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Project Introduction and Summary

Following the Cleveland Museum of Art (CMA)’s acquisition of a painting of Boston Harbor by Fitz Henry Lane (1804-1865), research began in 2004 in preparation for a possible exhibition on the artist’s use of field sketches for his series paintings.1 Particular emphasis was placed on the examination of Lane’s use of underdrawing for paintings on canvas, as revealed by infrared reflectography. In 2007, Dr. John Wilmerding suggested that this research be enlarged to include Lane’s Brace’s Rock series.2 The versions from the Terra Foundation for American Art (TFAA) and the National Gallery of Art (NGA) collections were examined in the painting conservation studio of CMA. This paper will explore the differences and similarities between these two paintings and the works’ relationship to the graphite field sketch and oil of Brace’s Rock in the Cape Ann Museum (CAM). The quality of line used by Lane for both his field sketches and his underdrawing will be compared to that used by Mary Mellen for her painting Norman’s Woe (1860, private collection).3

The infrared image of the TFAA painting reveals numerous pentimenti, including distant mountains and foreground rocks that were painted out. The quality of the fine outline of the mountains is reminiscent of Lane’s 1855 drawings of the Camden Mountains in Maine (CAM), as well as the background hills in his painting of Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay (1862; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston [MFAB]). Franklin Kelly describes late works such as Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay as being representative of Lane’s progression toward simpler, more austere images. Without knowing about the pentimenti in the TFAA painting, Kelly wrote that Maine was on the artist’s mind when he painted what is presumably the series’ first version: “The Brace’s Rock paintings were the last true successors to Lane’s last Maine
pictures.” The mountain pentimento in the TFAA picture appears to confirm Kelly’s words. This report concludes with suggestions on ways to complete the research on the entire Brace’s Rock series and how to continue the investigation of Lane’s drawing and painting techniques.

Part One: Review of the Literature

I. Historical Background of Lane’s Images of Brace’s Rock

In the summer of 1863, at the age of fifty-nine, Fitz Henry Lane made a final voyage to his beloved Maine coast with his friend Joseph L. Stevens Jr. In keeping with his usual working method, Lane made numerous graphite sketches of the shoreline around Portland Harbor from a ship. Lane did not travel further north as he had during previous summers, perhaps because of failing health.

Upon returning home to Gloucester, Massachusetts, in August, Lane with the help of Stevens went to the shore at the northern entrance to Gloucester Harbor and made a graphite field sketch of a prominent rock formation known as Brace’s Rock. He inscribed the lower right corner of the sketch “Brace’s Rock, Eastern Point, F. H. Lane del. August 1863” (fig. 1). Later, in keeping with his practice of making notes on Lane’s drawings, Joseph Stevens (as Lane’s executor) added: “Painting made from this part of the sketch / for: Mrs. H. G. Davidson / Mrs. F. G. Low / Mrs. S. G. Rogers / James Houghton.” Two other names in the list have not been deciphered (fig. 2). Dr. and Mrs. Herman Davidson were close friends of Lane’s whom he visited almost every Sunday. Mr. and Mrs. Frederick G. Low were
Lane’s next-door neighbors in Gloucester, and they purchased his home following his death. Mrs. S. G. Rogers of Roxbury may have been related to Lane collector George Rogers or to W. E. P. Rogers, who is credited with having introduced Lane to the Boston lithographer William S. Pendleton (1795-1879). James Houghton was a Boston collector who would later commission Lane to paint another version of his *Ten Pound Island in Gloucester Harbor* (location unknown), which the artist was unable to complete before he died. To the right of the list of these names are three sets of initials, in addition to Lane’s, that identify his companions when he made the field sketch. They include those of Joseph L. Stevens Jr., his wife Caroline, and possibly a child of theirs with the initials “H. S.” Of the six painted versions of *Brace’s Rock* mentioned by Stevens, five have been published: those in the collections of CAM (fig. 3), NGA (fig. 4) and TFAA (fig. 5), an oil sketch in the Lano Collection (fig. 6), and a painting in a private collection (fig. 7). John Wilmerding has assigned the series a date of circa 1863-64. Lane must have returned to this site the following year, 1864, to make another field sketch of Brace’s Rock (now lost), this time looking north, which he used to paint the TFAA picture. Lane’s only other known drawing from this general area is of Brace’s Cove, a sketch of which Stevens wrote that Lane drew “from the south looking north over the point and across Brace’s Cove” (fig. 8). Stevens also wrote: “Painting ordered from the entire sketch by Mrs. S. G. Rogers of Roxbury. Shortly before his death Lane proposed a canvas measuring 22x36 for it, and that was all.” Certainly, this cove held a special significance for the artist.
II. Thematic Inspirations, Interpretations, and Precedents

