who may read this letter to consider helping in one of two ways: by sending notices or catalogues of exhibitions, booksellers' or publishers' lists, according to normal practice; or by offering for sale, or best of all as a gift, books, periodicals, catalogues, photographs or other material relating to modern art. All such help will be gratefully acknowledged and will play an important part in promoting the growth of the new Gallery.

DOUGLAS HALL

Keeper
Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art
Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh 3

Exhibition of Scottish Painting at Glasgow

SIR, Mr Basil Skinner's review in your December 1961 issue, p.525 of the Exhibition of Scottish Painting, which the Earl of Snowdon opened in Glasgow on 5th October, should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

A review which ignores the stated aim of an exhibition and criticizes the organizers for failing to do what in fact they did not set out to do, is bound to be misleading. The aim of the exhibition, which was clearly explained in the introduction to the catalogue, was to make a feature of the Scottish Colourists, to give a fuller representation than hitherto of the Glasgow School, and to provide an historical lead-in in the form of a number of acknowledged masterpieces. To this end, exactly half of the 200 exhibits was allocated to the Glasgow School and the Scottish Colourists, a further twenty-one consisted of drawings, and the remainder was given to painting from George Jamesone in the early seventeenth century to William McTaggart in the nineteenth.

To accuse Glasgow of lacking the spirit of adventure and failing to seize the opportunity of mounting a truly comprehensive display of Scottish art is quite fatuous, especially when the reviewer was aware of some at least of the facts. It was only in March of last year that Glasgow Art Gallery received a firm directive from the civic authorities to make ready an exhibition of Scottish Painting for opening on 5th October. The Gallery had already been committed to a heavy programme of exhibitions, loans, and the opening of redecorated rooms. Extra staff to cope with the additional burden was not forthcoming. In view of this, and since the general theme of the exhibition was not to be altered, the directorate decided to emphasize those two aspects of Scottish painting which its own and local resources could more readily handle and which at the same time would command public support. Visits of inspection were made perforce in the evenings or at weekends in order to arrive at a final selection. Such was the pressure of other activities that it was not until the fourth week in August that concentrated work on the exhibition was possible, and the catalogue had to be in the civic printers' hands by 11th September. A hypercritical review which fails to acknowledge the circumstances and avowed aims of an exhibition can do little more than flatter temporarily the ego of the reviewer.

Two of Mr Skinner's criticisms call for individual treatment. He states that the derivation of the Scottish Colourists (Peploe, Fergusson, Hunter, and Cadell) from the great days of the Glasgow School is logical and expected. I would suggest that the Scottish Colourists, who emerged towards the end of the first decade of the present century, owed little to the aims and achievements of the Glasgow School but a great deal to the enthusiasm with which they explored the new principles of painting expounded by Matisse and his followers.

Mr Skinner expresses disgust that Gavin Hamilton was represented simply by a portrait and that one of his neo-classical history pictures was not included. The organizers were well aware that the occasion demanded such a work, but they considered it most desirable that the work selected should be in a condition worthy of the occasion. A place of honour was in fact reserved for Hamilton's striking composition of 1758, *Dawkins and Wood discovering Palmyra*, which is on permanent loan to Glasgow University but was then in Edinburgh being cleaned. Belatedly this painting had to be excluded when the restorer complained that his work would suffer seriously through the canvas, a large one measuring about 10 ft 2 in. by 12 ft 9 in., having of necessity to be rolled and restretched for the Glasgow exhibition and again removed from its stretcher before its entry into the university.

GEORGE BUCHANAN

Curator of the Department of Art,
Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum.

