



**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



ART WORKS.
arts.gov

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)

amount of gypsum. It covers most of the image area in horizontal strokes but does not extend onto the tacking margins. The application is very uneven, with thicker deposits in some areas and almost none in the corners and along the right and lower edges. Charcoal underdrawing lines are visible in infrared reflectography, and under magnification some of these lines appear strengthened with bluish painted outlines. Several changes were noted in the background, where some elements were roughly indicated in the underdrawing but altered in the painted form. The signature disappears in infrared light. Most of the paint was applied in a thick, dry application, and much of the detailing is applied dry-over-dry. In 1986, fifteen pigment samples were analyzed, and the findings indicated that most pigments were generally characteristic of Gauguin's palette. All the samples contained wax, suggesting that it may have been either a component of the paint or an early coating.

1. Rick Brettell in Washington–Chicago–Paris 1988–89, p. 350.
2. Chicago–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 345.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
4. These aspects are explored by Heather Lemonedes, particularly in relation to Gauguin's 1889 "Volpini suite" of zincographs, which were printed on yellow paper. See Cleveland–Amsterdam 2009–10.
5. Chicago–Amsterdam 2001–2, p. 345.
6. *Ibid.*
7. An unpublished report (*procès-verbal*) of this sale lists the Clark painting as no. 45 and notes that Gauguin bought it back, as he did many of the works in this largely unsuccessful sale. The report was reproduced in Paris 1949, p. 98.
8. Information on the sale from Vollard to Reber and on Sternheim's purchase of this painting in 1915 is given in Pophanken and Billeter 2001, pp. 261, 355, 357.
9. In the Paul Rosenberg Archives, this painting, inventory no. 2837, appears in a list of works photographed, listed after an entry dated 30 June 1930, and before an entry of Nov. 1930, thus giving an approximate date of acquisition by the gallery. See The Paul Rosenberg Archives, a gift of Elaine and Alexandre Rosenberg. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.
10. Information on the exhibitions in Barmen 1912 and Berlin 1913 is given in Pophanken and Billeter 2001, pp. 389–90. Gordon 1974, vol. 2, p. 649, gives the title *Mädchen aus der Bretagne* in Berlin 1913. Information on the exhibition in Winterthur 1922 is given in Wildenstein 1964, p. 212, no. 518.
11. The presence of this painting in this exhibition is confirmed by a photograph of the installation, labeled "tableaux du 19e, décors anciens," in the Paul Rosenberg Archives. See The Paul Rosenberg Archives, a gift of Elaine and Alexandre Rosenberg, III.A.1.38. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

Théodore Géricault

French, 1791–1824

149 | Trumpeter of the Hussars c. 1815–20

Oil on canvas, 96 x 71.8 cm; original dimensions, 72 x 58 cm
1955.959

Style of Théodore Géricault

French, 19th century

150 | Study after *Trumpeter of the Hussars*

c. 1815–27

Oil on canvas, 35.7 x 27 cm; original dimensions 32.5 x 24.3 cm
1955.745

Géricault first established his reputation by showing a monumental painting of a mounted military figure, the *Charging Chasseur*, at the 1812 Salon, followed two years later by the *Wounded Cuirassier Leaving the Field of Battle* (both in the Musée du Louvre, Paris). He continued to depict similar figures at both large and small scale for a number of years. His attention to details of the sitters' uniforms generally allows for precise identification of the type of soldier depicted, and he devoted equal care to the depiction of horses, in military as well as many other contexts throughout his career. *Trumpeter of the Hussars*, although much smaller than the two Salon works, clearly relates to them both formally and thematically. Despite the precision of his subjects' external forms, however, perhaps the most striking aspect of nearly all his military-themed works prior to about 1818, including *Trumpeter of the Hussars*, is their ambiguity. The connections between these evocative figures in their closely focused, abbreviated settings and the complex political situation at the end of the Napoleonic era in which they were made are open to interpretation; the paintings have, for example, been seen as embodiments of Imperial power and its defeat, or as a "real and very subtle allegory against war," among many other readings.¹ Even the figures' role as soldiers is unclear, since Géricault never showed his subjects actually engaged with an enemy, although evidence





150

of combat is often distantly present. As Régis Michel has described it, “These modern warriors don’t fight at all, they *think*. They are philosopher-soldiers. . . . [T]hey replace action with contemplation.”²