1. Shipwrecks

In the foreground of the *Brace’s Rock* series, one sees a prominent beached vessel in decay, a repeated motif in Lane’s work. This is hardly surprising since he was continually inspired by the surroundings of Gloucester, Boston Harbor, and the Maine coast. One of his earliest known works, painted in 1830 when the artist was twenty-six and still working part-time as a shoemaker in Gloucester, is the watercolor *The Burning of the Packet Ship “Boston”* (fig. 9)—showing not exactly a shipwreck on the shore, but a vessel in distress nonetheless. Lane may have been familiar with the paintings of Michele Felix Cornè (1752-1845), who in an earlier generation worked in Salem and Boston depicting naval disasters, as in his 1802 watercolor *Wreck of the Brigantine “Mars”* (fig. 10). The use of a foreground shipwreck served a compositional purpose according to manuals from which Lane learned basic drawing techniques. In discussing Lane’s use of nineteenth-century drawing books, Elliot Bostwick Davis notes that Lucas Fielding and John H. B. Latrobe’s *Lucas’ Progressive Drawing Book*, published in 1827, may have influenced Lane’s composition of the *Brace’s Rock* series. The illustrated text states that the “remains of a wreck or boat (are) useful in the near part of the picture” (fig. 11). Davis further speculates that Lane’s drawing of a boat washed ashore, titled *Beached Hull* (1862; CAM) and based on a dream, may also have been a source of inspiration for the boat in his *Brace’s Rock* series.10

When Lane apprenticed in the studio of the Boston lithographer William Pendleton in 1832, he undoubtedly would have seen prints of shipwrecks, as well as paintings on this
theme exhibited at the Boston Athenaeum. Lane’s mentor at Pendleton’s was the British artist Robert Salmon, who had begun exhibiting at the Royal Academy in London in 1800. Salmon exhibited a harbor scene at the academy in 1802, the year J. M. W. Turner was elected a full Academician.11 In 1805, Turner exhibited his painting of a Shipwreck in his London gallery.12 Salmon was influenced by Turner’s paintings of shipwrecks (fig. 12), and he made a copy of Turner’s The Wreck of the Minotaur (location unknown) that hung in his Boston studio.13 In 1829, one year after arriving in Boston, Salmon exhibited a painting titled Shipwreck (location unknown) in the annual Boston Athenaeum exhibition.

Numerous other artists exhibited paintings of shipwrecks at the Athenaeum between 1829 and 1853.14 If Salmon’s painting failed to sell, he may have consigned it to his dealer Balch or kept it in his studio, where Lane could have seen it when he arrived in Boston three years later. In 1834 Salmon was living in the back of Pendleton’s studio, where Lane worked. Lane continued to look to Salmon for inspiration during the next decade, for example by using a drawing of Salmon’s for his painting Yacht “Northern Light” in Boston Harbor of 1845 (fig. 13).15

Rooted in the Bible, the symbol of the shipwreck was a metaphor that would not have been lost on nineteenth-century visitors to the Boston Athenaeum, where images of Christ and Biblical scenes were frequently exhibited alongside contemporary scenes. In particular, seventeenth-century Dutch paintings of shipwrecks drew on the story of Noah’s Ark and the Deluge (Genesis Chapters 6-9); the storm calmed by Christ (Matthew 8:23-27); and the shipwreck of St. Paul (Acts 27:13-44). Augustine compared the voyage of human life to a ship en route to eternity, with the mast a symbol of the cross.16 Lane was aware of the
moral symbolism of this image, for in 1842 he produced a lithograph of a shipwreck titled *Alcohol Rocks* (fig. 14), drawing on a current a metaphor used by the temperance movement.\(^{17}\) The image of the wrecked boat as a *memento mori* was popular with many European artists in the early part of the nineteenth century, such as Caspar David Friedrich (1774-1840) in his *Stranded Boat* of 1839 (fig. 15).\(^{18}\) Further discussion of possible European influences on Lane follows.

