The artist, sold to Charles Ricada, Paris (until 1893, his sale, Drouot, Paris, 20 Mar. 1893, no. 66, as *Roses*);⁴ [Gustave Tempelaere, Paris]; Émile Chouanard, Paris (by 1906); [F. & J. Tempelaere, Paris]; Alfred Pacquement, Paris; [F. & J. Tempelaere, Paris, sold to Clark, 21 Apr. 1936, as *Roses de toutes couleurs*]; Robert Sterling Clark (1936–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS Paris 1906, no. 122, as *Roses*, lent by Chouanard; London 1934, no. 27, ill., as *Roses épanouies*; Amsterdam 1935, no. 36, ill., as *Roses épanouies*; Williamstown 1956a, pl. S-11; New York 1967, no. 13.

REFERENCES Fantin-Latour 1911, p. 125, no. 1215, as *Roses*; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 1963, no. 55, ill.; Young 1967, p. 383; Lucie-Smith 1977, p. 161.

TECHNICAL REPORT The support is a light-weight weave canvas whose thread count is inaccessible due to the present lining. This glue lining is the second on the picture, probably done during a treatment in 1940 by Mr. Murray. It has an open-weave fabric of 16 x 22 threads per cm and the five-member stretcher may be original. The picture was cleaned again in 1995, when earlier residues, abrasion, and retouching were noted. In ultraviolet light, one can still see older varnish residues in the darker solvent-sensitive colors. The extent of solvent damage to the signature, which was once greener, suggests the entire background may be abraded, and darker deposits of background paint can still be seen between floral elements. There is solvent damage at the edges of green leaves, and possibly in touches of red and yellow glaze details on the paler roses. The thicker paint has some age cracking, and the impastos have lost their crispness due to the various lining processes and now appear quite flat. The surface is also very matte, and the colors are not as saturated as they could be.

The off-white ground has a diagonal pattern of stippled ridges, as if paint were rolled onto the surface, rather than brushed, and may have been artist-applied or specially pre-

pared at his request. Over this there seems to be a thin gray toning layer, which runs under the entire image. No underdrawing was detected, although white chalk could have been used. The image areas are created with a paste-consistency paint, applied wet-into-wet with glaze detailing. The palette has a somewhat faded appearance, especially in the reds.

1. See Paris–Ottawa–San Francisco 1982–83, pp. 123–24.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 265.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 30–31.
4. The invoice from Tempelaere to Clark states that “Monsieur Ricada . . . obtained this painting from Fantin himself.” See the Clark's curatorial file.

135 | Peaches and Grapes 1894

Oil on canvas, 27.3 x 36.4 cm

Lower left: Fantin

1955.732

Sterling Clark purchased his first painting by Henri Fantin-Latour, a still life of *Peaches and Grapes*, in 1912. Clark would not purchase another Fantin-Latour for decades, until 1936. A simple composition, it consists of a plate of peaches on a table with a bunch of dark grapes to the left. It most likely dates to 1894 based on a date given in Madame Fantin-Latour's catalogue raisonné of her late husband's work. This picture represents a period in the artist's career when he had transitioned away from the still-life painting for which he was best known toward more imaginative work that had little to do with his most popular and lucrative kind of painting. Fantin-Latour had become disenchanted with still-life painting in part due to the lack of critical response he received for these works. Although very successful in England, his still lifes were much less appreciated in France, where he exhibited them only three times at the Salon, in 1873, 1874, and 1876, before becoming discouraged.¹

Peaches and Grapes, like the other Fantin-Latours in the Clark collection, has a significant history of ownership. Dealer Gustave Tempelaere (1840–1904) owned the picture soon after the artist painted it. Tempelaere's Parisian gallery represented Fantin-Latour along with the still-life painter François Bonvin (1817–1887), some of whose work is reminiscent of Fantin-Latour's. Tempelaere was an important figure



135

in Fantin-Latour's career, along with his English agent Edwin Edwards and his wife Ruth, who provided his principal means of support for much of the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s. Tempelaere was introduced to the painter around 1887 and became so successful for the artist in the French market that Fantin-Latour was able to stop sending paintings to Mrs. Edwards—who had taken over for her husband after his death in 1879—by the mid-1890s.

Armand-François-Paul Desfriches, comte Doria (1824–1896) was a wealthy landowner whose posthumous sale of his vast holdings of Barbizon and Impressionist art (including nearly seventy paintings by Camille Corot) significantly marked the beginning of a new generation of collecting in the French capital.² Alfred Pacquement purchased the Clark picture at Comte Doria's sale and owned several other Fantin-Latours, including the Clark's *Roses in a Bowl and Dish* (cat. 134). His brother Charles Pacquement was an influential collector who also owned work by Fantin-Latour. Ownership then passed to the sons of Gustave Tempelaere, Ferdinand (1871–1955) and Julien (1876–1961), who ultimately sold *Peaches and Grapes* to Sterling Clark in 1912.

