France in the Golden Age: A Postscript

PIERRE ROSENBERG
Conservateur en Chef, Département des Peintures, Musée du Louvre

To Charles Sterling, whose exhibition “Les Peintres de la réalité en France au XVIIe siècle” took place fifty years ago

The history of exhibitions is an old one, often associated with the history of museums. But the history of exhibition catalogues—scholarly catalogues, that is—is quite recent, certainly much more recent than that of scholarly catalogues of museum collections. Linked of course with the recent development of exhibitions themselves, the scholarly exhibition catalogue is a phenomenon that deserves careful study. While this is hardly the place to address the problem in detail, any number of questions come to mind: questions of definition and precedent, of social and scholarly purpose, of practicality (the weight alone of some catalogues seems to preclude their being read at the exhibition), of differences of approach from country to country and cataloguer to cataloguer. Whatever the outcome, examination of the subject would in my view contribute to a better understanding of where art history as a discipline stands today, and to a clearer vision of its role, its special function, and its development.

Some of the speculations I have mentioned seem posed particularly acutely by the exhibition “France in the Golden Age” and its catalogue. The exhibition had a very simple objective: to present to the French and American publics the finest seventeenth-century French paintings from collections in the United States. In Paris, furthermore, as a result of the installation, the accompanying orientation panels, and the grouping of the works—by theme (landscape, portraiture), artist (Poussin, La Tour), style (Caravaggism, Parisian Atticism), or region (Provence, Lorraine)—we were able to display French seventeenth-century painting in all its diversity and multiplicity of aspect, limited only of course by what was available in the United States and with due allowance for the subjectivity and personal taste inherent in any selection.

The ambitions of the catalogue were somewhat different. Naturally, the 124 pictures chosen had to be studied as closely as possible (and I shall have a word to say about the difficulties encountered); their origins had to be researched and an opinion given on their attribution and dating. By means of the layout of the catalogue, I also wanted the less informed reader, who would do no more than leaf through the 124 reproductions, to be able to grasp pictorially the major trends in French painting of the period, and to understand its personality, greatness, and originality in relation to Spain as well as to Italy, to Flanders as well as to Holland. Finally, and this was a feature of the catalogue as distinct from the exhibition, I wished to draw up a list of all seventeenth-century

1. The earliest exhibition catalogues are the livrets of the Paris Salons, the first of which dates from 1673. They dealt, of course, only with contemporary works and cannot be regarded as more than the remote ancestors of today’s catalogue.

2. The first scholarly catalogue, in the modern sense of the term, seems to be that of the exhibition “Les Peintres de la réalité en France au XVIIe siècle,” held at the Orangerie in Paris in 1934. Written for the most part by Charles Sterling, the catalogue is not only almost entirely illustrated, it also includes very full entries arranged alphabetically by artist.

3. Paris, Grand Palais, Jan. 29–Apr. 26, 1982; New York, MMA, May 26–Aug. 22, 1982; Chicago, Art Institute, Sept. 18–Nov. 28, 1982. The French title of the exhibition, “La Peinture française du XVIIe siècle dans les collections américaines,” better expressed its ambitions. In realizing the exhibition, I was generously aided by many people on both sides of the Atlantic; their names are acknowledged in the preface to the catalogue.
French pictures in American public collections; an artist not represented in American public collections—that were on exhibit at the Segourea Gallery in New York in 1979, in the event, these two superb fêtes galantes before their time went to the National Gallery in London. In certain cases, the absence of an essential aspect of an artist's activity led to a partial and inadequate view of his career: the Le Nain brothers did not confine themselves to peasant scenes, and Poussin's works after his Paris stay of 1640-42 are not less important—far from it, indeed—than those preceding it. In other cases, an embarras de richesses meant dropping a picture of exceptional quality that would otherwise have been entirely qualified for the exhibition: why show the Cleveland La Hyre rather than the one in Houston, the Malibu Le Sueur and not that in Boston? It was sometimes difficult to renounce a picture by a favorite painter.

4. I was guided by the example of Burton B. Fredericksen and Federico Zeri, Census of Pre-Nineteenth-Century Italian Paintings in North American Public Collections (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), which is, however, not illustrated.

5. In fact, the works exhibited were painted for the most part between 1620 and 1660, and the period covered was little more than half a century.

6. Certain museums in the United States, such as the Frick Collection in New York and the Frick Art Museum in Pittsburgh, are by constitution unable to lend from their collections. Loan requests were also denied because of a painting's fragility; this happened in the case of Philippe de Champaigne's Landscape with the Healing of the Blind of Jericho, owned by the Timken Art Museum, San Diego. Certain paintings included in the catalogue—those from Cleveland, the Clauses from Richmond and Williamstown, Mass., the Bourdon from Providence, R.I.—were for various reasons shown only in New York.

7. Approximately fifty, from Honolulu to Ponce in Puerto Rico, from Amherst to Williamstown.

8. The painting by Perrier, The Defication of Aeneas (No. 82), illustrated my paper "Longhi e il seicento francese" given at the symposium commemorating the 10th anniversary of the death of the great Italian art historian, held in Florence, Sept. 1980. The papers were subsequently published under the title L'arte di scrivere sull'arte, ed. Giovanni Previdi (Rome, 1982); for the Perrier see fig. 14. In the same article are reproductions (figs. 23, 25, and 28 respectively) of the Vignon at Wellesley (No. 113), the Vignon owned by the Hispanic Society of America (Inventory, p. 375, no. 2), and the Guy François in Hartford (No. 29). See also note 30 below.