In the 1844 Boston Artists’ Association exhibition at Chester Harding’s Gallery, Lane exhibited a series of five currently unlocated paintings on the theme of *The Voyage*, which included *Storm and Wreck* and *Calm After the Storm*.\(^{19}\) Lane’s series was probably influenced by the work of Thomas Cole (1801-1848), notably his 1829 painting *The Subsiding of the Waters of the Deluge* (fig. 16) and his five-work series *The Course of Empire* of 1836 (New-York Historical Society), which concluded with *Destruction* and *Desolation*. In addition, Cole exhibited his series *The Voyage of Life* (Munson-Williams-Proctor Arts Institute, Utica, New York) in Boston in September 1843 in the Boston Artist’s Association annual. A contemporary writer noted that the paintings made a great impact on local artists.\(^{20}\) Cole in turn was inspired by the 1828 series of paintings by British artist John Martin (1789-1854) that included *The Deluge* (fig. 17). Martin’s work reflected contemporary British angst wrought by social and economic turmoil following the Napoleonic Wars. Likewise, Cole’s series may have touched on fears in the United States during President Andrew Jackson’s administration about the impending breakup of the republic.\(^{21}\)
Boston poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow created a sensation when, in 1845, he published his poem *The Wreck of the Hesperus*, about a ship captain and his daughter who perished on the rocks of Gloucester’s Norman’s Woe. The poem was illustrated by New York artist Daniel Huntington (1816-1906) with an image of the discovery of the young woman’s body washed ashore (fig. 18). In 1861, Lane made a drawing of Norman’s Woe (fig. 19) that he used for a painting in 1862, a year before he made his drawings of Brace’s Rock. Although the composition of this drawing does not include a shipwreck, the site’s reputation as a place of maritime disaster was well known. The 1862 painting includes eerily glassy water similar to that in the *Brace’s Rock* paintings. The year after Longfellow’s poem was published, Lane painted *The Wreck of the Roma* (1846) with such realism that it has been suggested he may have seen this event in person (fig. 20). Wilmerding notes other links between the *Brace’s Rock* paintings and contemporary literature, such as Thoreau’s writing on stillness and silence, Hawthorne’s literary image of the mirror, and Henry James’s description of a still landscape in an early story on landscape painting.

In 1852, Frederic Edwin Church (1826-1900) exhibited his painting *The Wreck* (fig. 21) to popular acclaim. In 1856, English critic John Ruskin published an article “On Boats” in *The Crayon* in which he used the metaphor of a ruined boat to show that “man’s work has therein been subdued by Nature.” The first volume of the first American edition of Ruskin’s *Modern Painters* appeared in 1847. In a chapter on the “Turnerian Picturesque,” Ruskin wrote with disdain that the “lower picturesque delights in the sight of disorder and ruin, and the soaking wrecks of boats,” which he felt was a “heartless ideal.” He also wrote of “the Divine mind . . . visible in its full energy of operation on every lowly bank and smoldering
Several historians have described the image of the beached ship in *Brace’s Rock* as a metaphor for the broken “ship of state” during the Civil War, as well as a symbol for Lane’s declining health.\(^2^8\) The popular theme of the wrecked boat is significant in mid-nineteenth-century art and literature, as shown by historian David C. Miller, who cites the TFAA *Brace’s Rock* as an example.\(^2^9\) Miller notes the influence of works by Friedrich, such as *The Wreck of the Hope* (also known as *Arctic Shipwreck*; Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg) of 1822, and agrees that in Lane’s *Brace’s Rock* paintings and Martin Johnson Heade’s *The Stranded Boat* (1863; MFAB), the wrecked boats are metaphors for the Civil War. Miller quotes a speech that Daniel Webster gave in 1850 entitled “The Constitution and the Union”:

> The East, the North, and the stormy South combine to throw the whole sea into commotion, to toss its billows to the skies, and disclose its profoundest depths . . . . I have a part to act, not for my own security or safety, for I am looking out for no fragment upon which to float away from the wreck if wreck there must be, but for the good of the whole, and the preservation of all.\(^3^0\)

