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Director’s Note

IN 2003 THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM acquired a collection of more than fifty paintings that represent a key period in European history, beginning in the 1780s with the advent of the French Revolution and concluding soon after the abdication in 1848 of France’s last king, Louis-Philippe. Assembled by the New York connoisseur Wheelock Whitney between 1972 and 2000, this remarkable collection underscores the role of the natural world as a source of inspiration for European artists living on the cusp of the modern epoch, and it provides ample evidence of a rich tradition of painting out of doors, en plein air, nearly a century before Impressionism. This collection was not assembled with the intention of illustrating a complete and comprehensive history of a period or style. Rather, it came together by chance, as Whitney chose works purely on the basis of their quality, even when they bore incorrect attributions or none at all.

The Whitney Collection encompasses the full scope of paintings that would have been found in a Parisian cabinet d'amateur in the first half of the nineteenth century, including portraits and historical and genre pictures. It is renowned, however, for its concentration of plein-air oil studies. At the heart of the collection is a group of paintings by northern European artists who were drawn to Rome in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by the city’s combination of antiquity and natural beauty. Several of these artists were recipients of the prestigious Prix de Rome, which enabled them to study in Italy under the auspices of the French government, and the majority of them showed their work at the Paris Salons. Yet although they may have been among the most promising and sometimes even the most successful painters of their day, many of them have been all but forgotten. One of the great strengths that artists of this period shared was their ability to engage their physical surroundings with unparalleled fluency, using skills they developed through rigorous academic training. It is enlightening to find works so immediate in their appeal that their makers are revealed as individuals, even when their biographies remain obscure.

This issue of the Bulletin celebrates the tenth anniversary of this important acquisition and coincides with the first exhibition of The Whitney Collection. Significant research has been undertaken on the paintings since they were acquired by the Museum, and their individual stories continue to unfold. Our visitors are invited to enjoy them in this spirit of discovery.

THOMAS P. CAMPBELL

Director, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Attributed to Simon Denis. View from the Villa d’Este, Tivoli, ca. 1786–1806. See also fig. 15.
If I had the time and if, like you, I were in the country, I would paint landscapes: it is a branch of art which teaches one philosophy. I would also make music! I’d want nothing more for a happy life than to be in a state of peace and independence.”1 These are not the words of Claude Monet or Camille Pissarro. They were written by the preeminent history painter and portraitist Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, nearly a half century before the Impressionists banded together in the 1870s to exhibit “The New Painting” to astonished Parisian audiences. The practice of sketching in oil paint out of doors—en plein air—had in fact begun to gain momentum in the 1770s, and it is documented well before that. So crucial was this development to the founding mythology of modernist painting that for the last forty years it has been one of the most actively studied areas of nineteenth-century art.

Two distinctly separate exhibitions, the first quite unheralded, played a significant role in drawing attention to early plein-air painting. In the spring of 1974 a small private firm in Paris, Galerie du Fleuve, put on “Aspects du paysage néo-classique en France de 1790 à 1835,” which featured a group of landscape oil studies that proved revelatory: for their candor, for their small size, and, not least, for the obscurity into which so many of the artists who painted them had fallen. Although it was on view for only three weeks, this novel exhibition made a deep impression on people who saw it. Their reaction was contextualized later that same year by the landmark traveling exhibition “French Painting 1774–1830: The Age of Revolution,” which opened at the Grand Palais in Paris (as “De David à Delacroix: La peinture française de 1774 à 1830”) and continued on to the Detroit Institute of Arts and the Metropolitan Museum in 1975. This second show interspersed finished landscapes (a number of them by artists whose studies had appeared in the earlier one) among history and genre paintings. It stimulated a generation of art historians to reappraise a period that had previously been the domain—so the thinking went—of a very small number of giants that began with Jacques-Louis David and his followers and concluded with Eugène Delacroix. While this pantheon remains firmly in place to the present day, a closer look has revealed legions of painters whose legacy now informs and extends our admiration for the art of an extraordinary period of unprecedented change. In short, the acknowledged titans, once isolated by their aura of greatness, now keep company with the artists who influenced them and whom they influenced in turn: Camille Corot, Gustave Courbet, and Édouard Manet.

Among the intrepid collectors, scholars, curators, and dealers who were inspired to look closely at this period was Wheelock Whitney, who in effect took on all these roles. Through exhibitions and publications, Whitney played a key part in nurturing a broader interest in painting of the French school between 1785 and 1850. The basic strategy was simple: to unearth informal sketches (esquisses) and studies (études) of aesthetic merit that artists typically squirreled away in their ateliers and to place them before the eyes of the public, often for the first time since they were painted. Because the majority of the painters were greatly admired in their day but had been overshadowed by subsequent artistic trends, finished paintings by these long-neglected artists were also added to the mix.

Discoveries were exciting and plentiful. In one instance a hitherto anonymous canvas was recognized as the only known surviving fragment of a painting commissioned in 1832 from Auguste-Hyacinthe Debay by King Louis-Philippe for his Paris residence, the
1. Auguste-Hyacinthe Debay (French, Nantes 1804–1865 Paris). The Nation Is in Danger; or the Enrollment of Volunteers at the Place du Palais-Royal in July 1792 (fragment), 1832. Oil on canvas, 11⅞ x 20½ in. (30.2 x 52.7 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Whitney Collection, Promised Gift of Wheelock Whitney III, and Purchase, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. McVeigh, by exchange, 2003 (2003.42.33)


Palais-Royal, where it was all but destroyed in the Revolution of 1848 (figs. 1, 2). On another painting (fig. 3) a portion of the inscription, Beyrouth, had been misread as Beyrouat and was thought to be the artist’s signature; Beyrouth is in fact the French spelling of the subject, Beirut, and its date of 1844 coincides precisely with a visit to the Levant by the artist Jules Coignet, by whom it is a characteristic and exceptionally fine example. (Edgar Degas probably had ample opportunity to admire Coignet’s painting in the Paris home of his friend Alexis Rouart, its first recorded owner.) Yet another discovery was the author of a landscape sketch that appeared at auction in 1976 as a work by Pierre-Henri de Valenciennes (fig. 4). Years would go by before the sketch was recognized as bearing all the stylistic hallmarks of studies by Simon Denis, an artist essentially unknown until then. Denis’s oil sketches are now better represented in the Metropolitan than in any other museum.

Not long before The Whitney Collection came to the Museum, a number of these paintings figured in several landmark exhibitions, among them “In the Light of Italy: Corot and Early Open-Air Painting” in 1996–97, “Paysages d’Italie: Les peintres du plein air (1780–1830)” in 2001, and “Crossing the Channel: British and French Painting in the Age of Romanticism,” which was shown at the Metropolitan in 2003–4.

Competitors for the coveted Prix de Rome awarded by the Académie des Beaux-Arts in the categories of history painting and, from 1817, landscape painting were among the most promising, ambitious, and in many cases successful artistic figures of the era. But many of those painters are barely familiar today even to specialists. Long considered a genre subsidiary to history painting, landscape painting had a complementary yet distinct curriculum that included the practice of painting out of doors, a tradition that was passed down from master to pupil. And plein-air painting shares with the study of the human figure an emphasis on the experience of rendering the thing

observed, of painting d’après nature. This term, which translates literally as “after nature” but actually means “before nature” or “from nature,” appears in conjunction with all artistic genres and media, including figure studies and portraits. Yet as treatises on the subject and the catalogues of the Paris Salons make clear, paintings d’après nature had been closely associated with landscape painting since at least the early eighteenth century. It is in the context of landscape that the expression takes on a shade of meaning that is particular to this branch of art: the sense in which it implies the artist’s immersion in his subject, that he is not merely before but in nature. Nothing conveys this better than plein-air oil studies. To sketch with paints out of doors an artist equipped himself with specialized apparatus: a portable easel and paint box and, almost as characteristic as paint itself, paper. Paper was preferable to canvas because it was durable yet lightweight and easy to cut into small sheets. Typically, plein-air sketches were painted quickly in order to keep pace with nature’s fleeting effects. The paper absorbed a portion of the oil while allowing the impasted paint to lie on the surface, where it retained much of its viscous appearance and luminosity even after it dried. Made on the go, plein-air paintings are arresting in their ability to convey the circumstances of their genesis.