In *Trumpeter of the Hussars*, both horse and rider stand perfectly immobile, gazing off into the cloud- and smoke-filled atmosphere. This rather ominous background suggests the proximity of a battle that is largely outside the frame of the image, except for a second mounted soldier in the distance beyond the horse’s hind legs, who is silhouetted and fragmented by the landscape, and appears to be charging an unseen enemy. There is also a summarily-brushed line of soldiers behind the horse. The orange-red glow around these secondary figures has no identifiable source, further enhancing the unsettling quality of the

image. Thanks largely to the primary figure’s inactivity, the viewer is impelled to consider his state of mind rather than seeking out some narrative, political, or allegorical significance to the scene, an incongruous source of meaning for an ostensibly military subject. In most of these respects—ominous atmosphere, secondary figures, the reddish glow of mostly unseen battle, elements of introspection—*Trumpeter of the Hussars* bears comparison to both *Charging Chasseur* and *Wounded Cuirassier*, which might suggest a date for the present canvas of about 1814–15, since the uniform places it in the Restoration period.³ A slightly later date, however, is perhaps more likely; most writers now consider that the painting was probably executed after Géricault’s return from Italy in 1817, based on stylistic as well as possible documentary grounds. There

is a drawing by Antoine-Alphonse Montfort (1802–1884), a younger artist who studied with Géricault, of a mounted hussar that relates very closely to the present painting. While Grunchev suggests that it was made while both artists were before the motif—presumably a model who posed on one or more occasions—and thus must date to 1817 or later, since that was the year the two met, Bazin proposes that Montfort’s drawing copies a lost original by Géricault, and could thus have been made at any date.⁴

The physical condition of *Trumpeter of the Hussars* and its relation to another smaller version of the same subject (cat. 150) add yet another layer of complexity to the work. A 1991 technical analysis revealed that strips of canvas had been added on all four sides of the central portion of the painting, the largest strip, at the bottom, rising to approximately midway up the horse’s legs. The secondary figures of the charging soldiers were also additions, presumably made at the time of the enlargement of the canvas, as was the reddish paint surrounding them, replacing paint that was predominantly a cooler pink and yellow tone. The date of these modifications cannot be determined definitively; however, because this painting is very likely the work entitled *Le hussard en vedette sur une hauteur* (Hussar Standing Watch on a Hill) that appeared in an 1827 sale and was described as having the dimensions of the present enlarged canvas, it seems most likely that the strips were added either during Géricault’s lifetime—perhaps even by the artist himself—or no more than three years after his death. Furthermore, examination of the lining canvas and adhesive that had been used to connect the added strips to the main canvas, as well as comparison of the paint surface of the strips with that of the central portion, all appear to date the procedure to the nineteenth century, very likely in the same period that the principal section was painted.⁵ It seems, then, that the full image, while quite possibly completed by Géricault, might instead have been reworked by an artist in his immediate circle.

Most writers agree that the smaller version of *Trumpeter of the Hussars* is not a preliminary study but was probably made at the same time as or after the larger work, and current critical opinion tends to favor attribution to an artist other than Géricault.⁶ It repeats the composition of the larger work very closely, with some notable differences, including a slightly greater attention to detail in certain passages. This canvas, too, has been slightly enlarged by having its tacking

margins unfolded, adding approximately 2.5 cm to both dimensions. Significantly, the original composition, with the bottom edge folded, corresponds to the *original* state of the larger work, before that canvas was extended so that the full length of the horse’s legs could be shown, and the sky is painted in the pink and yellow colors that presumably compare to those originally used in the larger work. This suggests that whoever the author of the smaller version may have been, he must have known the first, un-enlarged version of the composition. The execution of the smaller work, moreover, presumably dates prior to 1827, when the full-size, larger work appeared at auction. These facts point once again either to Géricault or to an artist close to him. The water at the horse’s feet seems less closely linked to Géricault’s hand, and was probably added when the tacking edges were unfolded, as if to justify the animal’s truncated legs.⁷ But here too, documents indicate that this detail was almost certainly added before 1855, since at that date, Charles Blanc described a painting measuring 34 x 26 cm in the sale of the Barroilhet collection—presumably the Clark study—as showing a horse standing “in water up to its fetlock,” or ankles.⁸

