

this monograph. Helen Rosenau had written a notable essay on Boullée's designs for the *Architectural Review* in 1952 and, in the same year, Emil Kaufman had issued his 'Three revolutionary architects: Boullée, Ledoux, Lequeu' in the *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*. There was more, by both these authors, and indeed by others. But the Boullée held up for admiration was the Boullée of the vast geometrical projects. His built works were little remarked. His only surviving building, the Hôtel Alexandre, was illustrated in the fourth volume of Louis Hautecoeur's compendious *Histoire de l'architecture classique en France* (1957), but its author was yet to be identified. Pérouse de Montclos changed all this. He provided a detailed and convincing history of Boullée's career and each of his architectural commissions; he also charted a history of the large-scale projects and theoretical texts that accompanied them. These last, which Rosenau had published in partial form in 1953, Pérouse de Montclos had already issued in full in 1968 (with a revised edition in 1993). His real contribution, however, was the hard definition of Boullée's career as an architect. His book was a revelation, of a kind, the first of a sequence of serious studies on the architecture of France in the late eighteenth century.

The new edition has been rewritten, restructured in part, and greatly enhanced by excellent illustrations, many in colour, all integrated within the text. But though reformulated, the initial history survives intact, reinforced by treating many of the visionary designs as serious commissions in their first formulation, only later to be reworked as ideal propositions. A brave attempt is made to integrate the initial versions of the grandiose projects into the structure of Boullée's active career – both in the text of the book and in the greatly extended catalogue of works provided at the end – but the dividing line between reality and the visionary gleam is not readily to be determined in the instance of Boullée. He was a utopian.

There are no great surprises in the new book. Findings by Simone Bonnardin, Mark Deming, Jeus Erichsen, Gilbert Erouart, Richard Eltin, Michel Gallet, Yves-Jean Riou, Bernard Sournia, and, in particular, Werner Szambien, have been incorporated and all are generously acknowledged, though it is notable that Pérouse de Montclos firmly rejects Szambien's reconstruction of Boullée's treatise on domestic architecture, accepting no more than two of the designs identified as deriving from Boullée. Szambien's notion that building construction continued in force after the years of the Revolution is likewise dismissed – as is Simone Bonnardin's proposition that Jean-Thomas Thibault was the draughtsman of Boullée's great projects. But though these are not revelations, there are a handful of minor additions to the *œuvre* – a proposed Turkish salon for Racine de Monville, of 1762; an hôtel in the rue de Varenne, of 1782, another for the Maréchal de Ségur, of 1783, and an extraordinary plan, illustrated by Durand, for a palace in St Petersburg, of 1789. There are more bits and pieces, but most interesting by far are the items of furniture now attributed to Boullée,

a painted commode designed for the Hôtel d'Évreux, and a canapé and chair, intended as Turkish, designed for the comte d'Artois's apartments in the Temple, now in the Louvre. Boullée has also acquired two additional pupils, Nicolas-Marie Clavareau and Jean (Joseph?) Benigne Varin. Pierre-Nicolas Bénard has now become Benard. There is much tidying up of this kind.

There can be no demur that Pérouse de Montclos has a full and easy command of the history of the period. His revised text is shorter and sharper, but far more coherent and convincing in its presentation, though there are, perhaps, moments when one might be stirred to disagreement, as when he seeks to project Boullée as the promoter of a Tuscan vernacular mode, or, more importantly, when he reiterates his thesis that 1774 marks a decisive break in the continuity of the French classical tradition. He quotes, with evident relish, Charles François Viel's jeremiads from the *Décadence de l'architecture à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (1800). An important aspect of this disintegration is identified as a slackening interest in building construction and structural concerns, and in this respect Boullée is recognised as, indeed, a revolutionary.

Pérouse de Montclos's monograph is very fine, well-written and well-presented, but it, nonetheless, cannot be considered as a full estimate of Boullée, for his theory is no more than partially explored, nor is it considered in any real context. The ground, however, has been expertly prepared.

ROBIN MIDDLETON
Columbia University, New York

Turner in Germany. By Cecilia Powell. 255 pp. incl. 82 col. pls. + 159 b. & w. ills. + 11 maps. (Tate Gallery Publications, London, 1995), £25. ISBN 1-85437-160-6.

Turner in the North . . . in the year 1797. By David Hill. viii + 213 pp. incl. 161 col. pls. + 115 b. & w. ills. (Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1996), £29.95. ISBN 0-300-06942-1.

Turner's 'Drawing Book': The Liber Studiorum. By Gillian Forrester. 184 pp. incl. 16 col. pls. + 219 b. & w. ills. (Tate Publishing, London, 1996), £25. ISBN 1-85437-182-7.

Turner's Watercolour Explorations 1810-42. By Eric Shanes. 111 pp. incl. 60 col. pls. + 44 b. & w. ills. (Tate Gallery Publishing, London, 1997), £15.95. ISBN 1-85437-222-X.