“Where I amused myself watching the auks and gulls fly past, gazing into the bluish distance, picking up seashells, and listening to the music of the waves among the reefs.” Thus François-René de Chateaubriand vividly evoked his youth on the shores of Brittany, adding, “Would my mind have been better developed if I had been sent to school earlier? I doubt it: these waves, these winds, this solitude which were my first masters were probably better suited to my native dispositions; perhaps I have these wild teachers to thank for certain qualities I would otherwise lack.” In the eighteenth century the unmediated experience of nature, associated in literature with the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, also manifested itself in the visual arts. Perhaps as early as 1785 Pierre-Henri de Valenciennes painted The Banks of the Rance, Brittany (fig. 5),
a view that could well depict the place Chateaubriand sketched in words and invites much the same degree of immediacy. It is one of ten such studies Valenciennes executed in Brittany, during one of the earliest known plein-air painting excursions on the Channel coast. 6

From the top to the bottom of his sketch Valenciennes differentiated between the sky, where haze is indicated by the white of the support showing through a thin layer of blue paint, and the water, where a reflection of the haze is indicated by touches of white paint. From left to right (taking advantage of the cast of sunlight) he used aerial perspective, the combined effect of light and atmosphere, to soften distant details and enhance the illusion of spatial recession. He used the same size brushstrokes to render faraway details and the trees and rocks in the near distance. Valenciennes advocated the economical and spontaneous approach that yielded this sketch in his highly influential treatise *Études de perspective pratique*, first published in 1800. He advised painters “to seize Nature” by sketching “maquettes made in haste” and, toward that end, recommended they not concern themselves with finish in the conventional sense. Although Valenciennes’s dry summations may strike the reader as self-evident, they are based on one of the fundamentals of the Enlightenment: the close observation of natural phenomena. His detailed description in prose of how moving water is disturbed as it flows over submerged rocks, for example, echoes the spirited brushwork that describes the swirls and eddies of the Rance, a combination of dabs, lines, and commalike strokes that are visible under magnification (see fig. 6). 6

Sketches like Valenciennes’s, executed on a sheet of paper small enough to be practical in an impromptu situation, were not exhibited, nor were they meant to be. Rather, they were exercises intended to educate the eye and the hand so that the artist would have a body of experience and a repertoire of motifs to draw upon later, within the confines of his studio. Such studies might have been seen by pupils and other visitors but not by the broader public. Sometimes an artist’s family kept these works together, out of sight, but just as typically they surfaced briefly on the occasion of an estate sale. In the case of Valenciennes, whose atelier was dispersed at auction in 1819, the sketches were acquired by a small number of enthusiasts, including Pierre-Charles de L’Espine. When L’Espine’s descendant Princess Louis de Croÿ presented 134 of those sketches (all Italian views painted between 1777 and 1785 or 1786) as a gift to the Louvre in 1930, they prompted a reevaluation of Valenciennes’s role in the history of French Neoclassical painting in the decades before and after 1800. Neoclassicism had by then been eclipsed by the successive waves of Romanticism, Realism, Impressionism, and so on, and a public accustomed to bold formal innovation readily accepted Valenciennes’s oil sketches as direct precursors of a modern aesthetic. The informality of painted sketches, which originally defined them as private works, was increasingly embraced as a hallmark of paintings made for public display from the late nineteenth century onward.

In contrast to his sketches, the landscapes Valenciennes sent to the official exhibitions were highly formalized compositions—idealized settings suited to the worthy acts of ancient peoples, in which urge is tempered by reason.
Jean-Victor Bertin (French, Paris 1767–1842 Paris), Classical Landscape with Figures, 1803. Oil on wood, 14 1/4 x 18 in. (36.8 x 45.7 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Whitney Collection, Promised Gift of Wheelock Whitney III, and Purchase, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. McVeigh, by exchange, 2003 (2003.42.3)

and the painter’s touch is correspondingly discreet. This type of painting, intended to decorate the same walls as historical compositions by Jacques-Louis David and his school, is exemplified in Classical Landscape with Figures, by Valenciennes’s pupil Jean-Victor Bertin (fig. 7). As early as 1797 Bertin’s talents were recognized by the leading art dealer of the time, Jean-Baptiste Pierre Le Brun: “We have many artists here [in Paris] who have made great progress. . . . One who is preparing to leave for Italy, a young man named Bertin who is a pupil of Valenciennes’s, has the greatest aptitude. If he profits by his journey, of which I have no doubt, he will become one of the greatest men of this genre.”

Bertin went on to fulfill his early promise as a painter and as an influential teacher of landscape painting in the mold of Valenciennes. Bertin was partially responsible for the Académie des Beaux-Arts establishing the quadrennial Prix de Rome for paysage historique, or historical landscape painting, for which he had been an advocate since 1801. Its first laureate, in 1817, was his pupil Achille-Bruno Michallon. Another of his pupils, previously a student of Michallon’s, was Camille Corot, the painter who more than any other is credited with transmitting the aesthetics and ethos of the landscape sketch to the Impressionist generation.

Bertin’s legacy includes no examples of the sort of sketches Valenciennes left in such abundance, and the connection of his finished paintings to the experience of nature as understood by his contemporaries may not be obvious. Bertin painted Classical Landscape with Figures in 1803, probably in his Paris studio. The eye is led through a cleft in the trees to an ordered
succession of distinct planes culminating in distant mountains, the whole softened by an atmospheric veil of light and shade. In the foreground of this arcadia, elfin figures gather beside an aged poet. (His precise identity, according to convention, matters little.) Although the figures’ formal role in the composition is minor, their presence nevertheless animates and thus justifies the picture; an uninhabited landscape would have been alien to existing pastoral and heroic paradigms. This is nature perfected, unabashedly in the manner of French painters active in Rome in the seventeenth century, especially Nicolas Poussin and, in this case, Claude Lorrain (see fig. 8).

The German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, a dedicated landscape draftsman himself, recommended that “what one needs to do is to look at [Poussin and Claude] and then immediately to look at Nature to learn what they saw in her and in one way or another imitated; then the mind is cleared of misconceptions and in the end one arrives at a true vision of the relationship between Nature and Art.” Goethe was expressing a prevailing view that echoes the advice of the well-known treatise on painting first published at the beginning of the eighteenth century by Roger de Piles: “After having thus gained some knowledge in good manner, it will next be proper to study after nature, and to chuse and rectify it, according to the idea which the aforesaid great masters had of it.” Classical Landscape is typical of Bertin’s Salon-style paintings, albeit on a scale that appealed to bourgeois collectors. Although the composition is contrived, its artifice arises from a firm grounding in the close observation of nature, which is keenly felt not only in the sky and in the treatment of foliage and other details but in their harmonious interaction as part of what Rousseau called “the great pageant of nature . . . , a total and undivided spectacle.”

The polished aesthetic shared by Neoclassical landscape painters belies their respective approaches to the transition from sketching out of doors to composing pictures within the studio. Bertin’s plein-air oil sketches, if indeed he made them, do not seem to have survived, and whether he produced such works with the same spontaneity, freedom of handling, and speed of execution that make his master’s so striking cannot be deduced. An altogether different approach was employed by another contemporary, Joseph Bidauld, whose plein-air sketches prize topographical precision and composition above accidents of nature. Bidauld traveled to Italy in 1785, about the time Valenciennes returned to Paris. At the time he was also an independent artist, that is, unaffiliated with the

8. Claude Lorrain (Claude Gellée; French, Champagne 1604/5–1682, Rome). Sunrise, possibly 1646–47. Oil on canvas, 40\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 52\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. (102.9 x 134 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1947 (47.12)
Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture (later the Académie des Beaux-Arts), and his trip was supported by Le Brun’s rival dealer Antoine-Charles Dulac. Bidauld’s study Lake Fucino and the Abruzzi Mountains (fig. 9) is as direct and well observed as any painted by the artists of the school of Barbizon fifty years later, but it comes far closer to conveying a sense of place, of being a view as such, than do Valenciennes’s sketches. It was executed in thin, delicate washes of color over a summary drawing probably made with a pencil to establish the basic contours. The underdrawing, visible here and there to the naked eye, enables one to see that the painter generally followed his initial outline but also improvised, notably in the foreground, where he laid in the fields and the trees, with their diminutive individual shadows, to assert a sense of scale. (Lake Fucino, which was drained in the nineteenth century, was approximately seven and a half miles across from Bidauld’s vantage point at Avezzano to the far shore on its south side.) In Italy, Bidauld said, he “learned to make studies by making pictures, and to make pictures by making studies.”

Bidauld’s formal paintings reflected the prevailing taste from the 1790s through the Empire period (1804–15) and were featured regularly in the Paris Salons. Coming on the heels of the inaugural Prix de Rome for landscape painting in 1817, his election in 1823 as the first landscape painter to be inducted into the exalted Institut de France—and admitted to the jury of the official annual exhibitions, or Salons—cemented the status of this burgeoning genre. Yet his influential role as a juror would soon deal a blow to ambitious young landscapists who
sought to introduce less highly formal elements and more innovative painting techniques into their work. Despite Bidauld’s firsthand appreciation of the value of painting out of doors, he steadfastly resisted the appearance of improvisation in his finished pictures and rejected those submitted to the Salon jury that failed to meet his inflexible standards.