10. The Boston picture (Sacrifice to Diana, Inventory, p. 357, no. 1) should perhaps have been exhibited beside known Le Sueurs of the same period, for the attribution is still rejected by many in favor of Simon Vouet. On the Le Sueur pictures in Boston and Malibu, see Elisabeth Foucart-Walter, Le Mans, musée de Tosté: Peintures françaises du XVIIe siècle (Paris, 1982) no. 78.
sometimes a problem to discover among the hundreds of American museums a work that was absolutely indispensable to the balance of the exhibition—an exhibition, let me repeat, not only of the finest French seventeenth-century paintings in the United States but also one that illustrated the different tendencies and currents making up the art of the period.

There was, however, one unexpected difficulty. Once the selection had been made and the list of loans drawn up, the catalogue entries had to be written. The lending institutions kindly shared with me the information they had gathered about their works, information that was frequently lacunary, supplied in a fragmentary manner by dealers, and that often had to be completed and in every case checked. It was a surprise to find that for the most part the pictures, whether painted in Italy or France, had been in Great Britain sometimes for quite a long period, so that it became necessary to trace their history through guidebooks to English houses and through sales at Christie's and Sotheby's. In what was for me a new and delicate task it was encouraging to know that English amateurs and collectors had at all times shown a marked taste for French seventeenth-century painting,11 and not only for Claude and the two Poussins, Gaspard and Nicolas—a taste which had not always been shared by my compatriots.

In conclusion, it remains for me to express a regret and a wish. Within the limitations described, I believe that we succeeded in the attempt to create as faithful an image as possible of French painting in the seventeenth century, as varied as it was comprehensive.12 Yet in one respect the exhibition failed, creating a distorted view of its subject: I refer to the absence of works on a grand scale. The importance for French artists of the period of the altar painting, the large-scale decorative schemes, the monumental canvas is well known. Museums in the United States do not possess works of this size, and consequently they were missing from the exhibition. Without Baudoin's or Vouet's great religious paintings, without the decorations of Le Sueur or Le Brun, one cannot claim to have done justice to seventeenth-century French art and to have presented it in entirety. This is all the more regrettable in that such pictures exist in North America, not in the United States but in Canada. Since the French Revolution, the churches in Quebec have owned a marvelous collection of large paintings coming from churches in Paris. Often clumsily repainted or badly damaged, rarely correctly attributed, these pictures would have supplied much that was lacking in the exhibition. Let us hope that in the near future they will be restored and studied, occasioning an exhibition that will redress the unavoidable imbalance of "France in the Golden Age."

My wish concerns young American art historians. As I explained in my preface to the catalogue, there is an area that I neglected, that of American collectors. How were the museum collections formed? Who in the United States liked seventeenth-century French paintings, and when? I was not always able to answer these questions. The field is one full of interest that awaits the attention of younger scholars.

The following notes are intended to amplify certain points mentioned in the catalogue, taking into account the reviews that the exhibition received,13 as well

11. The Nov. 1989 issue of the Burlington Magazine, devoted to French painting of the 17th century, confirms this impression. It must be borne in mind, however, that many of the pictures included in the exhibition were attributed at one time—in some cases until quite recently—to Italian and Northern painters. Thus, Nos. 37 (La Tour), 42 (Leclerc?), 80 and 81 (Pensionante del Saraceni), 106 (Valentin), and 129 (anonymous, now Régnier?—see below) were attributed to Caravaggio; 29 (Guy François) to Saraceni; 67 (Mellin) to Guido Reni, Lanfranco, et al.; 69 (Pierre Mignard) to Cittadini (and to J. B. or Jan Weneix); 82 (Perrier) to Albani; and 112 (Vignon) to Feti. Northern attributions were: Nos. 7 (Bourdon) to Dujaudin; 57 (Claude) to Swanevelt; 97 (Saint-Ignys) to Van Dyck; and 119 (Vignon) to Judith Leyster. There has, of course, also been confusion among the French attributions, e.g.: Nos. 65 (Maître à la Chandelier/Candlelight Master) to La Tour; 72 (Duguet) to Francisque Millet; 4 and 5 (Blanchard) and 83 (Poerson) to La Hyre; 104 (Tassel) to Bourdon; 105 (Tournier) to Valentin. Not surprisingly, Nos. 13 (J-B. de Champaigne), 19 (Chaperon), 72 (Millet), and 101 (Stella) have all at one time or another been attributed to Poussin.


13. Among the countless newspaper articles that appeared in 1989 were the following: Véronique Prat, "Nos Trésors français que les Américains nous prêteront," Le Figaro Magazine, Jan. 16; André Chastel, "Entre Rome et Paris," Le Monde, Feb. 2; Pierre Mazars, "Envoys XVIIe siècle," L'Express, Mar. 12: Jeffery
as the observations that scholars have communicated in writing or by word of mouth. 14 I hope to have overlooked none of my informants and above all to have quoted their views correctly.

It should be said that the French and English editions of the catalogue are substantially the same and contain no major divergences. For the English edition, however, signatures and dates were checked, and a number of minor details and obvious misprints—to which I shall not return here—were rectified. 15

I shall begin with the catalogue entries, to which the numbers below refer, and follow with the inventory of works in United States museums.

---


14 A symposium, which I was unable to attend, was held at the Art Institute of Chicago, Oct. 29–30, 1982. The speakers were Marc Fumaroli, Michael Kitson, Konrad Oberhuber, Alan Rand, Simone Zurawsky, and Richard Spear; the latter was kind enough to let me have a copy of his paper, "Reflections on France in the Golden Age."

15 A number of errors were, however, introduced in the English edition: the illustration on p. 1 is wrongly identified and is, in fact, a portrait of the poet Giambattista Marino (1569–1625); p. 233, Philippe de Champaigne's Portrait of Jean-Baptiste Colbert in the Metropolitan Museum is dated 1655 (not 1665); p. 256, the illustration shows the Fort Worth La Tour (No. 38, The Cheat with the Ace of Clubs) before not after restoration (cf. the color repr. p. 81); p. 901, the May of 1642 by Poerson measures 325 × 260 cm. (not 32.5 × 26).