Overall, the simplified background, somewhat more carefully detailed execution, and extremely smooth, uniform handling of the *Study after “Trumpeter of the Hussars”* might more strongly suggest that it was made by a follower of Géricault. Copies after his work by artists in his circle are documented (see cat. 151), and copies by others with less direct connection to the artist probably began to appear not long after his death; as one commentator noted, “Géricault, who was pilloried during his lifetime, was faked and copied furiously right after his death.”⁹ Certainly by the mid-nineteenth century, misattributions to Géricault were common, as figures including Delacroix and Baudelaire noted.¹⁰ Nonetheless, as Philippe Grunchev has discussed, attributions and de-attributions to the artist must be made cautiously, as much important documentation is lacking, and a number of compositions were the subject of multiple copies by students and followers of Géricault, rendering the determination of an original, if any, more complicated.¹¹

The more recent history of *Trumpeter of the Hussars* is also significant, for it was one of the small number of works that had belonged to Sterling Clark’s mother, Elizabeth Scriven Clark, who acquired it in an exchange with the dealer Herman Schaus for Gérôme’s *Snake Charmer* (see cat. 154). At her death

in 1909, she bequeathed it to her third son, Ambrose, but he kept it for only three years. Presumably thanks to his growing interest in art, Sterling arranged in 1912 to acquire the painting through the sale of a portion of the land he had inherited in Cooperstown, New York; the document that records this exchange states that Sterling sold 519 acres of land, comprising Fernleigh Farm, to Ambrose for \$100 “and other valuable considerations.”¹² Sterling later wrote explicitly of “swapping Fernleigh Farm with Brose for the Géricault ‘Trompette de Hussards.’”¹³ Curiously, the date of acquisition of the smaller study is unknown, as is the dealer from whom it was acquired. A receipt of 1952 from Knoedler for framing the painting that reads “Framing Gericault [*sic*] painting (Copy) / ‘Horseman,’” even leaves it uncertain whether Sterling Clark considered his painting to be by Géricault. Moreover, he did not usually buy work if he felt that he already owned a good example of the type, so his acquisition of the second version and his lack of commentary about it only increase the number of questions surrounding the work. SL

PROVENANCE Cat. 149: The artist (possibly his sale, Hôtel de Bullion, Paris, 2–3 Nov. 1824, not in cat.);¹⁴ possibly sale, Paris, 13 March 1827, no. 38, *Le hussard en vedette sur une hauteur*;¹⁵ Monjean; Prosper Crabbe, Brussels; Baron Ury von Günzburg; Defoer (by 1883–86, his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 22 May 1886, no. 20, ill.); Georges Lutz, Paris (by 1889–1902, his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 26–27 May 1902, no. 68, ill.); [Schaus Art Galleries, New York, sold to Clark];¹⁶ Elizabeth S. Clark (Mrs. Alfred Corning Clark), New York (probably 1902–d. 1909); F. Ambrose Clark, New York, her son, by descent (1909–12, given to Robert S. Clark in partial exchange for Fernleigh Farm, Cooperstown, N.Y.); Robert Sterling Clark, his brother (1912–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

Cat. 150: Probably Paul Barroilhet, Paris (his sale, Drouot, Paris, 12 Mar. 1855, no. 38, as *La vedette*, sold to Mercier); Robert Sterling Clark (by 1952–55); Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.

EXHIBITIONS Cat. 149: Paris 1883c, no. 57, *Hussard à cheval*, lent by Defoer; probably Paris 1889b, no. 382, as *Le Trompette*; London 1923, no. 18, as *Un Trompette à cheval des Chasseurs de la Garde Impériale*; Paris 1924d, no. 9, as *Un Trompette à cheval des Chasseurs de la Garde Impériale*; London 1932a, no. 368;¹⁷ London 1932b, p. 94, no. 403; Williamstown 1957, no. 301, pl. II; Williamstown 1959b, ill.; New York 1967, no. 17; Los Angeles–Detroit–Philadelphia 1971–72, no. 20; Williamstown 1981–82, no cat.; Providence 1982, no. 5; New York 1987, no. 11, pl. 10; Williamstown 1988c, no cat.; San Francisco 1989, pp. 24, 47, no. 12, ill.;

Paris 1991–92, pp. 45, 341, no. 44, fig. 78; South Hadley–Williamstown–New York 1994, pp. 60–64, no. 7, figs. 7a–e.