After the Salon of 1824, when the informal, naturalist tendencies of the British school exemplified by John Constable began to exert an influence on impressionable young French painters, Bidauld refused to yield the hegemony of his own stately mode of picture making. He found the ascent of the Barbizon painters from 1830 onward to be particularly vexing and repeatedly rejected the work of progressive painters like Paul Huet and Théodore Rousseau (see fig. 10). Sheer frustration led the critic Gustave Planche to accuse Bidauld in 1840 of being unqualified to judge these painters on their own merits. And in 1843 an anonymous account of that year’s Salon in the widely read review L’Artiste opened with an illustrated vignette depicting seven men hanging from an aged oak, an obvious allusion to the painters of the Forest of Fontainebleau who were dispirited by Bidauld and the rest of the Salon jury’s exclusion of their latest efforts. Of course at this late stage of Bidauld’s life few people had any inkling of the hundred or so plein-air oil studies

10. Théodore Rousseau (French, Paris 1812–1867 Barbizon). A River Landscape, ca. 1845–50. Oil on wood, 16 1/8 x 24 5/8 in. (41.6 x 62.4 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Richard De Wolfe Bixey, 1943 (43.86.7)
he had painted more than half a century earlier; they came to light only after his death in 1846. With greater hindsight, the critic Charles Blanc gave a more temperate assessment. In Blanc’s view, Bertin, Bidauld, and others like them “had two great qualities; they were studious and conscientious. They drew firmly, they made excellent studies as a basis for bad pictures; but they exhibited only the pictures and shamefully hid their studies.”

Another painter closely associated with the growing French taste for Italian (and Italianate) landscape painting at the end of the eighteenth century is Alexandre-Hyacinthe Dunouy. His surviving oil studies do not fit easily on either side of the pedagogical divide between Valenciennes’s instruction to capture fleeting effects, on the one hand, and Bidauld’s attentiveness to description, on the other. Dunouy’s first visit to Italy reportedly lasted eight years, possibly from 1783 until 1791, when he made his debut at the Paris Salon with an Italian view. A fire destroyed Dunouy’s studio in 1803, and no studies from his first Italian sojourn can be traced with absolute certainty. One work attributable to him from
this period is a view of Subiaco (fig. 11), the village east of Rome that would soon become an essential destination on artists’ itineraries both for its picturesque setting and for the richness of its churches and monasteries. Dunouy may have used a camera obscura (one was included in his estate sale) to plot the complicated haphazard lines and interstices of hilltown architecture in the initial drawing. With this complex faceting in place, the artist then completed the study by applying his paints. The result is a technically brilliant tonal study of the play of light and shadow, particularly given the great distance at which he positioned himself.11

Success at the Salon led to official commissions for Dunouy, including paintings for Empress Josephine at the château of Fontainebleau and for Joseph Bonaparte’s country estate at Mortefontaine. View in a Park (fig. 12) exemplifies the pastoral ideal of French landscape architecture of the period, informed by English models that in turn owe a debt to the paintings of Claude and Poussin. It could have been painted either before or after Dunouy’s second Italian sojourn in 1810–15. The artist was invited to work in Naples by its king, Joachim Murat, whose wife, Napoleon’s sister Caroline, cultivated a flourishing if short-lived court. The majority of Dunouy’s known Italian sketches belong to this later period, including The Palazzo Reale and the Harbor, Naples (fig. 13), a study for a painting that once decorated the royal palace at Portici (fig. 14). Dunouy’s small- and medium-scale canvases were as highly prized by Grand Tourists as they were by the royal patrons whose support enhanced his success.


In Naples Dunoy crossed paths with another painter who specialized in landscape, Simon Denis (see fig. 15). Denis had established himself permanently in Naples in 1806, and he was also a court painter to Caroline Murat when he died there in 1813. What must constitute the vast majority of his finished landscapes, painted for amateurs from all over Europe, remain largely unidentified today. In 1978 the appearance of a single signed oil study, A Torrent at Tivoli (on long-term loan from the Gere Collection to the National Gallery, London), created a stir among the burgeoning group of collectors and scholars interested in early plein-air painting. As additional studies by Denis appeared on the market (occasionally mistaken for the work of other artists), there began to emerge a sense of the scope of his achievement, which compared favorably with other recently re-appreciated contemporaries, notably Valenciennes and the Welshman Thomas Jones. Here was a painter—enterprising, accomplished, held in high esteem by those who knew his work—whose finished paintings had for all intents and purposes vanished. Yet his private studies conjured an artistic personality on the most intimate terms. That they were numbered by the painter in a manner that suggests he organized them retrospectively into broad categories (water, sky, flora, rocks and caves, panoramas) for use in the studio affords unprecedented insight as to their function.

Denis came from Antwerp, where he was the pupil of Henricus Josephus Antonissen, exponent of a traditional and somewhat provincial strain of landscape painting. In 1775 Denis struck out for Paris, where he caught the attention of the dealer Le Brun. It was Le Brun who sponsored Denis’s move to Italy, where he was living by 1786. There he plied his trade as a painter of landscapes for the lucrative market among Grand Tourists. The 1780s were a propitious time for the French school of landscape painting, even if the genre has not received the attention devoted to parallel developments in history painting. There is no single landscape painting of the decade as momentous as David’s Oath of the Horatii, yet the genre was evolving. Denis’s exposure to the marketplace would have made him
Denis, “It is a pleasure to see that you do nothing without nature. It is only through her that one has talent. Her most mediocre if faithful reproduction is pleasing. He who puts care into the choice of his subject and fineness of tone into its color, and thus achieves that effect often felt by chance in nature—becomes a painter par excellence.” 16. One notable feature of Denis’s finished paintings is their adherence to the artist’s initial observation of nature and lack of historical pretext or pretense, as typified by View from the Villa d’Este, Tivoli (fig. 15). In this respect they find parallels in works like Vernet’s Ponte Rotto, Rome (fig. 17).


17. Joseph Vernet (French, Avignon 1714–1789 Paris). Ponte Rotto, Rome, ca. 1765. Oil on canvas, 15½ x 30½ in. (40 x 77 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris (9468)


For many artists active at the turn of the nineteenth century, painting out of doors was something to try and possibly even to enjoy. No matter how enthusiastically plein-air painting was embraced, however, infatuation was no guarantee of a long-term commitment. Simon Denis never ceased to engage nature directly. In 1806, some fifteen years after his arrival in the Eternal City, he was still sufficiently attached to the practice to paint a rooftop view from the upper story, perhaps from a balcony, of a palazzo along the Salita del Grillo, a short street close by Trajan’s Forum on the Quirinal Hill (fig. 22). The cityscape is frankly unassuming, with no single building or monument to serve as a key to the attraction it held for the artist, at least in terms of novelty or importance. The simple fact of Denis’s having arrived on the spot with his paint kit makes it plausible that the view was familiar to him. And this familiarity—the cumulative experience of observing this particular view—is the strongest clue to what it represents.

In the urban pell-mell Denis took advantage of an array of diagonals culminating in the belvedere that pierces the sky at the center of the painting. The strongest of these is the roofline of the church at the lower left, Santa Caterina da Siena. The resulting pyramidal structure is a conventional perspectival device used by artists since the Renaissance. Yet even as the pyramid succeeds as a principal organizing component of the composition, its visual impact is diluted by a host of competing details. Sundry vertical elements—trees and chimney pots, a cross and a dome (part of Palazzo Vidman, now destroyed)—protrude above the horizon. Even the few monuments that can be easily identified, the Quirinal Palace with the obelisk before it at the far right and the two square towers of the Villa Medici immediately to the left, are accorded no more prominence than any other building. From an iconographic standpoint, an inversion of hierarchies is at work here. The role of the better-known monuments is in fact to further clarify the spatial construction of the picture, whose caniness is underscored by the deliberate omission of a particularly recognizable feature of the skyline, the Torre delle Milizie, which stands a hairsbreadth outside the left margin of the painting.

All these parts of the composition were evident to Denis before he applied his brush to the paper. He began this study with a simple linear drawing, probably in graphite, which is visible beneath the paint layer by means of infrared reflectography (fig. 23). The way the artist proceeded from this initial image expressed entirely in two dimensions offers exceptional insight into his painterly aims. Given his vantage point, he might have included a repoussoir (essentially a stage device such as a parapet or a windowsill) to tidy up the foreground, lead the viewer’s eye into the picture, and establish scale. Instead, leaving in place a few confidently and broadly sketched architectural elements, notably the volutes of Santa Caterina and the impasse where its vestibule meets the nave (which he joined with a crude daub of paint rather than a full correction), he retained the plunging foreground. In doing so, he took up a virtual challenge Roger de Piles had issued nearly a century before:

I am sensible, that there are very fine landscapes, with foregrounds, appearing to be well chosen, and carrying a great idea, but which are, nevertheless, very slightly finished: I own, indeed, that this slightness ought to be pardoned, when it is ingenious, when it suits with the nature of the ground, and bears the character of truth. But it must be owned likewise, that this effect is very rare, and that it is to be feared, lest this slight working should give some idea of poverty, or of too great negligence: So that in whatever manner the foregrounds of a picture be disposed, I would have the artist prescribe it as a law to himself, to finish them with skill, and accurate workmanship."

