

Malheureusement, l'auteur se contente d'énumérer longuement l'historiographie de l'artiste. L'« analyse serrée » qu'on serait en droit d'attendre est inexistante. Le seul point intéressant de ce chapitre est l'analyse des rapports entre l'artiste et son frère Edmond Z. Massicotte, archiviste et historien. Certains aspects de la production picturale et du choix des thèmes s'expliquent par la collaboration des deux frères.

Genest subdivise les thèmes traités par Massicotte en trois catégories, dans le chapitre suivant : – Du berceau à la tombe, – Les jours de fête, – Les travaux et les jours. Ce chapitre se serait bien prêté à une analyse statistique du corpus des quelques mille œuvres inventoriées. Genest a préféré énumérer certains thèmes en les expliquant brièvement.

Intitulé « L'époque », le quatrième chapitre analyse la maison, le mobilier, les objets usuels, le costume et les moyens de transport. Étudié en deux pages, le costume aurait eu avantage à être traité statistiquement. Genest n'a fait qu'effleurer un sujet aussi vaste alors qu'une étude comparative pouvait cerner certaines constantes de l'histoire du costume. Ce texte nous renseigne peu sur les objets représentés par l'artiste. Par exemple, l'énumération des outils dans un paragraphe, sans aucune explication de leurs fonctions et de leur datation, fait piètre figure. Nous nous attendions à une étude exhaustive de ces objets de la culture matérielle québécoise.

Le thème du dernier chapitre, le « Folklore oral », aurait dû être traité au chapitre trois consacré à la thématique de l'œuvre de Massicotte. Il ne semble pas y avoir de raison spéciale d'isoler ce thème des autres et d'en faire un chapitre entier. En effet, l'auteur affirme que les légendes comptent pour bien peu dans l'ensemble de la production du dessinateur (p. 176).

Genest conclut que les thèmes de l'agriculture, de la religion et de la patrie constituent la structure de base de l'ensemble de la production artistique de Massicotte (p. 189). Pourquoi alors ne pas avoir subdivisé l'ouvrage selon ces trois grands thèmes ? Il aurait été intéressant – et c'est d'ailleurs un des buts que se propose le directeur de la collection – de situer Massicotte dans l'idéologie et le contexte social de son époque.

logie et le contexte social de son époque.

Le catalogue comprend 1081 œuvres inventoriées. L'auteur les a regroupées chronologiquement par les périodiques dans lesquels elles parurent. Certaines erreurs se sont glissées dans l'inventaire, puisque l'illustration de la page couverture du *Monde illustré* du 30 mars 1901, publiée à la page 35, n'apparaît pas à cette date dans le catalogue. Dans l'annexe 11, Genest donne la liste de 17 cahiers de croquis contenant 793 feuillets de la collection du Musée du Québec. Trente de ces croquis ont été reproduits dans l'ouvrage. Nous regrettons que l'auteur n'ait pas jugé utile d'inventorier ces croquis et dessins qui semblent être des œuvres significatives de Massicotte.

Les photographies illustrant le texte n'ont pas été numérotées, ce qui rend très ardue la consultation du catalogue et du texte. Le numéro d'inventaire du catalogue aurait dû figurer au bas de la photographie de chacune des œuvres. De plus, l'identification des œuvres reproduites n'est pas systématique. Dans certains cas, le collectionneur (p. 49, 72 et 82), la technique d'impression et les matériaux ont été omis. Les dimensions des œuvres auraient dû apparaître dans la légende de chacune des illustrations. Le manque d'uniformité dans l'identification des œuvres reproduites nous fait douter du sérieux de l'auteur et de la collection. La collection « Iconographie de la vie québécoise » devra à l'avenir, si elle veut atteindre les buts poursuivis par son directeur, faire preuve de plus d'esprit scientifique dans la présentation des photographies.

A quelques reprises, Genest compare Massicotte à Henri Julien (ca. 1852-1908). Bien que certaines ressemblances thématiques rapprochent ces deux artistes, nous ne pouvons que réfuter les affirmations de Genest sur les similitudes de composition entre *Une veillée d'autrefois* (p. 99) et le dessin de Julien intitulé *The Dance* (p. 100). À la page 119, l'auteur écrit que l'œuvre de Jean-François Millet (1815-1875) a probablement influencé l'œuvre de Massicotte. Cette hypothèse mériterait un traitement plus approfondi. Contrairement à ce qu'affirme Genest, la composition de *l'Angélu* (Musée du Louvre, Paris) de Millet ne peut en aucun point se rapprocher de celle

de Massicotte. Il ne faut pas confondre la thématique d'une œuvre et sa composition. Bernard Genest confond aussi très facilement certains termes techniques comme tableau (p. 76) et dessin à la plume (p. 64) avec impression, gravure ou lithographie. Avant d'aborder une étude iconographique, il nous apparaît essentiel d'être familier avec la terminologie technique et le vocabulaire scientifique propres aux œuvres étudiées.