Cat. 150: New York 1987, no. 12, as after Géricault; Paris 1991–92, pp. 44, 340–41, no. 43, fig. 77, as by Géricault; South Hadley–Williamstown–New York 1994, pp. 65–67, no. 8, figs. 8a–b, as by Géricault.

REFERENCES Cat. 149: Clément 1879, p. 426, no. 61 bis, as *Hussard*, owned by Monjean; Wolff 1884, pp. 84, 100, ill. (print by Charles L. Courty after the painting); Dayot 1890, p. 98;¹⁸ Régamey 1926, p. 50; Daulte 1960b, p. 31, fig. 11; Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 1963, no. 64, ill.; Ashbery 1967, p. 45, ill.; Eitner 1971, p. 30, ill.; Johnson 1971, pp. 769–70, fig. 89; Butler 1972, p. 135, ill.; Grunchev 1978, p. 99, no. 81, ill.; Brooks 1981, pp. 36–37, no. 14, ill.; Grunchev 1979, p. 52, fig. 47; Eitner 1983, pp. 66–67, 298, pl. 14 (French ed., pp. 88–89, ill.); Sells 1986, p. 393, fig. 3; Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, pp. 41, 180, no. 1561, ill.; Michel 1992, p. 30, ill.; Esner 1996, p. 159, fig. 14; Kern et al. 1996, pp. 48–49, ill.; Williamstown 1996–97, p. 10; *Antiques* 1997, pp. 524, 526, pl. 6; Troccoli 1998, p. 84, ill.; Eitner 2000, p. 252n9; Williamstown–New York 2006–7, pp. 22, 63, 303, fig. 65.

Cat. 150: Possibly Blanc 1857–58, vol. 2, p. 603, as *La Vedette*; possibly Blanc 1861–76, vol. 9, Géricault section, p. 12; Grunchev 1978, p. 99, no. 81A, ill.; Grunchev 1979, p. 52, fig. 48, as circle of Géricault; Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, pp. 41, 181, no. 1563, ill., as by an unknown artist.

TECHNICAL REPORT Cat. 149: The support is comprised of five pieces of linen; one coarse and heavier-weight original central section (13 threads/cm), and additions to all four edges in a slightly lighter-weight fabric of the same thread count. Very early in its history, the original canvas was enlarged by glue-lining extensions of different widths to each edge: 5 cm at the top, 7.6 cm at the left, and 6.4 cm at the right. The largest extension at the lower edge is a combination of excess fold-over fabric from the original and new fabric for a combined addition of 19 cm. The central section, probably prepared by the artist, showed cusping distortions at the edges. This section has a lead-white ground, while the new sections were grounded with a chalk-based layer. Deep age cracks, which extend throughout the central portion, stop short at all the additions. X-radiography shows that the corners of the central section had been bent before the additions were made, but it also shows the extended horse's feet to be similar in painting style to the rest of the horse. X-radiography and inspection of the reverse show that the additions had been laid alongside the original edges without stitching them together, using gauze interleaf layers between the painting canvases and the lining linen. In 1991, the failing ancient lining, which was very brittle, darkened, moldy, and releasing along the lower edge due to an old water damage, was removed. The picture is presently lined with Beva 371 adhesive to linen sized with Beva D8 and a fine weight polyester monofilament screening interleaf. The early six-member mortise-and-tenon stretcher was retained.

The painting surface was treated in 1939 through the Knoedler Gallery of Paris. This restoration included brush-applied retouchings, as well as spray-applied toning layers. The picture was also “regenerated” by Miss Testut in 1956, which probably amounted to a surface cleaning and revarnishing. A green layer is visible under several abraded passages of the upper sky and below the horse’s hind legs, indicating another painting below the present one. This lower picture could not be seen with X-radiography due to the lead-white ground on the central section. A varnish layer on the lower picture led to major solvent erosion of the visible surface during previous cleaning, particularly in the sky. During the 1991 treatment, the lowest restoration was therefore left in place as a barrier layer. The sky is extensively reglazed, and the present small retouches on the horse and figure replace those done in 1939. The present synthetic resin varnish has a low, soft gloss.