Mr Skinner writes:

SIR, I am flattered indeed by the unusual length of Mr Buchanan's remarks. Since he thinks my review 'misleading', I can only refer him to the title-page of his Catalogue where he will find the words, 'Exhibition of Scottish Painting from the Early 17th Century to the Early 20th Century', and to the opening paragraph of his Introductory Note, where he indulges in some equivocation. At once he disclaims exhaustive treatment and at the same time puts forward his exhibition as an opportunity for 're-appraisal and reassessment' of Scottish painting whereby its 'vigour, breadth, and individuality' may appear. One is surely entitled to interpret as an attempt at a balanced review an exhibition that claims to show (and again I quote) 'the best work prior to Victorian times, the best of Victorian painting, the best of the Glasgow School, and of more recent painting up to about 1940' (already, the reader will observe, a confusing enlargement in date of the title-page wording).

Mr Buchanan proceeds to an *apologia* in which he complains first of all of the lack of time allowed him by his Civic Committee for the preparation of the exhibition, and second (in answer to my particular criticism) of the restorer's objections to the hanging of Gavin Hamilton's *Dawkins and Wood*. These plaints are hardly the concern of your reviewer, but some comment may be made. Regarding the first, Mr Buchanan is again a little misleading, for, if his first 'firm directive' came in March 1961, the idea of the exhibition, as his Lord Provost indicates in her Foreword to his catalogue, was in mind from the autumn of 1960. For the second point, one might enquire which of the other owners of Hamilton's histories (not all in poor condition) was approached by the organizers in an effort to fill this notable gap in the exhibition's coverage. But my main criticism concerned the pedestrianism of rearranging so many familiar subjects from public collections, at least unsupported by a larger quota of talented pieces from private ownership. This charge Mr Buchanan excuses but does not refute.

That my review was critical I admit, but not hypercritical. If Mr Buchanan will read it again, he will find that I have not been consistently or unduly antagonistic. The Glasgow exhibition was, after all, very much of an artistic curate's egg.

Pietro da Cortona's Camera della Stufa

SIR, I noticed with interest the opinions Messrs Campbell and Laskin, Jr., have set forth in your October 1961 issue concerning a drawing in Prague for Pietro da Cortona's *Age of Bronze* in the

Camera della Stufa of the Pitti Palace. Apart from the brilliant identification of the purpose of a drawing in a collection not frequently visited by the art historian, one valuable aspect of the authors' researches seemed to me the discovery of a Christian theme in Pietro da Cortona's preliminary drawing at Princeton for the *Age of Iron*. As the authors rightly observe, in the series of frescoes as executed the Christian theme has been transposed from the *Age of Iron* to the *Age of Bronze*. The authors seem, however, somewhat baffled by the appearance of the Christian theme in one preparatory drawing for the *Age of Bronze* (Prague) when it had not occurred in another, earlier study (Munich) for the same fresco. They write: 'The appearance of a Christian element in the *Age of Bronze*, so aptly documented by the Prague drawing, raises an iconographic problem . . .'. And they conclude: 'The insertion of a Christian motif into one of the Four Ages of Man and its subsequent transfer from one Age to another will be a matter for speculation in future interpretations of the iconography of the Sala della Stufa.' It seems possible to solve the problem at once, and on the evidence so competently assembled by the authors.