Massicotte et son temps est le premier ouvrage consacré à cet artiste montréalais de la fin du XIX^e siècle et du début du XX^e. L'inventaire et la publication des photographies nous permettent de mieux connaître l'ensemble de l'œuvre de Massicotte et de découvrir certains aspects méconnus de sa production, comme la page couverture de la revue *Le Monde illustré* (p. 35) dans laquelle on sent nettement l'influence du style Art Nouveau. Cet artiste québécois avait été négligé par les historiens de l'art; l'ouvrage de Bernard Genest, malgré ses failles, comble certainement une lacune en publiant l'inventaire de 1081 œuvres et les photographies de 112 d'entre elles. Cette amorce permettra sans doute de faire mieux connaître l'art québécois de cette période.

NICOLE CLOUTIER
Maître d'œuvre de l'histoire inc.
Montréal

The Diary of George A. Lucas: An American Art Agent in Paris, 1857-1909. Transcribed and with an introduction by Lilian M.C. Randall. 2 vols. Princeton (New Jersey), Princeton University Press, 1979. xvi + 148 pp., 130 illus; ix + 965 pp.; \$50.00.

George A. Lucas (Fig. 3) was a Baltimore native who went to Europe in 1857, presumably only for a tourist's visit, but after making the usual grand tour, he settled in Paris where he remained until his death in 1909. He is remembered as an American expatriate who never returned home because he got seasick on the trip over and thus dreaded to make another ocean crossing. Perhaps even that distinction would not have survived him



FIGURE 3. L.J.F. Bonnat, *Portrait of George Lucas*. 1885. From *Diary of Lucas*.

except that his collection of art was bequeathed to his native city, and through exhibitions his name was kept before the public. It was also known that Lucas had advised certain American collectors of French art, in particular, that he had assisted with the acquisitions of the Barye bronzes for the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, and for the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore. With the publication of his diary, we learn that Lucas was actively involved with American patronage throughout the fifty years he lived abroad, and that his circle of associates included many of the artists and dealers of his day. In the milieu of the art world in Paris, Lucas found that his business acumen and his love of art were perfectly compatible, and he happily eased himself into an enjoyable and profitable career as an art agent.

Brief biographical information about George Lucas appeared in the catalogues for three major exhibitions of his collection, the first of which was held at the Maryland Institute in Baltimore in 1911 shortly after the 419 paintings, drawings, and small bronzes, and about 15,000 prints arrived from Paris. In 1941 at the Baltimore Museum of Art acquisitions by Lucas appeared along with those of two of his close associates, William T. Walters and his son Henry Walters, in 'A Century of Baltimore

Collecting.' In 1965 the Baltimore Museum organized an exhibition of the Lucas collection itself following a transfer of the bronzes from the Maryland Institute to the museum; the paintings, drawings, and prints had been deposited at the museum in 1933. In connection with the publication of *The Diary*, The Walters Art Gallery presented in early 1979 an exhibition which included works from Lucas's collection together with objects documenting his career in Paris. The manuscript diaries, which consist of 51 separate year-books, are deposited at the Walters Art Gallery, as are Lucas's address books, his correspondence with William T. and Henry Walters, and certain other manuscript materials.

Lilian Randall's introductory essay in Volume 1 presents much new information about Lucas and his two most important clients, William T. Walters and Samuel Putnam Avery. In 1864 Walters, a connoisseur and railroad magnate of Baltimore, and Avery, a printmaker who became an art dealer, formed a partnership to import and sell works of art; Walters supplied the capital and Avery did the actual selling in New York City. This business arrangement proved to be very successful and was described in an article in *The Century Magazine* for December 1896, but the crucial involvement of George Lucas in most of the Walters-Avery transactions was not understood. Acting as general administrator of the business affairs in Paris, Lucas maintained contact with scores of artists, often ordering works directly from them. He went to every exhibition in Paris, regularly visited dealers, arranged for proper framing of pictures, handled shipping details, and kept financial records. A tireless worker, he often made as many as six visits in one day to studios, framers, photographers, or to exhibitions. A typical day's activity was recorded by Lucas on Saturday, December 20, 1879, as follows:

At Carpentiers & ordered frames for Charnay & Delort. At Goupils & selected Bouguereau for SPA for 7500 fs - girl with insect on her arm. - At Pottiers to send for Merson picture Monday. At Ex'n Rue Lafitte. At Petits & paid 80,000 fs for Stevens & Troyon for whv - took Diaz aquarelle for SPA

@ 300 fs. - At J. Breton & asked him for 2 copies poems & a picture for S.P.A.

Thousands of drawings, paintings, prints, and sculptures passed through Lucas's hands to enter American collections, including such major ones as William H. Vanderbilt's and John T. Johnston's. Lucas, together with Avery and Walters, played a major role in directing American taste - and American dollars - towards contemporary European art, especially the French. Lucas revealed little about his personal life in his diary, but Lilian Randall, with sensitive insight into the brief entries, and with additional research in Paris, creates a convincingly real picture of him.