A thick layer of transparent black pigment, possibly bitumen, was used to help bridge the level shifts along the lower join, around the horse’s feet. This black pigment is similar to the black paint found on other areas of the image. The detection of underdrawing is difficult due to the presence of the dark lower image, although infrared reflectography does seem to show a line along the right edge of the coat sleeve and along the rump of the horse. There may also have been a slight shift in the profile of the figure’s face during painting. The paint layers are a combination of thinly applied glaze-like colors and loosely brushed fluid details. The original color of the sky below the horse, before the edge strips were added and the surface reworked, was a pale yellow and pink.

Cat 150: The support is medium-weight linen (13 threads/cm) that is glue-lined to a similar weight fabric (16 x 18 threads/cm). The five-member stretcher is an early to mid-twentieth century replacement, which together with the lining and the original tack margins, now up on the surface, extend the picture slightly beyond its original size. A small old tear below the horse’s belly is the likely reason for the lining. The fold-over edges are not severely aged, and there are no age cracks in the paint, suggesting that the picture was lined early in its history. The present secondary support may not be the picture’s first lining. The oil retouches on the extended edges mimic the main image’s paint in style, pigment ratio, and particle size, which may mean that they are close in date to the original. Minor abrasions in the thin dark passages skim along the upper surface of the textured ground. The painting was cleaned in 1991, and the edge paint was readjusted with inpainting. There are some residues of an earlier natural resin varnish on the figure and horse, and the older retouches left on the plume are discolored. In reflected light, the canvas weave and the ground-layer texture are discernible.

The white ground layer is an artist-applied brush coat, which shows as a diagonal pattern beneath the paint. There may be an additional pink layer beneath the sky colors. An underdrawing, probably in charcoal, is visible to the unaided eye along the top of the helmet and the upper curve of the

horse’s rump. In low magnification, other lines can be seen at the unpainted edges of forms. Also visible in infrared reflectography are the original holes in the old tacking margins now on the surface. The paint is applied using wet-into-wet strokes with very sure handling. There may be a bitumen layer below some dark colors on the horse, and many of the pigments look hand-ground, which suggests an early date. It appears that the water surrounding the horse’s feet was added when the edges were extended.

1. See Eitner 1983, p. 61, where he describes the *Charging Chasseur* and the *Wounded Cuirassier* as representing respectively “the Empire’s last triumphs and final catastrophe,” and Bruno Chenique referring to the *Charging Chasseur* in Lyon 2006, p. 65: “une véritable et très subtile allégorie contre la guerre.”
2. Paris 1991–92, p. 36: “Ces modernes guerriers ne combattent point: ils pensent. Ce sont de soldats philosophes. . . ils remplacent l’action par la contemplation.”
3. Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, p. 41.
4. Grunchev 1979, p. 52; Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, p. 41; see also Michel 1992, p. 30 for dating. For the drawing, see Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, p. 181, no. 1562.
5. For a full description of this analysis, see South Hadley–Williamstown–New York 1994, pp. 60–64.
6. The principal voice in favor of attribution to Géricault is Sylvain Laveissière in Paris 1991–92; and those against it include Lorenz Eitner (in a letter to the Clark of 2 Feb. 1995) and Germain Bazin (Bazin 1987–97, vol. 5, p. 41), though Bazin commented rather ambiguously that “the facture is excellent, and one would be tempted to see the hand of the artist himself if one were not familiar with the skill of copyists” (“La facture est excellente et on serait tenté d’y voir la main même du peintre, si l’on ne connaissait l’habileté des copistes”); while Grunchev 1978 and 1979 proposes an artist in Géricault’s circle.
7. See South Hadley–Williamstown–New York 1994, p. 65.
8. Drouot 1855, p. 11: “Le cheval est dans l’eau jusqu’au boulet.”
9. Lejeune 1864–65, vol. 1, p. 326: “Géricault, voué aux gémonies pendant sa vie, a été contrefait et copié avec fureur aussitôt après sa mort.”
10. Delacroix was asked to give his opinion on what he determined to be “a very mediocre copy” (“une copie très mediocre”), and Baudelaire noted that a reputable dealer and print publisher was offering as by Géricault a painting the writer knew to be by a different artist. See Grunchev 1979, p. 37.
11. See Grunchev 1979.
12. Otsego County Court Office, Deed and Conveyance, Book 283, 58ff., Otsego, New York. See also Williamstown and New York 2006, p. 303.
13. RSC Diary, 24 Jan. 1942.
14. In a written addition found in a copy of the sale catalogue (British Museum, London), there is a work titled *Hussard*