Pietro da Cortona includes in his fresco of the *Age of Iron* a group of sacrilegious soldiers who, at the foot of a statue of a goddess of antiquity, plunder a temple and slay a priest. The representation of the *Age of Bronze* contains a corresponding scene showing the propagation of the law of the Lord, again at the foot of a statue, now, however, of Christ. In point of fact, if no more than an immediate interpretation is aimed at, the question of a distinction between antiquity and Christianity is hardly relevant. It is sufficient to realize that the *Age of Iron* is identified with a scene showing the destruction of religion, regardless of what kind, whereas the *Age of Bronze* – free as it was according to Ovid from impiety – is identified with a scene showing the observance, or at least tolerance, of religion. Within Pietro da Cortona's general iconographic framework this double theme could evidently be expressed according to three variations: either both scenes take place in antiquity, or both in the Christian era, or one scene occurs in antiquity and one in Christian times. If the various preparatory studies and the final frescoes are checked, it appears that Pietro da Cortona had started with the first possibility, abandoned it for the second, and finally adopted the third. The original scheme is discernible in the drawing for the *Age of Bronze* showing the observance of religion in antiquity (Munich). This presupposes an as yet unidentified drawing with the destruction of religion, again pagan, for the *Age of Iron*. The second step is fully recorded in the Princeton and Prague drawings, the former for the *Age of Iron* and the latter for that of Bronze, both of which contain references to Christianity. The final step is taken in the frescoes as executed: antiquity for the *Age of Iron*, and Christianity for the *Age of Bronze*. This final disposition, thus contains a device which establishes unequivocally the sequence of time – from antiquity on to Christianity – i.e. from the Age of Iron to the Age of Bronze. This is the key to a correct interpretation of the four frescoes in the Camera della Stufa. It implies the reversal of the accustomed sequence of the Four Ages, and it is here that the authors sin most. They interpret the *Age of Iron* as 'the last of the four ages' whereas in fact the *Four Ages* in the Camera della Stufa have to be read, not as in Ovid from Gold down, with Iron standing for the present, but in the opposite direction: beginning with Iron and continuing through Bronze and Silver, in order to culminate in the Age of Gold. That Pietro da Cortona's *Age of Gold* is meant to stand for the present, *i.e.* the 1630's, is clear enough. It has only to be recalled that three years before Pietro da Cortona started his decoration in the Palazzo Pitti the marriage between Ferdinand II of Tuscany and Vittoria della Rovere had been celebrated in this very palace, and references to this event become at once apparent. Already contained in the preparatory study for this scene (Fig.28) are the salient features of the fresco: the oak-branch (*rovere*) held over the centre of the composition by the man in the tree on the left; a laurel crown (*vittoria*) held beneath it by one of the dancing figures on the right; and at the bottom, on the same central axis, the lion of Florence. The preceding ages, from antiquity on, are no more than the preparation for this occasion.

In short, the theme of the Camera della Stufa is not the representation of the Ovidian Four Ages, but the *Return of the Golden Age* – occurring under the benign rule of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and his Duchess.

WALTER VITZTHUM

Mr Malcolm Campbell writes:

SIR, As indicated by its title, the express purpose of the article by Mr Laskin and myself was the publication of the Prague drawing for the *Age of Bronze*, and our remarks were, therefore, confined to the drawings related to the genesis of that fresco because in our opinion the significance of Cortona's *Four Ages* was such that an analysis of its iconography should be reserved for a more comprehensive article in which its stylistic importance could also be assessed. Evidently, Dr Vitzthum's opinion differs from ours. He has chosen to catalogue what he considers our scholarly sins and, by extending his remarks to the *Age of Gold* (not directly considered in our article), to attempt an explanation of the fresco cycle. Dr Vitzthum's deductions are neither as accurate nor as unfamiliar to students of Cortona as their presentation would lead one to assume.

It is gratifying to learn that Dr Vitzthum considers our discovery of the introduction of a Christian theme into the *Age of Iron* and its transposition to the *Age of Bronze* an essential ingredient in the reverse reading of the cycle, according to which the Ages commence with the tumultuous *Age of Iron* and culminate in the Arcadian world of the *Age of Gold*. It must be pointed out, however, that this shift of the Christian motif from the last to the next to last of the Ovidian Ages does not, unless one assumes some sort of visual momentum, carry the counter-clockwise interpretation beyond the *Age of Bronze*. Yet Dr Vitzthum proposes to use it as a device for constructing a reverse reading that continues through the *Age of Silver* to the *Age of Gold*. These two Ages do, in fact, contain elements that permit the reversal of their customary chronology. In the former Age there appears, looking incongruous among the rustic implements of its primitive inhabitants, a large antique urn of burnished bronze over which a youth is squeezing grapes. The substance and shape of this urn necessitate the existence of a previous epoch of higher technical skill than the one in which it is depicted (appropriately, the preceding one, the *Age of Bronze*). The gold *patera* in the lower right corner of the *Age of Gold* (Fig.29) continues the conceit, providing an example of the ore for which this Age was named and also appearing as a forgotten and disused object from the past as represented in the *Age of Bronze* or the *Age of Iron*, where, in fact, an almost identical *patera* may be seen among the loot grasped by the soldier in the left section of the fresco.