'Have strong boots; will go anywhere.' This could be the motto of three of the four authors reviewed here. When dealing with an artist whose most apparently non-representational creations are based on intense observation, nothing but 'walking in Turner's footsteps' (to quote the title of one of David Hill's earlier publications) will suffice to establish the origins of his images. Turner research today is almost entirely a matter of such minutiae; since 1987 no major over-

all surveys of his work have been published. These four publications also demonstrate how, particularly since the demise in 1991 of *Turner Studies*, the main source of new information about Turner, save for the occasional article in *Turner Society News*, has been that new hybrid, the book-catalogue published to accompany an exhibition at the Tate Gallery.

Although Turner's travels as set out in his sketchbooks were roughly established by A. J. Finberg in 1909 in his *Complete Inventory of the Drawings of the Turner Bequest*, both Cecilia Powell and David Hill have produced numerous corrections and identifications both of places and, in Powell's case, of dates, systematising their discoveries with revised tables of the appropriate sections of Finberg's listing. In addition they have enriched their accounts of Turner's travels with descriptions of the places visited and their appeal to his predecessors and contemporaries, as well as discussing Turner's use of sketchbooks of various kinds and the use to which he put his drawings in later years.

Powell has established, almost day by day, Turner's itinerary on his journeys through Germany in 1817, 1824, 1833, 1835 and the years 1839-44. Maps clarify the precise routes: that of Turner's trip to Venice in 1833 by way of the Neckar and the Danube, including his first visits to Munich, Salzburg and Vienna, is newly established, as is his itinerary in 1835. Powell's achievement can be measured, in part, by listing some of the cities that are not to be found in Finberg's topographical index: Hamburg, Copenhagen, Berlin and Trieste. Her researches also have wider implications, establishing what drawings and water-colours resulted from which journey in Germany and helping to confirm what works resulted from Turner's last visit to Venice in 1840.

David Hill's contribution is basically similar but includes more anecdotes, such as Lord Torrington's views on the amenities at the Angel in Doncaster when he visited it five years before Turner in 1792, some imaginative surmises as to Turner's thoughts as he was making his drawings, and detailed meteorological observations that are important in correcting the time of day assigned to certain of Turner's water-colours. Unfortunately there are no maps, though one is included in the handlist published by the Tate Gallery to accompany the exhibition, but the book is greatly enriched by the author's own photographs of sites drawn by Turner. Among other things, these demonstrate how he often artificially widened his range of vision, either by turning his head or sometimes even by moving his stance.

Unfortunately Hill is not so thorough when it comes to the occasional art-historical problem. Drawings not good enough for Turner tend to be attributed to Girtin, who visited many of the same places over much the same period. More importantly, the recently discovered and somewhat problematical small oil painting of Harewood Castle is relegated to a footnote and the bare statement, 'it does not seem likely to the present author that Turner himself

would have repeated the composition [i.e. that of one of the two closely related finished water-colours of the late 1790s] so closely'; this after accepting the equally close relationship of two versions of Dunstanborough Castle – one in water-colour, one in oils – from the same tour. As neither of the relevant views of Harewood Castle is reproduced, one is left having to take Hill's word that the two cases are different.

This is an independent publication by Yale University Press, though designed to accompany the exhibition recently at the Tate Gallery and Harewood House; it follows the oblong format of Hill's previous publications. Pressure of time prevented the inclusion of an actual catalogue and also, it would appear, accounts for several mistakes over plate numbers that make it particularly difficult to follow Hill's accounts of the various depictions of Derwentwater and Windermere. The otherwise most useful revision of Finberg's summary of the *North of England* sketchbook omits one of the commissions listed inside the cover, though this list is given correctly elsewhere. Haste is also presumably the reason why plates 25 and 205 are captioned 'c.1800?' whereas the text on page 26 suggests a date of about 1807; Ian Warrell, in the Tate Gallery's handlist to the exhibition, suggests a date of c.1800–05.

With Turner's *Liber Studiorum* one stops travelling, save in the mind. The catalogue in Gillian Forrester's book follows the structure established by W.G. Rawlinson in 1878 and revised 1906, and by A.J. Finberg in 1924, using their numerical system though omitting nine drawings possibly done for this scheme after it petered out in the early 1820s (they are of course mentioned in the text). Twelve further drawings which were never engraved are included. Forrester's research has resulted in numerous refinements and additions of detailed information. Turner's techniques and those of his engravers, and their close working relationship, are fully analysed.

As Forrester points out, following John Gage, the engravings often 'translate' pre-existing works, including exhibited oil paintings, and often depart considerably from the originals. But what is it that is being translated; what actually was Turner's purpose in his *Liber Studiorum*? Although modelled on Claude's *Liber Veritatis* in format, it is not a record of authentic works but rather a didactic work, a 'Drawing Book' in the manner of a number of contemporary treatises. However, Forrester perhaps goes too far in suggesting that Turner is directly illustrating the styles of individual old masters and contemporaries. Rather he illustrates works of his own in which the influences of such artists have been assimilated; what Turner is demonstrating is his own range and achievement. Forrester is careful not to over-emphasise Turner's intellectualism, pointing out how his 'administrative inefficiency' and 'his difficulties with articulating intellectual ideas' led to a lack of balance between the various categories of landscape he established within each published part, particularly the growing difficulty in finding enough architectural subjects. The problematic category

'E.P.' is identified as Elevated Pastoral and clarified through Turner's reference to the early *Liber* subject *Woman and tambourine* as 'Claude EP'. However, John Varley, who paid tribute to the *Liber Studiorum* in his *Treatise on the Principles of Landscape Design*, 1816–21, contrasts, as is illustrated by Forrester, an 'Epic' and a 'Pastoral' design, suggesting a possible alternative interpretation.