Discussing Lane’s style, Miller writes that his images evoke an impersonal emotional reaction through the simplification and abstraction of form:

> “*Brace’s Rock* oscillates unnervingly between literal and metaphorical representation, conscious and unconscious awareness. The concentrated patterning of the painting’s background suggests the emergence of self-conscious form that would be the hallmark of modernism.”\(^3^1\) Other historians have noted links between Lane’s work and George Curtis’s 1863 painting *View of Boston Harbor* (fig. 22), which also reflects the social turmoil of the 1860s through the device of a wrecked boat in the foreground.\(^3^2\)
Multiple events, both personal and within the artist’s community, could have negatively affected Lane’s emotional outlook. In 1862, one hundred and twenty fishermen, many presumably from Gloucester, drowned in a single night in a gale on Georges Banks. In 1864 Lane was experiencing not only failing health but also tense relations with his sister and brother-in-law, who lived with him. Other local disasters may have also clouded Lane’s outlook. That year, a fire in Gloucester apparently destroyed artwork that Lane had stored in a warehouse.33

Images of shipwrecks persisted well into the later nineteenth century in painting as well as photography. In the 1880s, photographer Baldwin Coolidge captured an image of a woman contemplating a shipwreck in Nantucket (fig. 23). In addition, in a recent exhibition catalogue on Winslow Homer’s watercolors, Martha Tedeschi claims it likely that Homer saw some of Lane’s views of Gloucester.34 At the very least, Homer’s teacher Frederick Rondel (1826-1892) and his colleague and fellow artist Alfred Waud (1828-1891) were producing images of beached hulls at the time Lane painted the TFAA Brace’s Rock. Homer studied painting with Rondel in New York in the fall of 1861, just before he was sent to cover the Civil War for Harper’s Weekly in 1862. Homer made drawings of the conflict together with Waud.35 In 1864 Rondel and Waud collaborated on a painting of a wrecked boat at sunset (fig. 24), the type of image of which Homer would have been aware before his departure for France in 1866.

Linda Ferber writes that in contrast to Church, Lane rarely annotated his drawings and unlike Church he did not paint en-plein air, possibly due to his poor health.36 In contrast to Church, who “responded to Ruskin’s demand for complete fidelity of nature,”37 Lane used
his drawings to help create an image from memory in his studio. Lane did not include either
clouds or reflections in his field sketches. As Barbara Novak notes, Lane’s sketches first fixed
a precise, memory of reality in silhouette, which he then transformed into an inner vision in
his studio.\textsuperscript{38}

2. Nineteenth-Century Panorama Drawings and Paintings in the United States

The tradition of accurately depicting the coast of the United States in panoramic views began
in the 1700s for the practical purpose of coastal navigation.\textsuperscript{39} Drawings of this kind were
made by British and French military artists, many of whom had studied in academies that
gave instruction on the genre. For example, Paul Sandby, a founding member of the Royal
Academy who is considered the father of the topographic watercolor, taught panoramic
drawing at the RA, where he exhibited frequently and was honored with a memorial
exhibition following his death in 1809. In 1778-79, Pierre Ozanne, a military engineer and
artist attached to the French fleet, made a series of panoramic drawings reproduced as
engravings, including \textit{Boston, Capital of the United States} (fig. 25). In the same decade,
another French artist and architect, Pierre Charles L’Enfant (1754-1825), made a four-page
panoramic watercolor of West Point (fig. 26). L’Enfant executed engravings on order for
George Washington and originated the design for the new capital of Washington, D.C. His
work would have been familiar to Pendleton and Lane.\textsuperscript{40} The American artist Charles Robert
Leslie (1794-1859), who had studied drawing and painting in London beginning in 1811,
became an instructor of drawing at West Point, where accurate topographical rendering was
stressed, in 1833. The following year he was succeeded by Robert W. Weir (1803-1889).\textsuperscript{41}
Leslie’s and Weir’s instruction was intended partly to prepare explorers of the American west to document their discoveries in drawings.42