Although the reverse reading of the cycle is valid when it has been demonstrated that motifs facilitating this interpretation exist in all four of the Ages, it does seem a trifle excessive to censure our reference to the *Age of Iron* as the last of the *Four Ages* when we had discussed the cycle only in its Ovidian sense and had never introduced the reverse reading. Dr Vitzthum is so emphatic in this matter that I find his methodology open to what appears to be a fundamental error. He assumes that the counter-clockwise reading cancels the Ovidian interpretation, whereas the cycle is actually freighted with double significance: a primary clockwise reading of Ovid's Four Ages and a secondary interpretation,

accessible only to the more observant spectators, in the counter-clockwise reading. Thus the Ovidian sequence is the necessary prelude to the second (reverse) reading and lends poignancy to the implication in the latter that time has been turned back to the *Age of Gold*.

I would concur with Dr Vitzthum's thesis that when the cycle is read in reverse, the *Age of Gold* may be construed to refer to the 1630's, but I wish to modify his deduction that this Age alludes to the 1634 marriage of Grand Duke Ferdinand II de' Medici and Vittoria della Rovere. A close look at history indicates that the marriage was contracted in 1623, and in 1634, the year to which Dr Vitzthum attaches such importance, there followed '... *le nozze private celebrate nel Palazzo Pitti, fatte soprattutto per soddisfare il desiderio della nonna granduchessa Cristina; la quale, essendo ormai in là con gli anni, voleva veder compiuto (se non consumato) quel matrimonio*' (G. PIERACCINI: *La Stirpe de' Medici di Cafaggiolo*, II, pt.2, Florence [1947], p.190). The marriage was actually consummated on 6th April 1637, at which time public festivities were planned, including a masque entitled *Le Nozze de' Dei*, written especially for the occasion by Giovanni Carlo Coppola, to be held at the Palazzo Pitti. Then, owing to the death of the German Emperor Ferdinand II, protector of the Grand Duke, the celebration was postponed until July and was thus precisely concurrent with the frescoing of the *Age of Gold* (*Descrizione delle Feste fatte in Firenze per le reali Nozze de' Serenissimi Sposi Ferdinando II Gran Duca de Toscana e Vittoria Principessa d'Urbino*, Florence [1637], p.10). Surely it is unnecessary to look back three years, as Dr Vitzthum has done, to an event that was a mere formality when a public celebration more suited to an allusion in the *Age of Gold* is close at hand.

With regard to the interpretation of the *Age of Gold*, Dr Vitzthum has found the larger pieces of the puzzle, but several important ones have been overlooked. In republishing Uffizi No.18477 F, a composition study for the Age (O. GIGLIOLI: 'Disegni inediti ... nella R. Galleria degli Uffizi', *Bollettino d'Arte*, II [1923], pp.514–15 and 520) (Fig.28), one would have expected Dr Vitzthum to comment on Marabottini's appraisal of the drawing as of doubtful authenticity (*Mostra di Pietro da Cortona*, Rome [1956], p.10, n.21), particularly since proof of Cortona's authorship is readily available. Among the preparatory drawings for the *Age of Gold* in the Uffizi there are four studies containing sketches for figures that appear only in the composition study or are altered in the fresco. One of these drawings, Uffizi No.13909 F, is a study for the two women wearing garlands (Fig.25) who appear in the left section of the composition study and are replaced by a youthful male and female in the fresco. Another, Uffizi No.11768 F *verso*, contains studies for figures retained unaltered in the fresco and also a study for the head of a *putto* seen in profile which derives from the composition study where he is located immediately behind the *putto* carrying oak branches (Fig.27); in the fresco his head is seen frontally and in a foreshortened position.