---

CATALOGUE

2. Jacques-Samuel Bernard, Still Life with Violin, Ewer, and Bouquet of Flowers (private collection, New York)

The painting was in the sale of Marie-Thérèse, comtesse de la Béraudière, American Art Association-Anderson Galleries, New York, December 11–12, 1930, no. 312, ill.

For a complete list of the exhibitions in which this still life has been included, see the catalogue of An Exhibition of Old Masters from the Collections of the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts, Hagerstown, Maryland, and the E. and A. Silberman Galleries (New York, 1964) p. 31, no. 27, ill.


Another copy has appeared, in a private collection in Lebanon.


The smaller replica, which was formerly in Bologna in the collection of the sitter's descendants, is reproduced here (Figure 1).

The Washington picture was left by Marc-André de Buttet (1850–1914) to his nephew Louis de Buttet, baron du Bourget-du-Lac (1876–1915), whose widow, née Anne-Antoinette Richard (1879–1970), sold it in 1949–50. Jean Aubert, curator of the Musées d'Art et d'Histoire, Chambéry, to whom I owe this information, has also drawn my attention to two articles in the Indicateur savoisien of 1887 (June 25–July 2 and July 23–30) containing accounts of a fire at the Hôtel d'Allinges in Chambéry; it seems that the portrait of Talon, which had not long been in the house at the time of the fire, was miraculously rescued by a lodge, a certain M. Dénarié, architect. The picture was then transferred to the nearby château du Bourget, where it remained until it was sold. The date when it passed from the Talon family to the barons du Bourget-du-Lac is still not known.

30. Laurent de La Hyre, Two Nymphs Bathing (Museo de Arte de Ponce, Ponce, Puerto Rico)

In his review (Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] p. 530), Jean-Pierre Cuzin mentions Sylvie Béguin’s hypothesis that this painting may represent Sylvie Béguin’s hypothesis that this painting may represent Jupiter in the guise of Diana attempting to seduce Callisto.

31. Laurent de La Hyre, Cyrus Announcing to Arasps that Panthea Has Obtained His Pardon (The Art Institute of Chicago)

One learned reader, J. de Vazelhes, has pointed out that Panthea had inspired many authors since Xenophon’s Cyropædia, and that no less than five tragedies devoted to the story of Panthea appeared in France between 1571 and 1639. In his opinion the painting represents Arasps trying to persuade Cyrus to visit the captive Panthea, whose extraordinary beauty he praises. Cyrus refuses, preferring war—he points towards the military camp—to love, which would distract him from his duty. If La Hyre was not inspired by Tristan L’Hermite’s Panthéa (staged in 1638 and published the following year), but rather by Xenophon or one of the French writers of the beginning of the seventeenth century, then on grounds of style the picture may be dated about 1636–37, rather than 1638 at the earliest.16

A mediocre engraving after the Montluçon painting, which is from the same series as the present work, is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, in the volume of the work of Lepautre compiled by the abbé de Marolles.17 Philippe de Chennevières must have known the engraving, from his description of one of the drawings in his famous collection (information kindly supplied by Louis-Antoine Prat):

Sujet inconnu, tiré sans doute d’un roman du temps: un roi d’Asie, coiffé du turban et assis sur son trône, montre du doigt une femme que les gardes lui amènent enchantée; d’autres gardes, à droite au premier plan, déposent au pied du trône toutes sortes de vases précieux, conquis sans doute dans la même victoire qui leur a livré cette femme. J’ai trouvé ce dessin gravé dans l’oeuvre de J. Lepautre, sans nom de dessinateur ni de graveur, mais avec le nom de l’éditeur L. Lagniet. A la pierre noire, lavé de bistre.18

This drawing has evidently been lost. Reproduced here are the unpublished oil sketch for the Montluçon painting, and the engraving (Figures 2, 3).

16. Spear (“Reflections”) rightly points out that before Claude Gillot (1673–1722) and Jean-Antoine Watteau (1684–1721) very few 17th-century artists illustrated specific scenes from plays. Robert Fohr, in his exemplary catalogue (Tours, Musée des Beaux-Arts; Richelieu, Musée Municipal; Azay-le-Ferron, Château [Paris, 1982] no. 41), seeks to extend the number of scenes illustrating the story of Panthea by his identification of a painting in Tours as a copy after La Hyre.

17. Ed. 42, in fol. I am indebted to Maxime Préaud, curator of the Cabinet des Estampes at the Bibliothèque Nationale, for the photograph of the engraving.


32. Laurent de La Hyre, *Job Restored to Prosperity* (The Chrysler Museum, Norfolk)

Anthony Blunt (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 530) points out that the painting was sold at Sotheby's, London, March 23, 1949, no. 137.


The painting is here reproduced with the music-making angels from the Musée Magnin, Dijon, on either side (Figure 4). It is evident that the three canvases belong together, though originally they would have been separated by frames or, more probably, by the paneling that decorated the room. In 1937 Charles Sterling noted, in connection with the Dijon pictures, that three other paintings of children from the same series had been on the Paris art market in 1934. Unfortunately, the document does not indicate the number of paintings by La Hyre sold on this occasion.

34. Laurent de La Hyre, *The Kiss of Peace and Justice* (The Cleveland Museum of Art)

Célia Alégret has pointed out to me that a rather similar picture by La Hyre was in the Claude Tolozan sale, Paris, February 23, 1801, no. 44:

Dans un paysage encore d'un beau style, on voit sur la partie droite une masse d'arbres, et une fontaine décorée d'un vase de sculpture. Près de ce monument sont assises deux femmes bien drapées, caractérisant par leurs attributs la Paix et la Justice qui se tiennent embrassées. Plusieurs moutons sont répandus sur la gauche du sujet, ainsi que quelques débris de ruines.