British artist Robert Barker (1739-1806) is credited with coining the term panorama, from the Greek words for “all” and “view.” In 1792 he executed a joined six-sheet watercolor entitled _London from the Roof of the Albion Mills_, using a movable framing device. He created a sensation the following year with his panorama _The Grand Fleet at Spithead_, which he presented in a large gallery in Leicester Square that remained open for seven decades.43 The first public exhibition of a panorama in the United States took place in New York in 1795. Four years later the American engineer and inventor Robert Fulton introduced the panorama to France. In 1819, Albany artist John Vanderlyn (1775-1852) created a panorama view of Versailles.44 Art historians note the connection between panoramas and the landscape paintings of Hudson River School artists, who used it as a model for their expansive views of the American landscape.45

As already noted, Lane’s mentor Salmon exhibited at London’s Royal Academy in 1802, the year Turner was appointed a full member. Although lectures at the academy were intended for students, they were open to all who could obtain an admission ticket. As an exhibitor, Salmon likely had access to these lectures. While none of Salmon’s drawings have survived, his 1829 painting _Boston Harbor from Mr. Greene’s House_ shows that he knew how to render panoramic views (Fig. 27).46 Turner lectured on panoramic drawing at the academy as early as 1807. Turner’s _Petworth Park_ sketchbook of about 1827 (fig. 28) is an example of his two-page panorama drawing.47 His method of rendering such a broad expanse
was based on natural observation, since the eyes do not perceive a flat surface but a concave view of about one hundred and eighty degrees.

Lane often used three to five sheets to portray a coastline scene. He drew panoramic field sketches one sheet at a time on site, using two X’s at the edges to register where sheets should meet, thus ensuring they join into one expansive view. His numerous panoramic landscape drawings (those that have survived date from 1850-63) are nearly all precise graphite renditions of coastal silhouettes, many of which he used as the basis for backgrounds in studio paintings.\textsuperscript{48} Two examples that approximate the curved foreground of the graphite rendering of \textit{Brace’s Rock} are the drawings entitled \textit{Western Shore of Gloucester Outer Harbor} (fig. 29) and \textit{Norman’s Woe} (fig. 19). Scholars have suggested that Lane may have used optical devices to make his sketches, such as a \textit{camera lucida} or a spyglass, which might have influenced his style of finely drawn outlines, which show no corrections.\textsuperscript{49} Lisa Andrus notes that in Lane’s early years he “first relied on the mechanical aids which stood him in good stead later: a drawing machine to measure distances accurately and use of transfer lines.”\textsuperscript{50} Other artists similarly may have used optical instruments in addition to the framing device as an aid in making panoramas although further research on this topic is needed.\textsuperscript{51}

3. Influence of Thomas Doughty’s \textit{Nahant Beach Series}

In exploring Lane’s repeated imagery of Brace’s Rock and other settings one must take into account the influence of his work as a lithographer, a trade that relied on the sale of multiple, often commissioned images. When Lane began his apprenticeship in the Pendleton
lithography studio in 1832, he surely realized the value of repeated imagery. In addition, it
was here that he had his first chance to work alongside painters. His co-worker Benjamin
Champney (1817-1907) wrote that “there were few artists in Boston. Alvan Fisher and
Thomas Doughty were painting landscapes; Salmon marines; and Geo. L. Brown was
exhibiting landscapes and marines . . . . (Lane) was very accurate in his drawing, understood
perspective and naval architecture perfectly, as well as the handling of vessels . . . .”\textsuperscript{52}

