

**Jean-Paul Bouillon, éd., *La Critique d'art en France 1850-1900*.
Université de Saint-Etienne, travaux LXIII, Centre
Interdisciplinaire d'Études et de Recherches sur l'Expression
Contemporaine, 1989, 231 p.**

Yves Thomas

Volume 17, Number 2, 1990

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073080ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073080ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)

1918-4778 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Thomas, Y. (1990). Review of [Jean-Paul Bouillon, éd., *La Critique d'art en France 1850-1900*. Université de Saint-Etienne, travaux LXIII, Centre Interdisciplinaire d'Études et de Recherches sur l'Expression Contemporaine, 1989, 231 p.] *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 17(2), 185–186. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073080ar>

Raphael Symposium, on technical aspects of some Raphael paintings in the National Gallery and on the cartoons for the Vatican tapestries, are infused with characteristic authority and clarity of expression. Her descriptions of the technical findings in each case, from the material composition of the supports and grounds to the methods used to model the various pigments, are exemplary. Of particular interest are Plesters's findings concerning the close correspondence of specific Flemish and Raphaellesque oil-painting techniques, which point up the importance of Northern influence during this period and will, it is hoped, stimulate further research.

One other excellent paper is by Hubertus von Sonnenburg, on the examination of Raphael's paintings in Munich. In this essay von Sonnenburg provides a very careful description of the materials and techniques found in two works from Raphael's Florentine period (1504-1508), the *Tempi Madonna* and the *Canigiani Holy Family*. Exploring their individual features from the support up, von Sonnenburg also extends the relevance of his enquiry by drawing numerous comparisons with the techniques of other examined paintings by Raphael. For this reason, his is one of the most comprehensive contributions to the study of Raphael's painting technique in the collection. It was wonderful to hear the recent news that von Sonnenburg is now working out of North America, as head of the painting conservation studios at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

The other essays on technique are less worthy of note, either on account of their more narrow scope or because of a relative lack of new information due to limited scientific investigation of the works. Nevertheless, it is important to stress the range of aspects of technical enquiry represented in the volume, from dendrochronological studies of the nature and structure of the wood supports used in Raphael's panel-paintings, to the techniques employed in the interior decorative marble facing of the Chigi Chapel in Rome (a subject which seems somewhat out of place), as well as numerous accounts of the various stages of Raphael's painting techniques. These diverse topics seem to have been assembled in response to John Shearman's clearly articulated plea for greater variety in our research on aspects of Raphael's technique (p. 12). Indeed, participants were issued at the outset with a number of questions or problems that it was hoped their papers would address. And in this way the outcome was moulded to reflect the diversity of Raphael as an artist and technician and the optimal breadth of the emerging sub-discipline.

The second interdisciplinary area investigated in a few of the papers is restoration history. Although tracing the restoration history of a work has, to a certain extent, formed part of the traditional routine of the conservator—the equivalent to the art connoisseur's searching of an object's provenance—as a sub-discipline of art history this area of research is very new and, to my mind, full of potential. The only extensive, recent study concerning the history of restoration is Alessandro Conti's cursory and very limited survey, *Storia del restauro e della conservazione delle opere d'arte* (Milan, 1973). Consequently, the few contributions to this area in *The Raphael Symposium* are extremely signif-

icant, particularly Raffaella Rossi Manaresi's account of the restoration history of Raphael's Bologna *St. Cecilia Altarpiece* and his *Madonna di Foligno*. As she recounts, both altarpieces were taken to France in the late eighteenth century by Napoleon's army, and in Paris at the Musée Central des Arts, both were restored and in the process transferred from panel to canvas, changing the surface qualities of the paintings. Subsequently, after it was returned to Bologna in 1815, the *St. Cecilia Altarpiece* underwent at least two treatments during which three layers of varnish and two intermediary strata of brown patina were added to the surface, altering the chromatic effects to suit contemporary aesthetic tastes. Only recently have these accretions been removed to recover Raphael's original chromatic balance so valued by modern observers. Indeed, studies like this one cannot help but reveal how tastes have changed and how with these changes works of art have been subjected to physical transformations to bring them into line with contemporary aesthetic standards. Clearly, the fabric of a work of art is far from static; and from an object's ever-changing physical make-up we can learn a lot about the cultural contexts in which it has been and is appreciated.