The Tolozan painting measured 19½ by 27 pouces, or roughly 61 by 68.5 cm., while the Cleveland picture measures 55 by 76 cm.

4. La Hyre, Allegory of Music with Music-Making Angels, 1649. Oil on canvas (photo: Agaci). Allegory: $37 \times 53\frac{3}{4}$ in. ($94 \times 136.5$ cm.); New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Charles B. Curtis Fund, 50.189. Angels: each $40\frac{1}{2} \times 21\frac{3}{4}$ in. ($103 \times 54$ cm.); Dijon, Musée Magnin

37. Georges de La Tour, The Musicians' Brawl (The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu)

Cuzin (Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] p. 529) records Jennifer Montagu's amusing suggestion concerning the gesture of the musician at the right center: in his right hand he holds a lemon, which he squeezes in the face of his grimacing adversary who, feigning blindness, is unmasked by this ruse.

38. Georges de La Tour, The Cheat with the Ace of Clubs (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth)

Mention should be made of the divergent opinions of Cuzin (Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] p. 529) and Hugh Brigstocke (Apollo 116 [1982] p. 10) concerning the quality of this painting and the very similar version in the Louvre, The Cheat with the Ace of Diamonds. The latter is in course of restoration, which should confirm its exceptional quality, even though its state is by no means perfect; the passages that are well preserved show extraordinary technical mastery and leave no doubt as to the authenticity of the work. The two specialists differ, too, on the delicate problem of La Tour's chronology; see also Schleier, Kunstchronik 36 (1983) pp. 196–197.

39. Georges de La Tour, The Fortune Teller (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Rogers Fund, 60.30)


41. Charles Le Brun, Venus Clipping Cupid's Wings

(Museo de Arte de Ponce, Ponce, Puerto Rico)

The painting was in the Beaujon sale, Paris, April 15, 1787, no. 87.

A good copy of approximately the same format, formerly in the collection of Lindesay Knox (sale, Christie's, London, December 17, 1981, no. 151 [as by A. F. Callet], and March 19, 1982, no. 45), is recorded in the English edition of the catalogue, although the second sale is there incorrectly dated February 17, 1982. In this copy, which is once again on the market in London, Venus has blond not brown hair.

Christian Valbert, who accepts the proposed interpretation of the painting as an allegory of conjugal love, wishes to date it in the year of Fouquet's marriage with Marie-Madeleine de Castille (1651), or to
see it as a wedding anniversary gift. In the latter event, the meeting between Fouquet and Le Brun could have taken place several years later.

42. Jean Leclerc(?), *St. Stephen Mourned by Gamaliel and Nicodemus*\(^{20}\) (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)

The attribution to Jean Leclerc, cautiously advanced, has been generally rejected, although no more convincing name has been suggested. Nor is there any unanimity as to the nationality of the artist of this fascinating painting, which Anna Ottani Cavina attributes to the Pensionante del Saraceni.\(^{21}\)


A very similar painting was in the Martin sale, Paris, December 13, 1773, no. 156: “Vénus couchée, un Amour qui la menace de sa flèche; tableau sur toile par le même [Le Sueur], hauteur 19 pouces; largeur 23 pouces.” Gabriel de Saint-Aubin made a drawing of this work (Figure 5) on the last page of his copy of the Martin sale catalogue (the latter was sold at Christie’s, London, April 7, 1970, no. 109). Despite the similarities of composition, however, the Martin painting, measuring approximately 48 by 58.5 cm., cannot be identified with the one in San Francisco, which is octagonal in shape and measures 122 by 117 cm.

52. Eustache Le Sueur, *Young Man with a Sword*  
(Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford)

Blunt (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 530) has pointed out that the painting belonged to Tomás Harris of the Spanish Art Galleries in 1938, and that he published it in 1946 as a work by Simon Vouet, an attribution endorsed by William Crelly.\(^{22}\) In spite of Sterling’s attribution of the picture to Le Sueur, Blunt believes that it could have been painted by Vouet in France. While the hesitation of certain specialists over the name of Le Sueur is understandable, the attribution to Vouet must definitely be dismissed.

5. Gabriel de Saint-Aubin (1724–80), Drawings in a catalogue of the Martin sale, Paris, December 13, 1773, showing (second register, right) a *Sleeping Venus Surprised by Cupid* by Le Sueur. Location unknown (photo: A. C. Cooper Ltd.)


The painting was in two sales not mentioned in the catalogue (the first of these was brought to my attention by Célia Alégret): the Séguin sale, Paris, April 2, 1835, no. 8 (3,101 francs); and Christie's, London, December 12, 1947, no. 86, when it was sold by the earl of Normanton (294 guineas to “Wallraf”).

I owe to Denis Laval the information that there is a copy of this picture in the church at Anneville, Seine-Maritime.

57. Claude Lorrain, *Landscape with an Artist Drawing in the Roman Campagna* (Helen F. Spencer Museum of Art, The University of Kansas, Lawrence)

A comparison in the Metropolitan Museum galleries of this painting and the version in New York amply confirms that the latter can only be an early copy.23


59. Claude Lorrain, *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha)

The figures are closely derived from the Vienna Holy Family attributed to Raphael,24 as John Spike has pointed out.