In the index to the diary, also in Volume 1, the names of individuals mentioned by Lucas are given with their dates and their professions; in some cases, additional information from Lucas's address books is included. The lengthiness of the list, from Louise Abbéma to Jean-Baptiste-Ignace Zwinger, is astounding: if a telephone directory existed for the art community in Paris from the 1860s through the turn of the century, I think it would be very similar to this index. There are omissions, of course, and among the most notable are Cézanne and Renoir (although Lucas owned drawings by those artists), Gauguin and Vincent Van Gogh; although several references are made to Vincent's brother, Theo. Subject headings include such useful categories as 'exhibitions,' 'catalogues,' 'dealers,' and 'collectors.' Together with several appendices of specialized information, the index and Lilian Randall's introduction make the first volume an important contribution to studies of nineteenth-century art.

However, it is to the diary, transcribed in the 965 pages of Volume 11, that scholars will turn in eager anticipation of making their own discoveries. They should understand that the concise entries rarely describe a response beyond factual statements of 'who,' 'what,' 'where,' and 'when.' But with the index in hand, the diligent researcher can ferret out data and piece together various aspects of the art scene in Paris. One area that is glittering with nuggets of knowledge is the

community of American artists in Paris, for Lucas kept in close touch with Whistler, William Dannat, Edward May, Henry Bacon, Frank Boggs, Henry Mosler, Daniel Ridgeway Knight, Ogeden Wood, and many more. (The letters of Whistler to Lucas were published, with an introduction and notes by John A. Mahey, in *The Art Bulletin*, September 1967.) Those who are conspicuously missing from his acquaintance are the women who spent many years in Paris: Elizabeth Nourse, Anna Klumpke, Elizabeth Jane Gardner, Cecilia de Wentworth, and others. Like Lucas, American artists who spent their careers in Paris are not well known in histories of American art, and some are even omitted from standard reference sources. Evidence of this lack of knowledge appears in the diary index, where, for example, Boggs is identified as a member of the French school.

Notations in the diary bring out the importance of the international expositions in promoting a taste for oriental art, and of the Salons as marketplaces for contemporary art. Even in the months which followed the spring Salon, Lucas continued to buy Salon *livrets* and illustrated catalogues to send to Avery and other collectors; orders were sometimes placed with painters for a work 'like the last Salon picture.' In the setting of recurring exhibitions, painters became celebrated for certain types of subjects: in 1880 Shreyer promised to block in a 'snow piece' for Lucas – which could then be taken, if preferred, instead of a 'vue of Arabs' being considered. Photography was much used to facilitate the purchase of art works, and it is not surprising that the works of the most successful painters of the day photographed very well. Prices were competitive, and the production of art was a predictable enterprise.

The Diary of George A. Lucas has much to reveal about the organization of specific events, the interrelations of particular individuals, the development of certain works, and the methods of buying works of art. It will contribute to a genuine knowledge of art and patronage in Paris in the second half of the nineteenth century, a period that has inspired so many meaningless generalizations based on ignorance. For making this primary source of

enormous value accessible to us, we can be grateful to Lilian Randall and her colleagues at the Walters Art Gallery.

LOIS MARIE FINK
National Collection of Fine Arts
Washington, D.C.

PAUL HIRSHORN AND STEVEN IZENOUR *White Towers*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, 1979. 189 pp., 315 illus., \$17.50.

White Tower is an American hamburger chain which at its peak in the mid-1950s had 230 outlets (Fig. 4). The book is a photographic catalogue of its shops with a brief historical introduction by two architects who became involved in the project while working in the office of Venturi and Rauch. Other than the nostalgia it might evoke in those who grew up with them, what interest does such a study of one company's fast-food restaurants have? Two possibilities suggest themselves, one for architectural historians, the other for architects.

As microcosmic architectural history, this survey could have been subtitled the rise and fall of a twentieth-century stereotype, and used to validate Vasari's anthropomorphic pattern of birth, growth, and death. At the same

time, it also illustrates the kind and range of influences that affect the style-making process. At the theoretical extremes of architectural history are those like Henri Focillon who claim that form begets form, and others who believe that forms necessarily arise from the conditions of the time. *White Towers* provides support for both. The basic form itself – a white one-storey building with a token tower – was apparently conceived by the company's owner, a Milwaukee entrepreneur named Thomas E. Saxe, with the help of a construction company draftsman. The possible sources of this image are not discussed although mention is made of an earlier hamburger chain named the White Castle system. On the other hand, it is stated that an exotic architectural theme was not unusual for a commercial enterprise in the 1920s, so perhaps the first White Tower was a seminal design. Its subsequent symbolic transformations are of a major concern to the authors and will be considered separately. Of interest here are the non-design influences that act upon and modify forms.

The building type was a reaction to social conditions. The growth of suburban America produced an urban work force that could not get home to lunch and needed quick, cheap meals. It was the Depression

FIGURE 4. White Tower. Hirshorn and Izenour, p. 146.