The pictorial awkwardness of these passages yields to increasing refinement as the eye glides along the subtle curve that begins in the left foreground and continues to the right middle ground before doubling back parabolically toward the distant vista of hills. It was not solely the topography that Denis aimed to depict, however. Facing north by northwest, the view beckoned to be painted in the afternoon to take full advantage of the shadows that heighten the counterpoint between the curve in the cityscape and the dome of the sky. This simple record of a few hours’ work, which Denis categorized as a sky study, is demonstrably a combination of rehearsal (identifying the subject and contemplating the means to depict it) and improvisation (execution).

These sky studies make clear that fully a generation before Constable famously sketched the sky above Hampstead Heath, Denis was fulfilling a similar ambition in Rome. Vernet, Valenciennes, and Thomas Jones had also favored rooftop views for their studies. In the end Denis’s View on the Quirinal Hill, like their paintings in this vein, remains a study, incorporating the investigatory properties of a sketch and the more highly developed features of a finished picture. As a private exercise intended to

23. Infrared reflectogram detail of fig. 22
satisfy personal aims, it could have been admired by Denis’s friends and associates, but lacking technical finish and a clear adherence either to the Picturesque or the Sublime, it did not meet the criteria for a complete work of art according to the standards of the day. Yet it serves as an eloquent summation of the trends in landscape painting of the eighteenth century that would be carried forward into the nineteenth.

One significant instance of Denis’s influence has come to light in the memoirs of the painter François-Marius Granet. Granet arrived in Rome in July 1802 bearing a letter of introduction to Denis. A native of Aix-en-Provence, he had studied under the landscapist Jean-Antoine Constantin before moving to Paris in 1797 with his friend Auguste de Forbin (who later became director of the Louvre). There he entered the studio of Jacques-Louis David, who since before the Revolution began in 1789 had been the undisputed standard-bearer of heroic figure painting. Much had changed, however, since the tempestuous early years when David’s best-known followers in this most exalted of genres, Antoine Jean Gros, François Gérard, and Anne-Louis Girodet-Trioson, had first reached maturity. The politically astute David pursued a more moderate course during the regime of the Directory (1795–99), which coincided with a group of relatively conservative pupils entering the studio, Granet among them. What had not changed was the intense experience of camaraderie (and also rivalry) endemic to David’s studio. This artistic milieu—not just the people, who included his fellow painter and lifelong friend Ingres, but also the physical spaces they inhabited—made a deep impression on Granet.

One-time sacred spaces that had been repurposed for all manner of uses after the Revolutionary government suppressed religious orders in 1790 seem to have held a deep resonance for him. In Paris he kept a studio in the former Capuchin convent near the place Vendôme, and later in Rome he maintained one in the veritable artists’ commune that was the convent of Santissima Trinità dei Monti.

In Rome the young Granet initially relied on landscape painting to support himself, and he is best known for the sensational plein-air oil sketches he made there, all but one of which (fig. 24), so far as is known, are in the museum in Aix-en-Provence that bears his name. His first attempt at painting the Colosseum gave him trouble, however:

My model was one of such richness, and I myself was so eager to leave nothing out, that I placed on my little canvas far too many objects to produce a good work of art. I lovingly caressed each of the separate elements I wanted to study; consequently, my picture looked more like a mosaic than a painting. I sensed that something was not right, but I could not determine what. So I submitted it to M. Denys, a Flemish painter who did landscapes and animals with great talent. I had been recommended to him in a letter of which I myself was the bearer. This worthy man was of ordinary appearance, but
his keen little eyes gave his expression a great deal of vivacity and wit. His manners, in keeping with his countenance, had inspired my confidence. I went to him, then, as to my master. After looking over my study, he said, “My friend, you’ve put on your canvas enough to fill four big paintings.” And he bluntly explained to me all my mistakes. I understood him so thoroughly I was already burning to start over, in order to put to profit his good advice.

Monseur Denys, knowing I had no money, exhorted me not to be alarmed by my situation. “When I arrived in Rome,” he added, “I was young like you, and I too had to work for a living. I began by doing a painting of the Temple of Minerva Medica, which I sold right off; that one led to others, and little by little I built up a modest fortune. You’ll have to try to do likewise.”

It was common practice for artists furthering their careers in Rome to paint views of the well-known sites to sell to Grand Tourists. The exhibition “Tivoli: Variations sur un paysage au XVIIIe siècle,” held at the Musée Cognacq-Jay in Paris in 2010–11, documented how just one such destination served as a source of inexhaustible inspiration to visiting artists. In keeping with this practice, Granet’s finished landscapes tended to be canonical depictions of famous locales (see fig. 25). By contrast, his oil studies are characterized by a deceptive offhandedness. Their compositions are determined by the idiosyncrasies of architectural fragments, ruins, light, and atmosphere that extend the pictorial language of the sketch established by Valenciennes and Denis. Granet never abandoned landscape painting, but in Rome he turned his attention increasingly to scenes of everyday life.

Granet’s genre pictures are decidedly architectural in nature. They tend to take minor monuments and lesser-known interiors as settings, often in the vicinity of his rented rooms near the Spanish Steps, the center of the artists’ district in Rome. Among the earliest examples is Monks in the Cloister of Gesù e Maria, Rome (fig. 26), which he sent to the Paris Salon in 1808. The cloister depicted in this painting belongs to a late seventeenth-century church (entered through the door at the left) that boasts a typically sumptuous Baroque sanctuary that is otherwise no more remarkable than any in Rome. It is situated on the Via del Corso, the thoroughfare that originates at nearby Piazza della Popolo, where travelers from the north of Rome spilled into the city, and ends at Piazza Venezia, near the foot of the Capitoline Hill.

The dynamism of life along the Corso is nowhere to be seen in Granet’s painting. Drawn from neither the Bible nor the lives of the saints, its subject arises from the latent French enthusiasm for the Catholic Church that surfaced after the initial amnesty of émigrés in 1800, the Concordat of 1801, and the publication of Chateaubriand’s Génie de Christianisme in 1802. The painting’s contemplative aspect derives from the scrupulously executed composition and the closely observed quotidian details of life in such a place, from the ample cloaks of the well-fed priests to the hot coals proffered by the bedraggled boy at the right. The cabinet-sized Monks in the Cloister of

the Church of Gesù e Maria also appealed to the well-established taste among aristocratic circles for seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting. A few years later, in 1815, Granet depicted a similar subject on a truly grand scale. Reserved by Caroline Murat, who gave it to her brother Louis Bonaparte, The Choir of the Capuchin Church in Rome (fig. 27) was an instant success when it was first exhibited in Granet’s studio, prompting Pope Pius VII to give the artist an audience. The painting’s celebrity spawned a dozen or more versions that were painted to order for aristocratic collectors all over Europe and that secured a place in French popular taste for modern Italian religious subjects.

Another painter whose work paralleled Granet’s was Franz Ludwig Catel. Born in Berlin in 1778 to Huguenot parents, Catel was exposed to current trends in French painting while enrolled at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris from 1798 to 1800 and during a second Parisian sojourn in 1807–11. He subsequently moved to Rome, whence he made frequent excursions to Naples. His First Steps (fig. 28) illustrates perfectly the pervasive attitude of visitors from north of the Alps who were conditioned to think of Italian peasants as diminished counterparts of their classical forebears, picturesque remnants of a disappearing breed, innocent of the changes that had overtaken
much of Europe in the era of enlightenment and revolution. (Stendhal expressed this sentiment in 1828 when he observed that “like the Neapolitans of today, the Romans spent their lives out of doors.”) The stability of the architecture and the distant landscape, its bounty on display in the still life with vegetables at the lower left, serve as a classic setting for a family whose immediate bonds and more distant connection to antiquity combine to evoke the larger theme of the Ages of Man. Indeed, a drawing by Catel executed in pen and brown ink and wash (now in a private collection) that depicts four of the five figures in the painting may have been either drawn from life or inspired by another artist’s work. The subject of a child’s first steps is thought to have entered the canon of modern genre painting at the Paris Salon of 1796. It attracted artists throughout the nineteenth century. Vincent van Gogh based his 1890 composition (fig. 29) on one by Jean-François Millet.

Catel’s technical virtuosity in portraying an utterly simple subject with minimal pictorial means parallels Granet’s. Light is as essential to his pictures as form and color. Although nothing is known of the early history of First Steps, its style and modest dimensions would have made it an easy choice as a souvenir of the south destined for a Biedermeier drawing room in the north. The same uncomplicated approach is found in a landscape recently recognized as a work by Catel, Virgil’s Tomb, Naples (fig. 30). The view is an iconic one, as a visit to this site—embodying the very essence of the Picturesque and with deep literary associations—was an essential stop on the Grand Tour. Owing largely to the rediscovery of Pompeii and a series of eruptions by Vesuvius, Naples was the most popular destination south of Rome. Catel used this study as the basis for a painting (fig. 31) that depicts almost precisely the same view, with the addition of two figures and a dog. The standing figure at the right, who may represent the painting’s first owner, has been tentatively identified as Prince Alexander Nikolaeевич Golitsyn (1773–1844), a Russian state official who accompanied the artist on a trip to southern Italy in 1818. The study probably remained in the artist’s possession as an aide-mémoire.