61. Claude Lorrain, *Landscape with the Battle of Constantine?* (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond)

I have not seen the version in Moscow for several years, but it seems likely that the Richmond painting is a good, early copy.25

66. [Du?] Mélezet(?), *Bowl of Strawberries* (Mrs. Francis Storza Collection, Atlanta, Georgia)

André Lacoude, professor at the university of Grenoble, and Jean Aubert, curator of the museum in Chambéry, have drawn my attention to the existence of the commune of Mélezet, near Bardonneche in Piedmont. This village was part of the Dauphiné until 1713. Was the painter of the charming still life in Atlanta a native of Mélezet?


Mellin was evidently one of the most prolific draughtsmen of his generation. Since the close of the Rome–Nancy exhibition in 1982,26 several sheets have been discovered that allow a better definition of the artist’s graphic style and of its evolution.27

69. Pierre Mignon, *The Children of the Duc de Bouillon* (Honolulu Academy of Arts)

I think it useful to reproduce here the rather indifferent drawing in Orléans that has enabled me to

---


25. I have examined it carefully and must honestly say that were there not another version in Moscow this picture would not have been questioned. It was included in the tercentenary exhibition: see H. Diane Russell, *Claude Lorrain 1600–1682/Claude Gellée dit Le Lorrain 1600–1682*, exh. cat. (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1982/Paris: Grand Palais, 1983) no. 44. Kitson (*Burlington Magazine* 125 [1983] p. 187) agrees with Russell that it is a damaged but autograph replica of the picture in Moscow.


27. Pierre Rosenberg, “Notes on Some French Seventeenth-Century Drawings: Saint-Igny, Vignon, Mellin, Millet and Others,” *Burlington Magazine* 124 (1982) pp. 697–698, figs. 53–54. 56. Since the publication of this article I have discovered several more drawings by Mellin; others have been brought to my attention by Barbara Brejon de Lavernée, and one of great importance has been discovered by Jennifer Montagu (Cooper-Hewitt Museum, New York, 1901-39-155). The sketch for the *Sacrifice of Abel* in Monte Cassino Abbey (see N. Spinosa, “Un Tableau de Charles Mellin retrouvé au Mont-Cassin,” *Revue de l’Art* 57 [1982] p. 81, fig. 3) was recently sold in New York, William Doyle Galleries, Jan. 26, 1983, no. 49, “attributed to Francesco Albani”; it has been acquired from Didier Aaron, Inc. by the Musée Historique Lorrain, Nancy, and will be published in my forthcoming article, “Quelques Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises du XVIIème siècle dans les musées de province,” *Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France* 33 (1983) p. 354, fig. 16.
The Boston painting, which was acquired in 1963, cannot have belonged to R. Payelle, as the Payelle picture was sold in Paris on November 25, 1972 (no. 46, ill.). A (new?) version of this composition, attributed to Stoskopff, was sold recently (Christie's, London, July 9, 1982, no. 9, ill.; and Christie's, New York, January 18, 1983, no. 151, ill.).

In a letter to the Burlington Magazine (124 [1982] p. 704), Sylvain Laveissière identifies the artist with a certain Pierre Nichon, who is mentioned at Dijon between 1625 and 1655. The great Calvary at Notre Dame in Dijon, which Laveissière reproduces (fig. 63), confirms that the artist was a painter of some consequence.

80, 81. The Pensionante del Saraceni, The Fruit Vendor (The Detroit Institute of Arts) and Still Life with Melons and Carafe (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.)

It no longer seems open to doubt that the two works are by the same hand. They depict not melons, as previously stated, but watermelons.

I take this opportunity to reproduce the magnificent Denial of St. Peter by the Pensionante (Figure 7), which was sold at Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York (May 30, 1979, no. 190, as Job Mocked by His Wife) and was recently acquired by the museum in Douai.28

82. François Perrier, The Deification of Aeneas
(Mrs. J. Seward Johnson Collection, Princeton)

An eighteen-century copy, measuring 27 by 37 cm., was recently shown to me in a private collection in Paris.

Schleier (Kunstchronik 96 [1983] p. 234, fig. 2) has published a fragment of a Bacchic Sacrificial Scene by Perrier in a New York private collection.

84–94. Nicolas Poussin

These paintings raised questions of two kinds. Were they indeed all by Poussin, and was it possible to date them more precisely?

6. After Pierre Mignard, The Children of the Duc de Bouillon. Red chalk, inscribed "Les enfants de Monsieur le duc de Bouillon . . .," 8 x 10¼ in. (20.2 x 27.5 cm.). Orléans, Musée des Beaux-Arts (photo: Bulloz)

identify the painter and his sitters (Figure 6). The attribution is not accepted by G. de Lastic, "Contributions à l’oeuvre de Pierre Mignard," Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français, 1980 (1982) p. 176 n. 7. Mignard is known to have painted the duc and duchesse de Bouillon in Rome; see M. Rambaud, Documents du Minutier Central concernant l’histoire de l’art, 1700–1750 (Paris, 1964) I, p. 569.

72. Jean-François Millet, Landscape with Mercury and Battus (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929, H. O. Havemeyer Collection, 29.100.21)

A small copy (38 by 67.5 cm.) was recently sold (Finarte, Rome, March 30, 1982, no. 114, ill.) under an attribution to the school of Jan Frans van Bloemen.

75. P. Nichon, The Carp (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)
7. The Pensionante del Saraceni (active 1610–20?), The Denial of St. Peter. Oil on canvas, 38 3/4 x 50 1/2 in. (98.5 x 128.5 cm.). Douai, Musée de la Chartreuse (photo: Paul Rosenberg & Co.)

While the attribution to Poussin of No. 84, Amor Vincit Omnia (The Cleveland Museum of Art), has for the most part been accepted, opinions about No. 92, The Nurture of Jupiter (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) were far from unanimous (see especially Brigstocke, Apollo 116 [1982] pp. 13 and 14, n. 6, and Blunt, Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] p. 530; see also ibid., p. 707). More surprising were the reservations expressed by Cuzin (Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] p. 529) concerning the attribution of No. 88, The Assumption of the Virgin (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.).