For Dr Vitzthum, Uffizi No.18477 F documents the fact that many salient elements connecting the *Age of Gold* with Ferdinand II de' Medici and his spouse are already present in a preliminary stage of the fresco's evolution. Actually, the closeness of the composition study to the fresco is not entirely surprising since the chronology established in our article indicates that only a little more than two months elapsed between the initial studies for this fresco and the *Age of Silver* and their completion, hardly sufficient time for elaborate changes in their programmes.

As important as the similarities between composition study and fresco are the divergencies, an example of which is the appearance in the upper right section of the fresco of a pair of turtle doves who symbolize marital fidelity because they were thought to mate for life (G. P. VALERIANO: *Hieroglyphica* ..., XXII, Lyons [1610], 16). The most essential change, however, is the replacement of the two females under the oak tree with a seated male and a female who crowns him with a wreath of laurel. Not present in the composition study from which Dr Vitzthum makes his deductions about the iconography of the fresco, it is the wreath held by this woman which should be connected with a pun on Vittoria, the Christian name of Ferdinand's wife (not the one noted by Dr Vitzthum which becomes a less significant motif in the fresco than it had been in the composition study), as will be apparent if we consider a drawing now in Rome (Gabinetto Nazionale delle Stampe, F. C. No.124329) for the female who holds the laurel wreath (Fig.26). Although twice published as a study for this figure (L. BIANCHI: *Mostra di Pietro da Cortona*, Rome [1956], Cat. No.56, plate LX; P. BAROCCHI: *Disigni italiani di cinque Secoli*, Florence [1961], Cat. No.102, Fig.75) no comment has been made on her lightly sketched wings which permit us to adduce that in this phase of the evolution of the fresco, Cortona considered the inclusion of an allegorical figure representing *vittoria*. This overt reference to Ferdinand II's wife suggests that at this stage the youth being crowned not only alluded to the Grand Duke, but bore his likeness. A similar fusion of mythology and reality was, in fact, made in the ceiling of what is now the first room of the Museo degli Argenti on the *pian terreno* of the palace where Angelo Michele Colonna and Agostino Mitelli executed a scene (1638) usually considered to be *Jupiter Descending to Bestow the Crown and Sceptre on the Medici*, but in which the recipient of Jupiter's favours is Ferdinand II de' Medici.

Even without knowledge of the possible direct allusion to the Grand Duke and his wife in a preliminary stage of the *Age of Gold*, the retention of the lion (the Marzocco of Florence), the laurel wreath alluding to Vittoria, and the oak branches for her family, the della Rovere, in the final version of the *Age of Gold* are sufficiently cogent links with the consummation of their marriage to suggest that they are allegorically represented by the idealized couple who are strategically placed so as to be the culminating figures in the narrative sequence when the *Four Ages* are interpreted in a counter-clockwise direction. When this couple, overlooked by Dr Vitzthum, is understood as symbolizing the Grand Duke and Duchess, the allusion intended by the reverse reading of the cycle that the *Age of Gold* signifies the return of the Golden Age in Tuscany becomes far more explicit. Yet another link with the marriage is evident if we note that the youth who has climbed the oak tree is breaking off branches which a *putto* in the centre foreground is carrying towards the young couple. This transfer of the branches from the oak tree to the young couple symbolizes the Grand Ducal marriage. A precedent for the significance of this activity is to be found in the ceiling of the Salone Terreno of the Palazzo Pitti, decorated by Giovanni da San Giovanni between 1635 and 1636, in which the marriage of Ferdinand II and Vittoria becomes the subject of a delightful allegory. In the central area of this ceiling one of the three Fates is shown cutting a thread which is twined about a partially atrophied oak branch (symbolic of the expiring della Rovere family, of which Vittoria was the last direct heir). Just as her scissors are about to sever the thread, *putti* carry green twigs from the oak branch to the Medici coat of arms, much as the *putto* carries them to the young couple in the *Age of Gold*. The fact that Giovanni da San Giovanni's fresco is an important source for the iconography of the *Age of Gold* is even more apparent when we consider the two panels which flank the central scene. In one the Marzocco is used as a symbol of Florence, and in the other a flower-bedecked female personifying the Arno River appears, who has an iconographic counterpart in the nymph holding a floral garland in the lower right corner of the *Age of Gold*.