Catel and Granet were crucial to the early development of another former pupil of David’s, the Swiss painter Léopold Robert, who arrived in Rome in July 1818 for the requisite Italian sojourn. By then, the French throne had been restored to the Bourbon king Louis XVIII, and David, who had once voted for the execution of Louis’s brother, was living in exile in Brussels. Awestruck by Rome, Robert nevertheless found the going difficult, despairing in March 1819 that “a painter, a student of Monsieur David, necessarily lives from hand to mouth.” Yet he did not lose faith. Two months later he wrote, “I strive to follow nature in all ways. David always told us that it is the only master one can follow without losing his way.”

Thus Robert too began to paint contemporary genre scenes in Italy. Initially he followed in the footsteps of Catel and Granet in seeking an alternative to historical subjects, and he continued in this vein until he became captivated by a singular event that took place in July 1819: the parading through Rome of brigands who had been taken into custody at the nearby village redoubt of Somnino. Within less than a year Robert had arranged to equip a studio in the vast prison attached to Santa Maria degli Angeli (the former Baths of Diocletian), known as Termini, where he began to make faithful life studies of the prisoners in their colorful


29. Vincent van Gogh (Dutch, Zundert 1853–1890 Auvers-sur-Oise). First Steps, after Millet, 1890. Oil on canvas, 28¼ x 35¼ in. (72.4 x 91.1 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of George N. and Helen M. Richard, 1964 (64.165.2)
costumes and to paint scenes of their often violent exploits. *Brigand and His Wife in Prayer* (fig. 32) is one of several versions of the same subject, one of which was shown at the Salon of 1824, where Robert met with great success. The scene's piquant ambiguity serves as a titillating contrast to Catel's pictures of happy peasants. In this variant, the only one in which the wife is pregnant, the couple is shown praying for the health of their child and the successful outcome of an act of thievery or a vendetta that would ensure the husband's return to support his growing family. The collector Charles Marcotte d'Argenteuil wrote to Robert shortly after the opening of the Salon to say that he had wanted to buy one of his paintings (the catalogue lists six) and was disappointed to discover that every one was already sold. The influential art critic Étienne-Jean Delécluze, a strict classicist and like Robert a former pupil of David's, was similarly smitten by Robert's Salon entries. Delécluze found himself unable to distinguish Robert's work as either history painting or genre. And yet rather than
concluding that Robert had muddled the two categories, he delighted in the novelty of figures that are assertive by virtue of their naturalism and what he saw as “an air of strength, of well-being, and of insouciance.”

Despite Robert’s early success with paintings like Granet’s and Catel’s before he discovered brigandage, his initial concerns about the future were well founded. Neoclassical history painting did not die out immediately after the return of the Bourbon dynasty and David’s exile, but state patronage did succeed in turning the clock back to 1789, when religious subjects predominated. In 1816–17, as a flagship project intended to restore French prestige in the eyes of the Catholic world following the downfall of Napoleon, the new administration’s ambassador to the Holy See, the Comte de Blacas, arranged for the renovation and redecoration of Santissima Trinità dei Monti, the church adjacent to the Villa Medici that had long been patronized by the French royal family. The commissions went to former and current pensionnaires, initially including Ingres, Jean-Baptiste-Auguste Vinchon,
Henri-Joseph de Forestier, Léon Pallière, Frédéric-Douard Picot, Jean Alaux, and Jean-Baptiste Thomas, although ultimately the last three did not contribute. As a devoted follower of David, Robert probably lacked the stomach for painting religious subjects at the behest of the Bourbon king, even if he did envy the professional edge that came with such commissions.

The Whitney Collection includes a final study by Pallière (fig. 33) for The Flagellation of Christ, the only altarpiece from the commission that remains in place in Trinità dei Monti today. It is possible that Pallière himself was ambivalent about the political context in which The Flagellation was painted. Some scholars have plausibly interpreted the red and blue garments and Phrygian cap of the tormentor at the right as an evocation of the French Revolution’s violent excesses, which would suggest that Pallière was favorably inclined toward the Bourbon regime. His sympathies may have been more nuanced. That in 1815 he had accompanied the sculptor Pierre-Jean David d’Angers and other pensionnaires on a secretive expedition to Naples to lend support to the doomed Joachim Murat hints at the possibility of a contrarian undercurrent in his thinking. Whatever the case, in The Flagellation, whose subject had for centuries been depicted with little variation, Pallière may have been responding to a pivotal historical moment and struggling with the broader political dilemma faced by young artists who came of age under the Empire, most often identified in the person of Pallière’s friend Théodore Géricault, whose Italian sojourn coincided with this commission.

Some of the privileges enjoyed by Prix de Rome winners were extended to other French artists visiting Rome. They were sometimes invited, for example, to draw from the live model at the Académie de France à Rome in the evenings. The city’s own society of artists, the Accademia di San Luca, also sponsored activities that foreigners were welcome to attend. This openness among compatriots and among artists in general, whatever their national origin, in Rome in the early nineteenth century has earned the thriving artistic community the name “École de Rome.” Landscape painting may have served as the school of Rome’s lingua franca, but it was the painting of modern life in Italy, catalyzed chiefly by Robert’s success, that would become a genre of outsized popularity throughout Europe. There were numerous precedents for this besides the work of Granet and Catel, from the widely disseminated prints of Bartolomeo Pinelli to the watercolors Jean-Baptiste Thomas made in 1817–18 and published in 1823 as Un an à Rome et dans ses environs. For these artists, however, the local pantry in their traditional costumes remained either colorful types or, as in the case of Géricault, vessels to be infused with the heroic qualities of the antique. Robert’s innovation lay in further individualizing his figures, a feature that caught on with his contemporaries, such as Jean-Victor Schnetz and Guillaume Bodinier, and continued to infuse French paintings of similar subjects in the following decades. In 1825–26, for example,
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Léon Cogniet painted three versions of *The Italian Brigand's Wife*, a composition he originally undertook as a pendant to a painting by his late friend Michallon representing the brigand chief Luigi Masocco, known as Mazzocchi (see figs. 34, 35). And the Jubilee declared by Pope Leo XII in 1825, which was extended to 1826, was a godsend to artists captivated by the customs and costumes of Italian peasants. "The Holy Year is on," Robert's close friend Schnetz wrote from Rome to fellow painter François Gérard in Paris in 1826. "Every day one meets pilgrims in groups or singly who have come to put the [holy] water to their mouths." The Jubilee furnished the theme of a painting by Claude Bonnefond (fig. 36),
whose embrace of such subjects owed a debt to Robert as well as to collectors like Marotte and critics like Delécluze.

A later example of a modern religious subject, Jean-François Montessuy’s first such masterpiece, *Pope Gregory XVI Visiting the Church of San Benedetto at Subiaco* (fig. 37), was exhibited at the Paris Salon of 1844. Montessuy had studied with Pierre Révoil, Ingres, and Louis Hersent, but his slow convalescence from wounds he suffered during the Revolution of 1830 significantly delayed his painterly ambitions. He finally reached Rome in 1836. As had Granet’s *Choir of the Capuchin Church in Rome* (fig. 27) nearly thirty years earlier, Montessuy’s painting attracted admirers in Rome before it was exhibited in Paris.
Other painters had been drawn to the church’s frescoed interior. But there is no more complete expression of the penchant among Lyonnais artists for surface description than this picture, which recounts an actual event of 1834. (Lyons was a center of manufacturing noted especially for its silks and wall coverings.) The pageantry surrounding the papal visit that year made such an impression on the local populace that Montessuy was able to depict the event as though he had witnessed it himself. Details found in the painting are consistent with the account recorded in the monastery’s chronicle (now in the library of its sister institution, Santa Scolastica), although Montessuy’s source for the details in his painting can only have been the people of Subiaco, where the painting was largely completed before being finished in Rome. Indeed, some of his information may have come from a certain Fra Vicenzo, who in April 1837 told the artist Hippolyte Flandrin that he had posed for all the paintings Granet had made at Subiaco many years before. 33 Granet had exhibited a similar composition (now in the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire Marcel Dessai, Dreux) depicting this same interior at the Salon of 1818. His painting also includes figures, although with a more dreamlike quality of space. By contrast, and in keeping with Léopold Robert’s legacy, Montessuy was concerned with historical pretext and the individuality of the characters in his Italian scene.