With regard to the chronology of these pictures, it is impossible here to resume every point in the discussion. Suffice it to say that seeing the works together confirmed me in my opinion that up to 1630 Poussin was a rapid and prolific painter, before he arrived at the slow, painstaking technique and the intellectual formulations that were to assure his fame.

97. Jean de Saint-Igny, The Triumphal Procession of Anne of Austria and the Young Louis XIV (Vassar College Art Gallery, Poughkeepsie)

Reproduced here are two paintings representing Anne of Austria and Louis XIII on horseback (Figures 8, 9),
8, 9. (?) Jean de Saint-Igny (1595/1600?–after 1649), *Anne of Austria on Horseback and Louis XIII on Horseback*. Oil on wood, each 16½ × 12¼ in. (41 × 31 cm.). Versailles, Musée National du Château de Versailles (photos: Musées Nationaux)

10. Saint-Igny, *Assumption of the Virgin*, 1636. Oil on canvas, 112¼ × 59 in. (285 × 150 cm.). Fécamp, Church of the Trinity (photo: F. Coulon)

which have recently been acquired by the Musée de Versailles. They are by the same hand as the Vassar picture and form a group with a certain number of other works (Musée Condé, Chantilly; Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris; Nîmes). But is the hand indeed that of Saint-Igny? The known works of this artist for the moment comprise only the religious paintings in the museum in Rouen; the sketches for these paintings, which were recently acquired by the museum in Dunkirk; and the *Assumption of the Virgin* (Figure 10) of 1636 in the church of the Trinity at Fécamp, which is published here for the first time. The attribution
to him of *Air* in the Rouen museum—and by consequence *The Sense of Smell* in a private collection in Paris—is based on a suggestion of Jules Hédon, Saint-Igny’s first biographer.29 Research undertaken in connection with the acquisition of the Versailles pictures has not enabled me to confirm their attribution and that of related works. During the years preceding the death of Louis XIII, when the king was already very ill, an intense propaganda campaign was waged on his behalf and on behalf of his successor, the future Louis XIV. The existence of a considerable number of popular prints representing the king, the queen, and their young sons confirms this. The engravers must have been supplied with models by a number of painters, some of whom were northerners. Was Saint-Igny among them? Only in the context of a broader study of the paintings and engravings of royal subjects dating from this period will the problem of the attribution of the Vassar picture be resolved.


The attribution has been questioned, groundlessly in my opinion, by both Blunt (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 530) and Richard Spear (“Reflections”). Could this picture be the one listed in the Lebreton sale (Paris, March 17–18, 1840, no. 129)? The work is described as follows:


Cuzin (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 529) has noted the Raphaelian origin of most of the motifs in this composition. This article offers an opportunity to reproduce Stella’s *St. Peter Visiting St. Agatha in Prison* (Figure 11) from a private collection in Oberlin. This painting, brought to my attention by Spear (“Reflections”), is on slate. With the two works on marble in the collection of David Rust (Nos. 98, 99, *Susannah and the Elders* and *Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife*), it is further evidence of the artist’s interest in painting on stone, and confirms his taste for small, rather precious pictures destined for a refined clientele. Another work on slate by Stella, mentioned in the preface to the English edition of the catalogue (p. xii), is *The Holy Family* (Figure 12), discovered in storage at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts and reattributed.

105. Nicolas Tournier, *Banquet Scene with Lute Player* (The St. Louis Art Museum)

The player’s instrument was incorrectly described as a guitar in the French edition of the catalogue.


Cuzin (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 529) dates the painting after 1627. Spear (“Reflections”) does not believe that it is by Valentin and attributes it instead to Jean Ducamps. A copy with variations, mentioned in the catalogue, is reproduced here (Figure 13).30 Another copy, identical with the American painting except that the angel holds a sort of horn in his left hand, is in a private collection in Paris. See also John Michael Montias, “A Brammer Document About Jean Ducamps, Alias Giovanni del Campo,” *Essays in Northern European Art Presented to Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Doornspijk, 1983) pp. 178–182 with illustration. John Spike rightly compares the painting with one in the City of York Art Gallery formerly attributed to Caracciolo (*Catalogue of Paintings* I [York, 1961] p. 12, no. 811, pl. 28);

30. Nos. 107 and 109 (*David with the Head of Goliath*) are reproduced in my article “Longhi e il seicento francese,” figs. 21, 22 (see note 8 above).
11. Jacques Stella (1596–1657), *St. Peter Visiting St. Agatha in Prison*, ca. 1635. Oil on slate, 9\(\frac{3}{4}\) × 12\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (24.5 × 31.5 cm). Oberlin, Ohio, private collection (photo: courtesy Richard E. Spear)


14, 15. (?) Simon Vouet (1590–1649), *St. Catherine* and *St. Agnes*, the latter dated 1626. Oil on canvas, each 37 × 29¼ in. (94 × 75.5 cm.). New York art market (photos: Bruce C. Jones)


111. François Verdier, *Christ Carrying the Cross* (Mr. and Mrs. William J. Julien Collection, Nahant, Massachusetts)

This canvas should be compared to the painting of the same subject by Charles Le Brun, which is on the London market (see [Heim Gallery], *Recent Acquisitions: French Paintings and Sculptures of the 17th and 18th Century*, exh. cat. [London, 1979] no. 8, ill.).