The oak branch is one of several recurrent motifs which serve to link the allegorical significances of the Palazzo Pitti decorations

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

25. Figure Studies for the *Age of Gold*, by Pietro da Cortona. Black chalk, 23·1 by 26·2 cm. (Gabinetto dei Disegni, Uffizi, Florence.)

26. Figure Study for the *Age of Gold*, by Pietro da Cortona. Black chalk heightened with white on grey paper, 33·3 by 25·7 cm. (Gabinetto Nazionale delle Stampe, Rome.)

27. Study of Heads for the *Age of Gold*, by Pietro da Cortona. Black chalk heightened with white on grey paper, 22·7 by 40 cm. (Gabinetto dei Disegni, Uffizi, Florence.)

28. Study for the *Age of Gold*, by Pietro da Cortona. Red chalk, pen, and brown ink, squared in black chalk, 41 by 27·5 cm. (Gabinetto dei Disegni, Uffizi, Florence.)

29. *Age of Gold*, by Pietro da Cortona. Fresco. (Sala della Stufa, Palazzo Pitti, Florence.)

commissioned by Ferdinand II de' Medici with his reign. These interconnecting motifs occur not only in Cortona's *Four Ages* and the ceiling of the Salone Terreno, but also in the series of rooms decorated by Colonna and Mitelli, in the Grotto of the Ammannati Cortile, and in the five rooms generally known as the Sale dei Pianeti, initiated by Cortona and completed by his pupil Ciro Ferri (although the Sale dei Pianeti have generally been interpreted as referring to Grand Duke Cosimo I de' Medici, it can be proved that the rooms actually allude to their commissioner). The ramifications of this decorative programme were, as indicated in a footnote in the article by Mr Laskin and myself, the subject of my doctoral dissertation. It may now be added that they are the subject of a study in preparation for publication.

The Literature of Art

Watteau, Peintre Inconnu

BY F. J. B. WATSON

IN spite of de Julienne's purpose, proclaimed immediately after Watteau's death and unparalled in the case of a contemporary artist before the twentieth century, of publishing '*l'œuvre entier de Watteau*' with illustrations of every painting, the Watteau problem is perennial. During the years of research which preceded the publication of their magisterial corpus of Watteau drawings, it was inevitable that Sir Karl Parker and M Mathey should have come across a number of lost, forgotten or neglected paintings with serious claims to be by Watteau. A certain number were published independently during the preparation of the corpus or referred to briefly in the appropriate notes on individual drawings. Now one of the two collaborators has written a third volume* physically conforming with the preceding two and focused around these unfamiliar works, a book whose sub-title '*identification par les dessins*' emphasizes its close dependance on the earlier publication.

However pervasive Watteau's influence on eighteenth-century French paintings may have been, his reputation with French collectors slumped rapidly after his death. De Julienne's *Recueil* was languishing for want of support as early as 1735, and four years later the wealthy sponsor of the scheme sold off the entire stock both of plates and engravings to the widow of the print-seller Chereau. Five more years only had passed when Frederick the Great's art emissary, Count Rothenbourg, informed his master from Paris that '*tous les ouvrages que Watteau a faits sont en Angleterre où on en fait un cas infini*'. He may have exaggerated a little but there was an essential truth in what he said. When at about the same time Voyer d'Argenson ventured to prophecy '*dans vingt ans d'ici, on troquera en France deux tableaux de Raphael contre un éventail de Watteau*' he proved lamentably wrong, for almost exactly twenty years later Diderot was declaring that he would exchange any Watteau in the world for a small Teniers. With the rise of neo-classicism in the second half of the century, followed by Revolution and violent reaction against the *Ancien Régime*, it is hardly surprising that many Watteaus were forgotten or neglected.