The vogue for contemporaneity in Italian subjects, which paralleled the growing appreciation of spontaneity in painting, was sustained by the steady stream of artists to Rome. Each of the winners of the Prix de Rome for paysage historique that was awarded every four years starting in 1817 went to Rome for a four-year residency and set up his studio (only men were eligible to compete) in the Villa Medici alongside those of the history painters, sculptors, architects, engravers, and musicians who had won the prizes the Académie des Beaux-Arts bestowed in those categories. Rome’s primacy had waxed and waned dramatically since the late eighteenth century, but the imperatives of
French foreign policy and the related spread of Neoclassical taste had put the city squarely in the sights of the French cultural and administrative elite. The Académie de France à Rome played a key role in this development. From 1803 it occupied the Villa Medici on the Pincian Hill, the most commanding site in the city, which, together with the neighboring church complex of Trinità dei Monti, presides over the Spanish Steps. This grand agglomeration was a favorite backdrop of Ingres’s French sitters. He used this setting in 1808 in a splendid drawing (fig. 38) depicting the wife and son of Guillaume Guillon Lethière, director of the Académie de France from 1808 until 1816.

Painting out of doors was increasingly in the air, even for artists who did not practice it systematically. Charles Thévenin, who succeeded Lethière as director of the Académie de France in 1816 and held the post until 1822, even took care to note the pensionnaires’ extracurricular activities in this vein in official reports to the administration in Paris: in an 1817 letter reporting progress on the Trinità dei Monti decorations, he mentioned that François-Édouard Picot and Jean-Baptiste Thomas “took advantage of the spring to make landscape studies.” Picot, awarded the Prix de Rome for history painting in 1813, made a scintillating study of the Porta Pinciana from the Ludovisi Gardens (fig. 39), a popular location for sketching situated a short walk from the Villa Medici. Other oil studies by Picot are visible on the wall of his room in the villa in a portrait of him made by his colleague Jean Alaux (fig. 40). It is likely that Picot and Alaux had visited Tivoli together, perhaps with their confrère Pallière, whose View in the Gardens of the Villa d’Este is also in the Whitney Collection (fig. 41). In short, by December 1817, when Michallon arrived in Rome as the first laureate for landscape painting, he was virtually surrounded by artists with practical experience sketching in oil paint out of doors.

Artists’ excursions outside Rome presented the opportunity to foster camaraderie and strengthen personal bonds that might last a lifetime. Cogniet’s undertaking of the first version of The Italian Brigand’s Wife as a pendant to Michallon’s Mazzocchi (see figs. 34, 35) was undoubtedly an homage to his late friend. The already close fraternity of Ingres’s pupils virtually transplanted itself from Paris to Rome when the master assumed the directorship of the French Academy’s outpost there from 1835 until 1841. Paul Flandrin cemented a close friendship with Eugène André Oudiné, winner of the 1831 Prix de Rome for medal engraving, with a gift of View of the Villa Torlonia, Frascati, at Dusk (fig. 42), a study exceptional for its rendering of color with a minimum of sunlight at the precise moment of moonrise. A study from life depicting one of the “four most beautiful girls that you could have as a model in Rome” as a bather in a summarily indicated landscape
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setting (fig. 43) was inscribed as a gift from Henri Lehmann, possibly to the painter Théodore Chassériau. These and many other followers of Ingres dominated the French artistic scene in Rome from the 1830s onward.

Just as Paris would later become associated with Impressionism, so Rome in the early decades of the nineteenth century was a well-spring of innovative painting and the crucible of plein-air painting for artists from all over northern Europe. Rome’s particular appeal lay not simply in its antiquity and its layers of history, but also in the unique combination of urban and rural that typified the city’s fabric from its margins to its very center. (A parallel may be drawn between this aspect of Rome and the appeal of Montmartre later in the nineteenth century.) One indication of the dissipation of the ancient city’s former grandeur was the popular name for the Forum: Campo Vaccino, or Cow Field. Of the adjacent Palatine Hill, the site often referred to as the Palace of the Caesars, one nineteenth century visitor wrote, “One hardly knows whether to call the scene a landscape or a ruin. It is a labyrinth of vaults, arches, broken walls, and fragments of columns: a mighty maze of desolation without a plan.” In fact, the eventual transformation of Rome’s topography into a modern city with demarcated archaeological zones—especially the Forum and its environs, stretching from the Colosseum to the Capitoline Hill and south to the Baths of Caracalla—began during the French occupation of 1808–14.

It is thus no surprise that before long the secrétaire perpétuel of the Académie des Beaux-Arts, Antoine Chrysostome Quatremère de Quincy, would “recommend to those students who will pursue the genre of historical landscape painting in Rome to choose those views for their studies that no other country affords, owing to the fact that its natural beauties have the advantage of enfolding beautiful monuments, grand and imposing buildings, and the precious remnants of antiquity. In individual studies,
they must gather together all the forms taken by nature and art that will impart the character of greatness and nobility to their compositions."

This was far from a hollow statement, as it is borne out in the work not only of painters but of architects and sculptors, whether independent or institutionally affiliated. One such painter was Charles Rémond, a former pupil of Bertin’s who won the Prix de Rome for landscape painting in 1821. Rémond’s work is characterized by a balance between naturalism and Neoclassical structure, which enabled him to curry official favor throughout his career. He has largely fallen between the cracks of history and is today recalled most often as the disavowed first teacher of Théodore Rousseau (see fig. 10). In a series of tableaux (little paintings) dating to his first Italian sojourn, however, Rémond pioneered a form of painting that is a successful hybrid of sketching after nature and classical composition.

Owing to its loose brushwork, Rémond’s View of the Basilica of Constantine from the Palatine, Rome (fig. 44) gives every indication of having been painted out of doors, quickly and in a single sitting. The liquid appearance of the impasted paint perfectly conveys the fabric of Rome: limpid atmosphere, ubiquitous masonry, and unexpected lushness. But the picture seduces the mind as well as the eye. Overlooking the Forum from the Palatine Hill, Rémond focused on a narrow view whose beauty is notably more abstract than the one typically espoused by Picturesque convention. Essentially all that remains of the fourth-century Basilica of Constantine are the three contiguous vaults of its south aisle, which are open to the Forum and the Palatine opposite. Rather than convey this monumental shell in its entirety, however, Rémond excised the rightmost vault from its larger context, leaving it virtually impossible to identify without specialized knowledge of the site. This fragment of a fragment, which fully occupies the lower left quadrant of the picture, is an unconventional foundation on which to build a composition. Rémond undoubtedly placed his easel where he did because the prospect offered not one vanishing point but two divergent ones: the first terminates in the vault at the left, while the second continues into the open landscape at the right, so that the symmetry of the composition is reinforced despite the difference in the respective depths of field. Moreover, as they stretch across the entire width of the picture, the approaching clouds further unify its lower half. Why employ such a complicated, downright Cartesian spatial construction in the service of a painting that is ostensibly a sketch? In fact Rémond made a cognate of this view that may have been painted in his studio as a cabinet picture intended for a collector. Its size notwithstanding, the painting exemplifies the artist’s ambition to satisfy a growing taste for such works."

In a comparable work by Rémond, View of the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine from the Palatine (fig. 45), major monuments are shown as fragments of a compositional whole that is equal parts natural and urban, ancient and modern. The timelessness of the view is belied by a single inconspicuous detail: scaffolding
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abutting the Colosseum. The truss, which was in place for a short time beginning in 1822, is shown in a drawing by Giuseppe Valadier, the architect who designed it as part of a project to stabilize the first-century amphitheater’s long crumbling outer wall (fig. 46). Rémont’s aim, once again, was to imbue a timeless image with a sense of the present (and his own presence), in a painting that straddles the boundary between a sketch and a finished work. He did not forgo Picturesque convention entirely, as the barely indicated human figures attest. This work benefits from a device similar to the one he used in View of the Basilica of Constantine, where the grassy foreground continues up the right edge, working together with the basilica to formulate a repoussoir that frames the view into the field. What may initially register in View of the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine as part of the hill in the middle distance is actually a grassy row of arches just beyond arm’s reach, a barrier both solid and permeable whose broken contours playfully anticipate the forms beyond. This painting has been identified as one that Rémont included in an auction of oil studies from his atelier that he organized in 1842, when it seems to have been purchased by the then octogenarian painter Louis-Léopold Boilly.

Valadier was also responsible for completing the restoration of another monument
near the Colosseum, the first-century Arch of Titus. Since the Middle Ages, this triumphal arch had been encumbered by walls. Once those accretions were removed, Valadier directed the final restoration of the arch to its original appearance, for which travertine was used in place of the missing sections of Pentelic marble to distinguish the new work from the old. This was one of many ongoing renovations during these years. They were not always met with praise: Stendhal took every opportunity to deride Valadier for his “profanation” of the arch.39

Innumerable artists painted the Arch of Titus following the completion of its restoration in 1824. The as yet unidentified author of the ébauche (unfinished painting) in the Whitney Collection (fig. 47) worked on canvas rather than on paper, and it is unusually large for a work painted out of doors. But although the artist plotted his underdrawing with architectural precision, he very possibly painted it at the scene, a reminder that plein-air painting was not the exclusive province of the sketch. In addition to carefully noting the difference in colors between the old and new stone, he took pains to situate the “new” ancient monument into its setting by making small adjustments to ensure that the campanile on the Capitoline Hill is centered beneath the arch and that the churches along the Via Sacra, which passes through the arch, are clearly visible at the right.