- à cheval* (Mounted Hussar), listed under the heading “études peintes par Géricault,” that may correspond to this painting. The annotated catalogue is reprinted in Bazin 1987–97, vol. 1, p. 96, and the sale is Lugt 10747.
15. The sale catalogue notes that “in the background combatants are seen. A painting of beautiful color and a great energy of execution” (“Dans le fond on aperçoit des combattants. Tableau d’une belle couleur et d’une grande énergie d’exécution”) and the dimensions are given as 36 x 26 pouces (approximately 97 x 70 cm); this description may correspond to the present painting after it was enlarged.
 16. In his diaries, Sterling Clark later recalled that this painting was bought in partial exchange for Gérôme’s *Snake Charmer* (cat. 154), commenting in 1944, “[M]y mother had turned [*Snake Charmer*] in to Schaus for \$10,000 to \$12,000 around 1899 as part payment for the ‘Trompette de Hussards’ at \$35,000” (RSC Diary, 11 Nov. 1944). She could not have acquired *Trumpeter of the Hussars* in 1899, however, since it was owned by Lutz until 1902.
 17. Listed as lent by Roland F. Knoedler, Paris, although owned at the time by Clark; see correspondence in the Clark’s curatorial file from George H. Davey of Knoedler, London.
 18. Listed as appearing in Paris 1889b as “Le Trompette,” lent by M. Lutz.

Théodore Géricault

French, 1791–1824

151 | *Dervish in His Stall* c. 1820

Oil on paper, mounted on canvas, 25.4 x 34.2 cm
1955.746

From the beginning of his artistic career to near its end, Géricault depicted horses of different types, in a range of media, and for various purposes. According to some accounts of his early training, he grew impatient with the instruction of his teacher and went to the royal barracks to paint horses, although one account cites his first teacher, Carle Vernet (1758–1836), and another his second, Narcisse Guérin (1774–1833).¹ This discrepancy underscores the possibility that the story may be apocryphal, intended to help establish the myth of the artist as a self-taught genius who learned from nature rather than from academic principles, but the story surely reflects one of Géricault’s long-standing passions nonetheless. Another, more direct report points to a different motivation for depicting horses

a number of years later. In a letter to his friend Pierre-Joseph Dedreux-Dorcy (1789–1874), written in 1821 from London, where sporting and equestrian pictures were in great demand, Géricault commented that he would “renounce the buskin [antiquity] and Scripture, to lock myself in the stables, which I will not leave unless covered in gold.”² Neither a simple sketch nor a picture intended to make money, *Dervish in His Stall* is still another type, an intimate study of a particular animal shown on its own ground, in the stable. Although the painting is unfinished, its primary purpose was to capture a faithful portrait of the subject’s characteristic aspects. Géricault made a number of studies of this type at different times over the years.

Dervish in His Stall is in fact one of four versions of this composition, and questions regarding which of the four may be attributed to Géricault have been grounds for considerable debate. The other three are in the Musée Bonnat, Bayonne (fig. 151.1), the Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Ghent, and a private collection, and the version in Bayonne is often considered the original.³ This judgment is based in part on the appearance of the Bayonne version in the first catalogue of Géricault’s work, written by Charles Clément, often a reliable source for early information about the artist’s work.⁴ An earlier source, however, gives additional information about the genesis of these paintings. Antoine-Alphonse Montfort (1802–1884), one of the artists who studied with Géricault, discussed several paintings of horses in an unpublished commentary which Clément had requested from him while writing his catalogue. The relevant passage reads:

*Arab horses brought by Mr. Damoiseau. One was brought to Mr. Géricault’s studio where Mr. Horace [Vernet] made a painting which (I believe) he never finished. Mr. Géricault made a pencil sketch that he did not finish either. But soon he went to the Bois de Boulogne to the Dauphin stables, if I’m not mistaken, where there were horses, and he chose four, of which he made ravishing painted studies. These studies, of the same size, were sold in his sale and remained for a long time available to rent at Mr. Bralon’s [?], a color merchant in the rue de l’Arbre Sec. I rented two of them myself in order to copy them, the one representing the horse named Dervish whose legs remained unfinished and the horse seen from the back, now in the Louvre—date 1848.*⁵