The text of this large volume is lavishly and attractively printed, in three languages, English, French, and Italian, and there are remarkably few editorial slips. Unfortunately, however, the colour plates are a disappointment. In many of the overall plates the colour distortions are quite extreme, which seems somewhat ironic in a book so concerned with an artist's colouring techniques and his newly cleaned works. Yet, as John Shearman recently explained, because of publication costs they were compelled to print all the colour plates at the same time, and the contrasts had to be raised so that the differently coloured layers of the paint cross-sections would be absolutely clear.

CATHLEEN HOENIGER
Queen's University

JEAN-PAUL BOUILLON, éd. *La Critique d'art en France 1850-1900*. Université de Saint-Etienne, travaux LXIII, Centre Interdisciplinaire d'Etudes et de Recherches sur l'Expression Contemporaine, 1989, 231 p.

Ce volume réunit les actes d'un colloque international consacré à la critique d'art en France entre 1850 et 1900. Les quinze études regroupées et présentées par Jean-Paul Bouillon tracent la voie vers une connaissance élargie des conditions de la prise de parole dans la critique d'art de la deuxième moitié du XIX^e siècle.

Résultat d'un programme de recherche conjoint engagé par les départements d'Histoire de l'Art des universités de Clermont-Ferrand et de Montréal, *la Critique d'art en France 1850-1900* place d'emblée le lecteur devant la complexité des enjeux du discours sur l'art en montrant que loin d'être monolithique, il relève d'une diversité d'options culturelles.

Les contributions aux travaux de ce colloque sont réparties dans un ordre chronologique en trois temps

principaux: la critique du second Empire, la critique de la période impressionniste, les transformations de la critique à la fin du siècle.

La richesse de la documentation témoigne de façon exemplaire de la profondeur de l'enquête. En effet, les références aux revues et quotidiens du XIX^e siècle abondent. Abordant les écrits de Thoré, Castagnary, Blanc, Aicard, d'Hervilly, Maclair, Péladan et d'autres mieux ou moins connus, les textes de ces études sollicitent *l'Artiste*, la *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, le *Mercure de France*, le *Moniteur*, la *Revue des Deux Mondes*, mais aussi la *Plume*, la *Grande Revue*, la *Lanterne*, le *Radical*, la *Renaissance*, tout un ensemble de revues qui ont permis d'exposer le devenir des objets d'art à travers la multiplicité des interrogations et des commentaires qu'il s'agisse de Manet, Bouguereau, Millet ou Dubufe, Ribot et Breton.

Bon nombre de contributions sous ce rapport s'organisent autour d'un important échantillonnage d'approches dans le sens d'une archéologie du discours sur l'art. Les propos de Luce Abelès sur la Renaissance culturelle après la Commune, d'Antoinette Ehrard sur les procédures de compte-rendus du Salon de 1880, de Jean-Paul Bouillon sur les perceptions de l'oeuvre de Manet en 1884, de Michael Orwicz sur l'hétérogénéité du discours critique entre 1885 et 1889, de Constance Naubert-Riser sur les années 1890 et les conditions du renouvellement des modèles théoriques engendrées par la scission du Salon officiel offrent les éléments d'une reconstitution des possibilités de la critique d'art pendant la deuxième moitié du XIX^e siècle.