About the same time, André Giroux, who in 1823 succeeded Rémond as the winner of the Prix de Rome for landscape, painted a site near the Arch of Titus: the section of the Claudian Aqueduct abutting the Palatine Hill at Via di San Gregorio (fig. 48). The monument appears in works by artists from all over northern Europe, typically with the ruin’s imposing size indicated by subordinating it to larger features of the surrounding landscape and by adding human staffage. The miniature dimensions of Giroux’s sketch, by contrast, exude a pronounced sense of design and proportion. The focus is simultaneously on the architecture rising from the verdure
in the middle ground and the sky seen through and immediately surrounding it, resulting in a composition that is equal parts sought and found. The eye is drawn to the fluid materiality of the rapidly applied paint, that is, to the moment of execution. In all respects, the painting recalls Joseph Vernet’s counsel to one of his pupils: “After having situated yourself, it is necessary to take as the subject of your drawing or your painting only what can be seen in a single glance, without shifting or turning your head; because, every time one moves it, only to notice some previously unnoticed thing[s], one must begin as many new paintings, requiring alteration to the shapes of these things, their position, and, consequently, the perspective itself.”

Among the most varied naturally occurring compositions in Rome were those to be
found within the Colosseum. The Swiss painter François Diday painted *Interior Passage in the Colosseum* (fig. 49) as an arresting simple study of light streaming through unseen apertures into a curved, vaulted space. The device of the curve appealed to other visiting artists. A particularly ambitious example is the *View from the Colosseum toward the Palatine* (fig. 50), until recently attributed to the German painter Ernst Fries, one of Corot’s Roman companions. The view is taken from within a desiccated upper gallery of the Colosseum, looking across its open bowl toward the remains of the amphitheater’s even more porous southwest wall, with the Palatine and its ruins beyond. Ostensibly chosen at random, this view was depicted in similar fashion by a number of artists, including Granet and Robert. What sets this painting apart is the use of the horizontal format to frame what amounts to a vertical stripe of a view, with a balance of detail—near, far, and in between. Although the whole is decidedly legible as a picture, the subject is not immediately recognizable as the most famous monument in Rome.

Camille Corot has long been regarded as a herald of Impressionism, despite his firm grounding in the Neoclassical tradition. Apart from plein-air studies his œuvre is broadly divided between finished landscapes, religious or mythological subjects, and paintings of solitary figures in close interiors. In spring 1822, at the age of twenty-five, Corot realized his cherished wish to become a painter by entering the Paris atelier of Achille-Etna Michallon. That the mentor was nearly the same age as his pupil is an indication of Michallon’s reputation just under five years after winning the first Prix de Rome for landscape, and also sheds light on both Corot’s humility and his ambition. Following Michallon’s untimely death on September 24, 1822, Corot shifted to the atelier of his late teacher’s teacher, Jean-Victor Bertin, where he remained until 1824. Thus Corot’s training was


entirely under the rubric of historical landscape painting that extended back to Valenciennes, and he was steeped in the practice of carrying over into finished paintings what he had previously appraised in studies sketched d’après nature. Eager to follow in the footsteps of his eminent predecessors, he left for Rome as an independent painter in September 1825. This, his first visit to Italy, lasted until 1828, and he would return in 1834 and 1843. (Corot’s first Italian sojourn coincided largely with Giroux’s state-sponsored residency, but although they were acquainted they do not appear to have been close.)

Having explored Rome during his entire first winter there, Corot embarked on a series of extended sketching excursions in its environs. Between July and September 1826 he cut a swath across southern Umbria, passing through the villages of Papigno, Terni, and Narni, sketching indefatigably as he went. Among the sites that drew him was the Cascata delle Marmore, a waterfall engineered in the third century B.C. to divert the river Velino over the edge of a precipice into the Nera, a tributary of the Tiber. Corot trod a well-beaten path to the site, which by this time had become a standard subject of painters’ repertoires. A sketch of the falls appears on the wall behind the painter Picot in Jean Alaux’s portrait of him (fig. 40).

Of the five known drawings and oil sketches Corot made at the Cascata delle Marmore, only one, Waterfall at Terni (fig. 51), depicts just the upper falls.4 This study stands out both for its naturalism and for the freedom with which Corot handled his materials. Formal rigor was seemingly abandoned in favor of an intuitive and assured approach to picture making (“seemingly” because Corot’s unified treatment of perspective, form, and light is breathtakingly economical). From the foreground, the eye is drawn back along the grass ledge to the diagonal shelf in the rock face that climbs to the left until it reaches the point of pure white paint where the water passes over the edge, then doubles back to the right in the direction of the sunlit high country rendered with aerial perspective. The undulations of the leafy tree line alternate with the contours of the rounded peaks beyond. These horizontal elements are complemented by a vertical one, the scumbled
strip of rock wall at the right that displaces
the picture’s primary focus, the rush of water
somewhat to the left of the central axis. In this
way, the falls become the key arc in a loose
network of curves that enliven the surface and
converge near the lower left corner of the sheet
(once again paper, not canvas, is the primary
support). That Corot accomplished this with
such temporal and material efficiency is testi-
mony to his mastery of plein-air painting.

Waterfall at Terni is typical of some 150 oil
studies and at least 200 drawings the peripatetic
Corot made during his nearly three-year stay in
Italy. As a rule they were executed out of doors,
a fact that is all the more striking given Corot’s
relative neglect while he was in Rome of the old
masters (apart from the twin exemplars Claude
and Poussin) and the antique (with the excep-
tion of architecture). Corot’s experience of Italy
was not a reckoning with the past so much as an
act of living, painting, and drawing in the pres-
ent, which is conveyed by the spontaneous exe-
cution evident in this work and others like it. The
ability to make history seem to stop is precisely
what makes the exigencies of oil sketching
so absorbing, and it is also what makes these
works so compelling as images.

If the sum of Corot’s achievement is to be
measured by his entire production, then a sub-
stantial portion should be assigned to these infor-
mal, private images. Corot’s studies undoubtedly
merit as much sustained concentration as any
of his other works. Long hidden from view,
they are history unvarnished, offering a glimpse
behind the public face of the paintings whose
ground they prepare.
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Théodore Caruelle d'Aligny
French, Chaumes 1798–1871 Lyons
Edge of a Wood
ca. 1850
Oil on canvas
3/4 x 1 1/4 in. (19.7 x 43.2 cm)
Signed (lower left): CA [monogram] 2003.42.1; fig. 52, inside covers

Jean-Victor Bertin
French, Paris 1767–1843 Paris
Classical Landscape with Figures
Oil on wood
1 1/2 x 18 in. (36.8 x 45.7 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right, on rock): BBRTIN JVAI 1813 2003.42.3; fig. 7

Claude Bonnefond
French, Lyons 1796–1860 Lyons
Pilgrims Arriving at Rome during the Jubilee
Oil on canvas
18 1/4 x 14 1/4 in. (46.3 x 36.5 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Bonnefond Rome 1828 2003.42.6; fig. 36

Charles-Marie Bouton
French, Paris 1781–1853 Paris
Gothic Chapel
Oil on canvas
18 1/4 x 13 1/4 in. (46.7 x 33.7 cm)
2003.42.7; fig. 54

Alexandru Calame
Swiss, Vevey 1812–1864 Menton
Porvauis and the Bay of Naples
1844
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
12 1/4 x 16 1/4 in. (31.5 x 41.3 cm)
On stretcher: wax seal of Calame estate sale 2003.42.8; fig. 55

Franz Ludwig Catel
German, Berlin 1778–1816 Rome
Virgin’s Tomb, Naples
ca. 1818
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
12 1/8 x 8 1/2 in. (30.5 x 22.2 cm)
2003.42.49; fig. 30

Franz Ludwig Catel
First Steps
ca. 1820–25
Oil on canvas
18 1/4 x 14 1/4 in. (46.3 x 36.5 cm)
2003.42.9; fig. 28

Léon Cogniet
French, Paris 1794–1880 Paris
The Italian Brigand’s Wife
ca. 1845–46
Oil on canvas mounted on wood
9 3/4 x 8 3/4 in. (25.1 x 21.6 cm)
Signed (lower right): L. Cogniet 2003.42.10; fig. 35

Attributed to Léon Cogniet
The Abduction of Rebecca by a Knight Templar
1828 or later
Oil on canvas
12 1/4 x 15 1/4 in. (31.7 x 39.7 cm)
2003.42.11; fig. 56