As has been often remarked the *Recueil* is a frailer guide to Watteau's work than would appear at first sight. Not only are such major paintings as the second *Embarquement* and the *Gilles* omitted (together with, for instance, five other Watteaus in the Louvre and three in the Wallace Collection) but de Julienne, contrary to his declared intentions, seems to have pursued a deliberate policy of exclusion from the beginning. He made, for instance, little attempt to reproduce any of the juvenilia even when they are documented like the *Saint Nicholas*, the *Old Woman* after Dou, the four copies after Albanis in Louis XIV's Collection (mentioned by the Abbé de Maroulle in what is almost the earliest and certainly the least familiar life of the artist) or even the *sujet de l'histoire de David* which he submitted for the *Prix de Rome* in 1709. Some at least of these must have still been available but it may be fairly assumed that de Julienne regarded such things as beneath the interest of posterity. For similar reasons he must doubtless have rejected any idea of engraving Watteau's small religious works, direct imitations of his masters Audran and Gillot, or copies after other painters, and scarcely any landscapes, looking on them as the mere waste-matter of the studio. When it is added that twenty-eight of the paintings engraved in the *Recueil* are also untraced today it will be seen that the field for new discoveries in the way of paintings by Watteau should be wide.

M Mathey claims to add no less than thirty-four entirely new works to the canon of Watteau's paintings, many of them of types rarely associated with his name, and in addition he resuscitates eight more which in recent years have been generally rejected or assigned to other artists. An instance of this last category is the *Arlequin Empereur dans la Lune* at Nantes, a painting long in dispute between Gillot and Watteau, the supporters of Gillot having until now had the upper hand. A closely related drawing, *The Doctor*, in the Louvre is one of those recently transferred from Gillot to Watteau in the *Catalogue complet de son œuvre dessiné*, and therefore M Mathey, rationally enough, returns the painting to Watteau (with the qualification that the composition may be based on a design by his master). For those, if such there be, who still believe the Louvre drawing to be Gillot's, the old attribution of the Nantes painting will remain unshaken.

In general M Mathey's method is to start with unknown or rejected paintings which can be more or less securely assigned to Watteau usually by means of related drawings, though, occasionally, as in the case of the extremely Dutch *Revanche des Paysans*, there are engravings to establish their authenticity. Arguing by stylistic analysis of these, Mathey groups around them other paintings with similar stylistic characteristics but lacking any drawing to link them directly to Watteau. The method is logical enough though not invariably quite easy to follow where monochrome reproductions are all the reader has to go on. Photographs provide a peculiarly fallible instrument for the study of one whose *facture* is so highly personal. M Mathey, for instance, includes in his book some extremely interesting details from the puzzling large-scale *Mezzetin à la guitare* which are well calculated to convince the reader of its authenticity. But there still remains a disturbing scepticism at the back of the minds of many of those who saw and studied this painting in company with other Watteaus of unquestioned authenticity in the Rococo Exhibition at Munich in 1958.

That M Mathey is inclusionist rather than exclusionist in his attitude to Watteau is no bad thing, for the artist was prolific and, once he had found his métier, developed with extraordinary rapidity; almost all the works on which his fame rests date from the last eight years of his brief life. But the pitfalls which Mathey's method of analysis creates are apparent in a group of *tableaux à sujets enfantins* which he places quite early in Watteau's career. The series starts with a little *Enfants jouant au bal* in the Musée Carnavalet, authorless until M Mathey published it as by Watteau in *The Art Quarterly* not long ago. The grounds for the attribution

*__Antoine Watteau, Peintures Réapparues.__ By J. Mathey. 83 pp. + 148 pl. Paris (F. de Nobele, au dépens de l'auteur), 8500 francs.