Nobody, however, seems to have paid much attention to the most extraordinary aspect of the *Liber Studiorum* as a didactic work, the complete lack of any explanatory text. It was left to the publication of a selection with text by John Ruskin in 1890 to provide such material. Presumably Turner hoped that his illustrations would be sufficient; it is certainly a good discipline for the eye. Another of the extraordinary things about the *Liber Studiorum* is the fact that the reprinting from the worn plates in 1845 seems to have led the artist to do a series of eleven unfinished oil paintings based on *Liber* subjects. They are colour lay-ins of the kind that Turner took in to the Royal Academy and finished during the varnishing-days but the exact purpose of these particular works is unclear.

Such 'colour beginnings', though confined to work in water-colour, are the subject of Eric Shanes's *Turner's Watercolour Explorations*. He makes rather heavy weather of Finberg's invention of this term, replacing it by a number of separate categories that almost match David's account of the modes in Wagner's *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*; Shanes uses about twelve different terms including, in his text, Finberg's original 'colour beginnings'. Several of them depend on second-guessing Turner's intentions: a 'sketch' becomes a 'study' if Turner uses it, an 'underpainting' presupposes that Turner at least intended to paint over it. However, Shanes's exceptionally thorough analyses of each composition and also of the technical means employed at last brings some sort of order to the no fewer than 386 water-colours lumped together by Finberg in his section CCLXIII, and he also identifies a large number of subjects among 125 further works from Finberg's CCLXXX, CCCLXIV and CCCLXV, to say nothing of including one water-colour entirely missed by Finberg. Again, as in the other publications under review, tables at the back bring Finberg up to date, in this case acknowledging the contribution of other scholars, from C.F. Bell up to members of the present staff of the Tate Gallery.

Shanes correctly dismisses certain twentieth-century attempts to make Turner a pioneer of abstraction; even Lawrence Gowing, in the catalogue of the Turner exhibition that went furthest in this direction (at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, in 1966), stated clearly that 'Turner's work is never without a figurative reference'. Certain baffling patches of colour are convincingly explained as 'paper tests', that is the trying out of various colours on various papers, or 'undersheets', and Shanes's practical experience as an artist leading him to point out that artists frequently employ odd sheets of paper to protect the surface on which they are working from getting stained. In an amazing number of

cases, however, Shanes has discovered the figurative element. In a water-colour once identified by the present reviewer as an Italian landscape, for instance, Shanes convincingly identifies the horizontal lines on the mountainous form on the left as the characteristic stepped terraces of Powis Castle. Seen by itself the frenzied brush strokes and splashes of paint as if from a flicked brush of Shanes's no.75 would indeed seem to be an anticipation of abstraction, but he demonstrates the evolution from this work by way of three other water-colour sketches to the finished water-colour of *Rokeby*; the shared palette of these sketches confirms his identification. However, Shanes himself accepts the tentative nature of some of his identifications, and some are not fully convincing.

One would have liked a fuller discussion of the possibility that a feature in Turner's colour beginning might actually suggest a detail in the finished water-colour, as in the case of the coach on the right of *St Catherine's Hill*, and also on the relation between the colour beginnings and the work that Turner did on the spot, usually in pencil. Discussing the Land's End sketches which appear to show Turner moving around his subject and depicting it from different viewpoints, Shanes suggests that these water-colours were done during the same work session; contemporary observers confirmed Turner's boast that he could make a large number of water-colours at one session. That he could do so on the basis of pencil records, often of many years before, recalling details of composition, effects of weather and colour is a tribute to Turner's miraculous visual retention and inspiration.

MARTIN BUTLIN

David to Corot: French Drawings in the Fogg Art Museum. By Agnes Mongan; edited by Miriam Stewart. 306 pp. incl. 474 b. & w. ills. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London, 1996), £78.95. ISBN 0-674-19320-2.

The Fogg Art Museum contains one of the finest collections of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century French drawings in the world, mostly bequeathed over the last fifty years by benefactors such as Grenville L. Winthrop and Paul J. Sachs. It includes over three-hundred individual sheets; three sketchbooks by Jacques-Louis David; two albums assembled by the architect Achille Leclère (1785–1853); four albums of architectural and other drawings by Leclère himself; and an album of twenty-six drawings related to the style of Percier and Fontaine. Among the individual *clous* of the collection are Corot's *View of Mount Soracte from Civita Castellana* (cat. no.60) and David's perspective study for *The Oath of the Tennis Court* (no.69). Other delights include rare clutches of drawings by Prud'hon, David d'Angers, Barye, Chassériau and Géricault, including in the latter case a major compositional essay for *The mutiny on the raft of the Medusa* (no.174). There are no fewer than forty-four drawings by Delacroix, including the haunting *Portrait of*