114. Claude Vignon, *Esther Before Ahasuerus* (Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina)


115, 116. Simon Vouet, *St. Margaret* and *St. Ursula (?)* (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford)

118, 119. Simon Vouet, *Angels with the Attributes of the Passion* (The Minneapolis Institute of Arts)

The attribution to Vouet is not accepted by Cuzin (*Burlington Magazine* 124 [1982] p. 529); see also Schleier, *Kunstchronik* 36 (1983) pp. 194–195. In connection with these works, I mentioned the two canvases in the Museo di Capodimonte that are probably the ones seen by Charles-Nicolas Cochin in the collection of Prince della Rocca, Naples; I should add that these paintings had earlier been in the famous collection of Cardinal Filomarino, as Renato Ruotolo has pointed out.31

Reproduced here are two very beautiful paintings, *St. Catherine* and *St. Agnes* (Figures 14, 15), previously

16. St. Matthew and the Angel

17. St. Luke Painting the Virgin

18. St. John the Evangelist

19. St. Mark and the Lion
unknown and currently on the New York art market. They open up a number of questions: are they by the same hand, is the hand that of Vouet, was Vouet in Italy a prolific painter or had he a studio?

120. Simon Vouet, The Holy Family with the Infant St. John (The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco)

A good, early copy is in a private collection in Rome. This will be reproduced in my forthcoming catalogue of French paintings in San Francisco.

123. Anonymous, St. Matthew and the Angel (John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota)

I have received from Giuliano Briganti photographs of four paintings representing the evangelists (Figures 16–19), which were formerly on the art market in Florence. One of these is a copy, though in a different format, of the Sarasota picture (Figure 20).

More fascinating still is the fact that one of the others is a faithful copy of Régnier's St. Luke Painting the Virgin in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen (Figure 21). Might the Sarasota painting have been cut at the bottom? More important, is it also by Régnier? The possibility, which would give Régnier's work a new dimension, cannot be excluded.

124. Anonymous, Death Comes to the Table (New Orleans Museum of Art)

The painting is certainly Florentine, and very probably the work of Giovanni Martinelli (ca. 1600–68); see Giuseppe Cantelli, Repertorio della pittura fiorentina del seicento (Florence, 1983) pl. 543.

INVENTORY

of Seventeenth-Century French Paintings in Public Collections in the United States

SEBASTIEN BOURDON


NICOLAS COLOMBEL

Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery (Los Angeles) and The Adoration of the Magi (New Orleans). The two illustrations in the catalogue were inadvertently switched. Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery, which was incorrectly listed as belonging to the Los Angeles County Museum, was privately owned. It has since been sold (Christie’s, New York, January 18, 1983, no. 178) and is now on the art market in New York.

GUILLAUME COURTOIS


22. Gaspard Dughet (1615–75), Landscape with a Town on a Mountain, ca. 1660. Oil on canvas, 29¼ × 39¼ in. (74.3 × 99.7 cm.). Columbus, Ohio, Columbus Museum of Art, Museum Purchase, Howald Fund II (photo: Columbus Museum)
23. Georges de La Tour (1593–1652), *The Magdalen with the Flickering Flame*, ca. 1640, detail of the signature. Oil on canvas, 46½ × 35½ in. (118 × 90 cm.). Los Angeles County Museum of Art (photo: LACMA)

GASPARD DUGHET

A beautiful *Landscape* (Figure 22) has recently been acquired by the Columbus Museum of Art, Ohio; the preparatory drawing for the painting is in the Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf.35

LAURENT DE LA HYRE

The *Glaucus and Scylla* from the Joseph Bonaparte collection which, as mentioned in my preface to the catalogue, was sold at Bordentown, New Jersey, in 1845 (under the title "Palemon in the guise of a Triton expressing his love for a Nymph . . . "), has recently reappeared and is now in a New York private collection.

GEORGES LALLEMANT

*St. Sebastian Mourned by Two Angels*. The picture has been sold by Walter Chrysler, Jr.

GEORGES DE LA TOUR

*The Magdalen with the Flickering Flame* (Los Angeles). In the course of its recent restoration the painting was found to be signed at the right (Figure 23), though unfortunately not dated. (The photograph was supplied by Scott Schaefer.)

CHARLES LE BRUN


*The Holy Family*, studio (Houston) and *The Holy Family* (Minneapolis). The finest of the three known versions, which I have recently had occasion to see once again, is that in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

24. Eustache Le Sueur (1616–55), *The Wedding Night of Tobias*, ca. 1645. Oil on canvas, 34 × 45¾ in. (86.5 × 114.5 cm.). Paris, private collection; formerly Charlottesville, Virginia, private collection (photo: Ed Roseberry)

EUSTACHE LE SUEUR

*Bacchus and Ariadne* (Boston). Spear ("Reflections") mentions a painting of this subject, catalogued under the name of Le Sueur, in a sale in 1789.36

A previously unpublished painting by Le Sueur was until recently in a private collection in Charlottesville, Virginia (Figure 24).35 This oval picture, *The Wedding Night of Tobias*, painted for Fieubet, has been lost since 1801 (for the engraving after it by J.-F. Ravenet see Alain Mérot, "La Renommée d’Eustache Le Sueur et l’estampe," *Revue de l’Art* 55 [1982] p. 62, fig. 10).

EUSTACHE LE SUEUR(?)

*Decorative Allegorical Composition* (Lawrence). For my article on this painting see The Register of the Spencer Museum of Art, *The University of Kansas, Lawrence* 5, no. 10 (1983) pp. 5–9.