Dans cet esprit, mais sur des questions plus spécifiques, Wolfgang Drost s'est intéressé à ce Baudelaire critique d'art qui, au lisse des tableaux de Martin Drolling et de Horace Vernet, préfère les dessins de Constantin Guys. C'est cette même aversion pour le produit fini, le produit industriel en art, qui, selon Frances Jowell, détermine le critique et historien d'art, Thoré-Burger, dans son goût pour la touche expressive. Nicole Dubreuil-Blondin analyse, pour sa part, les métaphores du «sale» et du «malade» afin de mesurer à quel point le public des années 1860 est constamment appelé à choisir entre le lisse des textures de certains tableaux académiques et les empâtements de la peinture impressionniste qui devient par la même occasion l'objet de la prolifération des métaphores salissantes dans la critique d'art.

Mais il convient de prendre en compte le rôle de ce discours sur l'art dans la construction de l'imaginaire social. À cet égard, Neil McWilliam souligne qu'aux années 1850-1860 l'élaboration de l'image culturelle de la classe paysanne est liée au débat sur la question de la représentation de la vie rurale. Dans ce même ordre d'idées, Anne Higonnet montre que la critique d'art est responsable de la mise en place d'une image dépréciative de la féminité.

La publication de cette collection d'études marque, en définitive, un point tournant dans l'histoire du regard sur les objets d'art. Dario Gamboni signale que l'autonomie de la critique d'art est récente. Proche de la vie littéraire au point d'y être confondue, la critique d'art au XIX^e siècle renvoie plutôt aux noms de Théophile Gautier évoqué par Patricia Mainardi, de Baudelaire dont parle Wolfgang Drost, des Goncourt dont il est question dans le travail de Thérèse Dolan, et de Zola

que Jean-Paul Bouillon discute en rapport avec Manet. Ces noms d'écrivains sont de fait plus répandus, voire mieux connus en tant que critiques d'art que Castagnary ou Blanc, par exemple, qui font l'objet d'examens exploratoires de la part de Henri Dorra et de Neil Flax.

La Critique d'art en France 1850-1900 vient en ce sens combler une lacune importante et indique de nombreuses pistes à suivre dans les recherches sur le discours de la critique d'art.

YVES THOMAS
Trent University

ELIZABETH M. LEGGE *Max Ernst: The Psychoanalytic Sources*. Ann Arbor and London, UMI Research Press, 1989, 231 pp.

Many writers have speculated on the influence of Sigmund Freud and psychoanalysis on Surrealist writings and paintings, especially those by Max Ernst. The Surrealists themselves began this discussion in the early 1920s in their published writings, such as André Breton's 1922 "Interview du Professeur Freud à Vienne" in *Littérature*. Ernst came to the debate with a wealth of knowledge; before World War I he had been a student of psychology at the university in Bonn and had read Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* and *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious* in 1913.

Max Ernst: The Psychoanalytic Sources by Elizabeth M. Legge goes far in helping the modern reader understand the often complex relationship between the works of Freud and the art and theory of Max Ernst and the other Surrealists. The book is especially strong in chapter two, in which Legge explains the climate in Paris in the 1920s. During this period Freud's writings spawned concepts basic to the Surrealist movement. She not only notes Freud's influence—as many writers have done—but also documents its evolution by establishing a firm chronology for the translations of Freud's works into French. With keen awareness she explores forces within Surrealism that made André Breton, the leader of the movement, vacillate in his attitude toward Freud and psychoanalysis. Legge further establishes a timetable of events during which Ernst used references to Freud in an attempt to make a favourable place for himself in the theory and practice of Surrealism. For example, in examining Ernst's autobiographical writings of the mid-1930s she comments:

In a diplomatically indirect way, Ernst manipulates the events surrounding his invention of the procedure of collage, reappropriating for himself the modes of mental irritation that had been publicized by Dali in 1930 in "L'Ane pourri," assiduously situating his own ideas and techniques *before* Dali's. While apparently agreeing with Breton and Dali, flattering them as theoreticians by extensively quoting them, Ernst at the same time carefully draws attention to their indebtedness to his own works in their theoretical formulations. (p. 29)

In her objective analysis of Ernst's career, Legge presents scholarship on Ernst as it has developed and matured since writings published during his life. Many of the early works were written by the Surrealists themselves or their friends. For example, the books on