Julie Coignet
French, Paris 1798–1860 Paris
View of Beirut
1844
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
13 3/4 x 20 3/4 in. (34.8 x 52.7 cm)
Inscribed and dated (lower left): Beyrouth – 44 2003.42.12; fig. 3
SIMON DENIS
Flemish, Antwerp 1755–1833
Mountainous Landscape at Tivoli
ca. 1786–97
Oil on paper
8 1/4 x 12 1/4 in. (21.9 x 31.8 cm)
Signed, inscribed, and numbered (verso): a Rome / 45
2003.42.21, fig. 21

SIMON DENIS
Mountainous Landscape
at Vicovaro
ca. 1786–97
Oil on paper
8 1/4 x 12 1/4 in. (21.9 x 31.8 cm)
Signed, inscribed, and numbered (verso): a Vicovaro pres de Tivoli / Sn. Denis. 58
2003.42.22, fig. 19

SIMON DENIS
Cloud Study (Distant Storm)
ca. 1786–1806
Oil on paper
7 1/2 x 9 7/8 in. (19.1 x 25.1 cm)
Signed, inscribed, and numbered (verso): a Rome / 2. Div. / 49
2003.42.19, fig. 18

SIMON DENIS
Cloud Study (Early Evening)
ca. 1786–1806
Oil on paper
8 1/4 x 12 1/2 in. (20.5 x 31.7 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): F. Denis 1833. Rome
2003.42.18, fig. 20

SIMON DENIS
Fortified Wall, Italy
ca. 1786–1806
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
13 1/4 x 15 7/8 in. (33.3 x 40.3 cm)
2003.42.21, fig. 4

SIMON DENIS
View on the Quirinal Hill, Rome
1800
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
11 1/4 x 16 1/2 in. (29.2 x 41 cm)
Signed, dated, inscribed, and numbered (verso, obscured by lining): Peint a Rome en 1800 – 66 – Sn Denis
2003.42.20, figs. 22, 23

SIMON DENIS
View from the Villa d’Este, Tivoli
ca. 1786–1806
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
13 1/4 x 21 1/2 in. (33 x 55.5 cm)
2003.42.17, frontispiece, fig. 15

FRANÇOIS DIDAY
Swiss, Geneva 1802–1877
Geneva
Interior Passage in the Colosseum
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
11 1/4 x 14 7/8 in. (28.9 x 37.6 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): F. Diday 1835. Rome
2003.42.24, fig. 49

ALEXANDRE-HYACINTHE DUNOY
French, Paris 1757–1845
Jouy-en-Josas
The Palazzo Reale and the Harbor, Naples
ca. 1810–15
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
8 1/4 x 11 1/2 in. (21.3 x 29.3 cm)
2003.42.25, fig. 13

ALEXANDRE-HYACINTHE DUNOY
View in a Park
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
8 1/4 x 12 in. (21.2 x 30.5 cm)
2003.42.16, fig. 12

ATTRIBUTED TO SIMON DENIS
View from the Villa d’Este, Tivoli
ca. 1786–1806
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
6 7/8 x 10 in. (17.1 x 25.4 cm)
2003.42.27, fig. 11
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Jean-Augustin Franquelin
French, Paris 1798–1839 Paris

The Mariner’s Wife
Oil on canvas
75 1/2 x 18 1/4 in. (192 x 46.5 cm)
Signed (lower left): J. A. Franquelin
2003.42.29, fig. 69

André Giroux
French, Paris 1801–1879 Paris

A Section of the Claudian Aqueduct, Rome
ca. 1846–49
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
6 1/2 x 8 1/2 in. (16.5 x 21.6 cm)
On the stretcher: atelier stamp
2003.42.35, fig. 48

Francois-Marius Granet
French, Aix-en-Provence 1775–1849 Aix-en-Provence

Monks in the Cloister of the Church of Gesù e Maria, Rome
1808
Oil on canvas
19 1/4 x 15 1/4 in. (49.5 x 39.1 cm)
Signed (lower center, in flagstone): GRANET-ROME
2003.42.36, fig. 26

Antoine-Xavier-Gabriel de Gazeau, comte de La Bouëre
French, Jallais 1801–1881 Grenoble

The Gate to the Temple of Luxor
1835
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
10 1/4 x 7 5/8 in. (27 x 18.8 cm)
2003.42.37, fig. 62

Paul Flandrin
French, Lyons 1821–1902 Paris

Male Nude, Seen from Behind
ca. 1850–58
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
25 3/4 x 13 1/4 in. (65 x 34 cm)
2003.42.29, fig. 59

Paul Flandrin
View of the Villa Torlonia, Frascati, at Dusk
ca. 1854–58
Oil on paper laid down on paper
8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in. (22.5 x 29.3 cm)
2003.42.28, fig. 42

Alexandre-Emile Fragonard
French, Grasse 1736–1806 Paris

Dramatic Scene with Monks in a Crypt
Oil on canvas
28 1/4 x 35 7/8 in. (72.7 x 91.1 cm)
Signed (lower right): A. fragonard
2003.42.30, fig. 60

Auguste-Xavier Leprince
French, Paris 1799–1826 Nice

A Shepherd and a Rider on a Country Lane
ca. 1823
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
12 1/4 x 15 3/4 in. (31.6 x 39.5 cm)
2003.42.40, fig. 63

Auguste-Xavier Leprince
Man in Oriental Costume in the Artist’s Studio
ca. 1823–26
Oil on canvas
12 1/4 x 9 7/8 in. (31.7 x 24.4 cm)
Signed (on the portfolio): AX Leprince
2003.42.39, fig. 64

Henri Lehmann
French, Kiel 1814–1882 Paris

Study of a Female Nude
Oil on canvas
14 x 8 1/2 in. (35.5 x 22.3 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: Rome 1840 / H. Lehmann / a ton ami / [chassateur]
2003.42.38, fig. 45
Jean-François Montessuy
French, Lyons 1804–1876 Lyons
Pope Gregory XVI Visiting the Church of San Benedetto at Subiaco
Oil on canvas
49 3/4 x 55 3/8 in. (126.1 x 140.7 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower left): F. Montessuy / Roma. 1843
2003.42.42, fig. 37

Léon Pallière
French, Bordeaux 1787–1820
Bordeaux
View in the Gardens of the Villa d’Este ca. 1814–17
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
9 x 12 in. (22.9 x 30.5 cm)
2003.42.44, fig. 41

Léon Pallière
The Flagellation of Christ
1817
Oil on canvas
18 x 12 3/4 in. (45.7 x 32.5 cm)
2003.42.43, fig. 33

François-Édouard Picot
French, Paris 1786–1868 Paris
View of Porta Pinciana from the Gardens of the Villa Ludovisi ca. 1816–17
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
11 1/4 x 15 1/2 in. (28.9 x 40 cm)
2003.42.45, fig. 39

Charles Rémond
French, Paris 1795–1875 Paris
View of the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine from the Palatine ca. 1833–34
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
11 1/4 x 15 1/2 in. (28.6 x 38.7 cm)
Signed (lower left): Rémond
2003.42.48, fig. 45

Charles Rémond
View of the Basilica of Constantine from the Palatine, Rome ca. 1824–25
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
12 1/4 x 10 5/8 in. (31.4 x 27 cm)
2003.42.47, fig. 44

Charles Rémond
Entrance to the Grotto of Posilipo ca. 1824–26
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
14 9/16 x 21 1/2 in. (37.5 x 55.1 cm)
Signed; paper label of artist’s atelier sale of February 21–23, 1842
2003.42.46, fig. 65

Léopold Robert
Swiss, Epernay 1794–1835 Venice
Bacchus and His Wife in Prayer
Oil on canvas
17 3/4 x 14 3/4 in. (45.4 x 36.5 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed (lower right): Léopold Robert. Rome. 1844
2003.42.50, fig. 33

Paul-Narcisse Guérin
French, Carcassonne 1814–1908 Marseilles
The Faience Restorer 1848
Oil on canvas
23 3/4 x 25 in. (59.4 x 63.5 cm)
Signed (lower left): Paul Guérin
2003.42.51, fig. 66
(not in exhibition)

Pierre-Antoine-Augustin Vapplard
French, Paris 1777–1837 Paris
Study for “Young and His Daughter” ca. 1844
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
10 1/4 x 8 1/2 in. (27.3 x 21.6 cm)
2003.42.53, fig. 67

Pierre-Henri de Valenciennes
French, Toulouse 1750–1819 Paris
The Banks of the Rance, Brittany possibly 1785
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
9 1/2 x 19 1/8 in. (41.3 x 48.2 cm)
2003.42.54, figs. 5, 6

Eugène-Joseph Verboeckhoven
Belgian, Warneton 1798–1881 Brussels
Mountainous Landscape with Bridge
Oil on paper laid down on canvas
23 1/4 x 18 3/4 in. (57.3 x 47.4 cm)
Signed (lower right): Eugene Verboeckhoven
2003.42.55, fig. 68