33. The painting is also reproduced by Schleier, *Kunstchronik* 36 (1983) p. 233, fig. 1a; for the drawing see Christian Klemm, *Gaspard Dughet und die ideale Landschaft: Kataloge des Kunstmu-

34. See also note 10 above.

35. The photograph was provided by Mrs. D. B. Lawall. The picture has recently been acquired by a French bank.


Claude Lorrain

The exhibition held recently in Washington and in Paris has offered an opportunity to reconsider certain problems of attribution. The *Rape of Europa* (Fort Worth), listed tentatively as a copy, is in fact an autograph work though not in good state. It is one of the earliest of Claude’s paintings on a large scale, and he may not have felt at ease, which would explain the awkwardness of the composition and of the handling. The *St. George and the Dragon* (Hartford) has recently been restored and now looks very fine. The river scene in Norfolk (Paysage avec chargement d’un navire, rendered in the English catalogue as “Landscape with Ship Cargo”) must be one of the earliest works by Claude;

still, the warm light suggests that it is later in date than *Landscape with Herd and Woman Milking a Cow* (Houston), an autograph work in poor state.

Unfortunately, the two versions of the *Landscape with Four Shepherds and Flock* (New Orleans and San Francisco) were not included in the exhibition; had they been shown together it would have been possible to decide which was by Claude. I still believe that *The Forum* (Springfield), which was not shown in Washington and Paris, is an early copy. The *Shepherd and His Flock* (Washington, D.C.), evidently an enlarged and modified original, would, in my opinion, merit restoration. Finally, a copy of the *Pastoral Landscape* belonging to the duke of Westminster was omitted from the list; it is in the collection of the University Art Galleries, University of Southern California at Los Angeles.

36. See also note 25 above and comments on the paintings in Lawrence and Richmond.

Maître aux Beguins/Master of the Béguins

Peasant Family with Ram (Princeton). The painting (Figure 25) is listed, not surprisingly under the name of Le Nain, in the catalogue of an anonymous sale on February 17, 1774, no. 64. Gabriel de Saint-Aubin’s drawing (Figure 26) in the margin of his copy of the catalogue renders this identification almost certain. (The artist was incorrectly described in the English catalogue, p. 362, as Master of the Béguines; the name is in fact derived from the cap or bonnet—bèguin—worn by the girls in his paintings.)

Pierre Mignard(?)

The Virgin and Child (Norfolk). Schleier (Kunstchronik 36 [1983] p. 235, fig. 1b) rejects this tentative attribution in favor of Alessandro Turchi (1578–1649).

Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer

A Vase of Flowers belonging to the Flint Institute of Arts, Flint, Michigan, was omitted from the inventory. It is reproduced in a recent guide to the collection (Highlights from the Collection [Flint, 1979] p. 22, ill.).

Nicolas Poussin

Moses Sweetening the Bitter Waters of Marah (Baltimore). The painting, which has just been restored, is indeed by Poussin and should be dated about 1628. The X-radiograph is of particular interest:37 seen upside down (Figure 27), it shows a God the Father very similar to the one in the Sacrifice of Noah, known through the engravings of Gantrel and Frey, and through the painted version at Tatton Park. (It should be remembered that the Baltimore picture was rejected by Thuillier, and the painting at Tatton Park by Blunt.38)

Achilles Discovered Among the Daughters of Lycomedes (Richmond). This picture, which I have seen again recently, is unfortunately a copy.

37. The X-radiograph, laboratory report, and other information about the treatment of the picture were generously provided by Gertrude Rosenthal, formerly chief curator of the Baltimore Museum of Art.

28. Nicolas Regnier, Self-Portrait at the Easel. Oil on canvas, 43\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 54\(\frac{3}{8}\) in. (111 x 138 cm). Cambridge, Massachusetts, Fogg Art Museum, Gift of Mrs. Eric Schroeder, 1982.116 (photo: Fogg Art Museum)

NICOLAS REGNIER

A Self-Portrait at the Easel (Figure 28) has recently been given to the Fogg Art Museum by Mrs. Eric Schroeder.39 This picture might well have been included in the exhibition.

The Los Angeles County Museum of Art has recently acquired a fascinating Régnier, Allegory of Music (see Gazette des Beaux-Arts: La Chronique des Arts 61 [March 1983] p. 33, no. 180, ill.).

JACQUES STELLA

Like the Poussin, Hannibal Crossing the Alps (Cambridge), a Birth of the Virgin by Stella has been offered to the Fogg Art Museum on extended loan by the Seiden and de Cuevas Foundation.

CLAUDINE TOURNIER

It is The Drinker (Kansas City), which Cuzin reproduces (Burlington Magazine 124 [1982] fig. 46), really by Tournier?

VALENTIN

The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, California, has recently acquired a superlative Christ and the Adulteress (Figure 29).

CLAUDE VIGNON

Solomon Making Sacrifice to the Idols (Norfolk). The picture has been sold by Walter Chrysler, Jr.

49. Omitted from the inventory was an Adoration of the Magi (Figure 30), acquired by the Birmingham Museum of Art, Alabama, in 1979.


Simon Vouet (pupil)

Christ on the Cross (Chicago). According to Spear ("Reflections"), this painting is by Poerson.

Salome (Greenville). There is a better version in the collections of the Soprintendenza of Naples (Figure 31), whose existence was brought to my attention by Nicola Spinosa.

Simon Vouet(?)


Selected Anonymous Works

The Virgin and Child with St. Elizabeth (Los Angeles). According to Scott Schaefer, the picture could be by Reynaud Levieux.

Dido Abandoned(?) (Los Angeles). This is surely a fragment of a larger composition by Jean Le Maire.

Christ and the Woman from Canaan (Norfolk). Jennifer Montagu has attributed the painting to Thomas Blanchet.

The Adoration of the Magi (Richmond). Gilles Chomer ascribes the picture to Baigneur, an opinion not shared by Charles Sterling.

NOTE

This article was completed in December 1983. It was translated from the French by Katharine Baejter, Mary Laing, and Gretchen Wold.