Peaches and Grapes is similar to the quickly executed still lifes that Édouard Manet painted during his last years when his health was deteriorating. Manet depicted simple compositions of stacked peaches as

well as florals, stating, “a painter can say all he wants to with fruit or flowers or even clouds.”³ With the popularity of still life in the mid-nineteenth century and the revival of attention to the work of Jean-Siméon Chardin (1669–1779), Fantin-Latour was compared to the master of the genre in a Salon review of 1870 that noted his pictures were “worthy of Chardin.”⁴ Like Chardin, Fantin-Latour sought to raise the stature of the still-life genre, using light, color, and texture to ennoble simple household or kitchen objects. Although Fantin-Latour continued to paint still lifes late in his career, he did so simply for pleasure. He became increasingly fascinated with making lithographs and paintings of fantasy subjects based on his love of the music of Richard Wagner, Robert Schumann, and Hector Berlioz, something he had done irregularly since early in his career. These imaginative works seem anomalous in Fantin-Latour's oeuvre, which was built on traditional portraits and still lifes, but they appear regularly in his later work and demonstrate his desire to free himself, to a certain extent, from the familiar, repeated motifs of his previous subjects and their careful adherence to visual reality. KAP

PROVENANCE [Gustave Tempelaere, Paris]; Armand-François-Paul Desfriches, comte Doria (d. 1896, his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 4 May 1899, no. 145, as *Les pêches*, sold to Pacquement); Alfred Pacquement, Paris (from 1899);

[F. & J. Tempelaere, Paris, sold to Clark, 19 Dec. 1912, as *Nature morte (pêches dans une assiette et raisins noir)*]; Robert Sterling Clark (1912–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS Paris 1906, no. 73, as *Pêches et raisins*; Williamstown 1956a, no. S-12, ill.

REFERENCES Fantin-Latour 1911, p. 165, no. 1558, as *Fruits*; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 1963, no. 54, ill.; Lucie-Smith 1977, p. 161.

TECHNICAL REPORT The support is an unlined canvas with an uneven, moderate-weight weave (16–19 x 25 threads/cm). The five-member mortise-and-tenon stretcher is original. The brown background color stops short of all the surface edges. Pinholes in all four corners suggest that the painting was done while pinned to a board, then stretched. The tacking edges were painted in a thin dark color after the picture was stretched, as there is no color staining the canvas beneath the tack heads. There are drying/age cracks in the thicker paint layers of the fruit. The picture shows no evidence of cleaning, and the ultraviolet light fluorescence is very dense. The varnish has its own age crack network, primarily running horizontally with the warp canvas threads. The right and left edges are retouched on top of the upper varnish layer. In reflected light the surface is shiny except for a very matte 3.8-cm strip along the top and the repainted edges. Clark may have had the picture revarnished and retouched sometime after its purchase in 1912.

The commercial priming is an off-white color. There may be a charcoal underdrawing around the fruit and dish, which may be faintly visible in infrared reflectography. The background looks deliberately rubbed, probably by the artist, to expose some ground color. The paint is applied rather like pastel, in small strokes over the background and table colors, giving a slightly rough, textured appearance. The very resinous looking colors are applied in both thick and thin strokes, using a wet-into-wet technique, which intermixes the colors on the surface. Small detail strokes float over thicker resinous paint areas. Some of the flower petals appear to have discrete strokes of a pure mauve or lavender pigment invented in the nineteenth century, as no blending of red and blue particles is detected under magnification.

1. Paris–Ottawa–San Francisco 1982–83, p. 256.
2. See Distel 1990, pp. 171–4.
3. Washington–Boston 2001–2, p. 146.
4. Astruc 1870, p. 3; translation from Paris–Ottawa–San Francisco 1982–83, p. 256.

Imitator of Henri Fantin-Latour

136 | *Roses in a Vase* Late 19th century

Oil on canvas, 45.1 x 37 cm

Lower left: Fantin 72

1955-733

At first glance, *Roses in a Vase* has many of the characteristics of a still life by Henri Fantin-Latour. A vase of flowers sits on a book against a plain background. Several of the roses are opened fully while other stems are still in bud form. A bee rests on the lowest cream-colored flower, and some text can be seen on the spine of the book at the picture's center. The picture is signed "Fantin 72" in the lower left. This still life, however, has a flat, rigid appearance unlike those for which Fantin-Latour was known. The vase and book are awkwardly situated on the canvas, and the space of the image is poorly articulated. The roses are not painted in a particularly sophisticated manner but instead appear stiff.

Along with these obvious visual cues, the execution of this work is different from those in the Clark collection unquestionably by Fantin-Latour. In general, the paint is handled in a much simpler manner, and in one instance, this artist used a traditional blending of separate colors to achieve a shade of purple, whereas Fantin-Latour usually employed a more recently developed pure purple paint (see Technical Report below and for cat. 135). Moreover, this painting does not have the scumbled surface, textured appearance, or adeptly painted flowers of those by Fantin-Latour. A further complication appears on the bottom folded-over edge of the canvas, where lettering on the spine of the book appears to read "Die . . ." and "[1]874." If these are a German word and a date, they would be very hard to explain on a work by the French artist, particularly given the conflict with the 1872 date at the lower left. Finally, the fact that the signature lies on top of paint that had already developed age cracks indicates that it was applied a considerable length of time after the image was completed. While this painting is clearly not by Fantin-Latour, then, its author and his or her purpose in making it are uncertain.

One possible attribution is to Fantin-Latour's own wife, the artist Victoria Dubourg (1840–1926). Fantin-Latour met her, as he did Édouard Manet and many other artists, while copying works at the Louvre. An accomplished still-life painter in her own right, she