Art historians have noted Doughty’s influence on Lane.\textsuperscript{53} Soon after Pendleton
opened his Boston lithography studio in 1825, Doughty became one of his featured artists,
and by 1827 the studio was producing printed images based on his paintings.\textsuperscript{54} Also,
beginning in 1832, Doughty advertised courses at Chester Harding’s Gallery in drawing,
watercolor and oil painting, and lithography. Harding and Doughty made a point of
exhibiting the work of local artists, complaining that the Boston Athenaeum tended to favor
the work of artists from New York, Philadelphia, and Europe.\textsuperscript{55} Lane probably attended the
exhibition of two hundred paintings produced by Boston artists that was held at Harding’s
Gallery in 1834, two years after he moved to Boston.\textsuperscript{56} This 1834 exhibition included a series
of seascapes by Doughty of Nahant Beach, just north of Boston (figs. 30 and 31). The
paintings are studio repetitions with slight variations: all based on an oil field sketch, they
depict the distant island of Egg Rock and the shoreline of Nahant with crashing waves. Lane
was influenced by these paintings, particularly Doughty’s technique of rendering the
breaking, spraying waves. Just off the coast of Nahant Beach, Egg Rock was a well-known
navigational hazard where captains sailing south wrecked numerous ships by mistaking
Nahant Bay for Boston Harbor.\textsuperscript{57}
In addition to the depiction of waves in this series, Lane may have been influenced by Doughty’s compositional device of creating three-dimensional space by placing an object in the near foreground and a rocky island at the center of the horizon. Doughty located the horizon line in the lower third of the composition, as would Lane in most of his paintings. Doughty’s use of Egg Rock as a distinct distant outline that sailors would recognize would also have appealed to Lane’s sense of naval topographical accuracy. Furthermore, Doughty’s depiction of dramatic billowing clouds framing a luminous distant sky in his Nahant Beach series is paralleled in Lane’s 1836 lithograph *Gloucester Harbor* (fig. 32). The foreground of Doughty’s *Nahant Beach* in the Art Institute of Chicago shows broken masts and spars from a shipwreck, motifs echoed in many of Lane’s paintings.\(^58\)

4. Influence of Thomas Chambers

In Kathleen Foster’s recent exhibition catalogue on Thomas Chambers, she notes that Doughty’s Nahant Beach group may have influenced Chambers’ “serial canvases” showing the same setting, painted about 1843-50 (figs. 33 and 34).\(^59\) Foster suggests that Lane may have fallen under Chambers’ influence when the latter was in Boston around 1843-1851:

In the 1840s, before mastering the quiet luminist style that he developed after his first trip to Maine in 1848, Lane shared aspects of Chambers’ sense of decorative design and his penchant for sunset and sunrise effects over water. The intersection of taste can be seen in a painting by Lane made in 1845 after a sketch by the departed Salmon, *Yacht “Northern Light” in Boston Harbor* (see fig.13), which shows a view much like Chambers’ Boston Harbor paintings.\(^60\)

Foster also suggests that Lane was aware of Chambers’ techniques of painting water, figures, and foreground detail.\(^61\) She notes that Chambers and Lane were competitors as painters of
harbor views and that the two artists “worked both the artists’ exhibition venues and the ship owners’ haunts.”62

5. Possible European Influences: Dutch Landscape Painting

Barbara Novak notes that the Boston Athenaeum included numerous Dutch landscapes in its annual exhibitions during the period that Lane was a member, between 1841 and 1865.63 She credits Dr. Wilmerding for noting Lane’s interest in Dutch seascapes, and she also writes that Lane’s mentor Salmon “derived his style from Scottish-English variants on Dutch prototypes.”64 She cites a strong compositional link between River Landscape with Boats (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett) by Aelbert Cuyp (1620-1691) and Lane’s Southwest Harbor, Maine (private collection).65 She notes that Doughty copied a painting by Jacob van Ruisdael (c. 1628-1682), and that the important collector Robert Gilmor travelled to Holland and encouraged Cole to study Ruisdael’s work.66

6. British Influences: John Ruskin and the Depiction of Rock Formations

In a chapter on “Luminism in Europe,” Theodore Stebbins writes that although luminism can be considered something of an indigenous American style, one must also take into account the influence of the “highly realistic and frequently luminous romantic landscape paintings that were being made all over Europe during the mid-nineteenth century.”67 Above all, he notes the importance of British painting, with the work of John Brett and Edward Lear “closest to the luminists.”68 Curiously, he does not mention the influence of the work of
Ruskin, with whose writings Lane must have been familiar as he subscribed to the *London Art Journal*.69

Novak, and Rebecca Bedell more recently, make convincing arguments for Cole’s interest in the relationship between geology and theology, and they point out that he was familiar with studies on the age of rocks in Maine.70 Cole was also familiar with the writings of Yale geologist Benjamin Silliman, who went on rock collecting trips with Samuel F. B. Morse (1791-1872).71 Novak notes that in 1850 the Prussian geologist Alexander von Humboldt, a major influence on Church, wrote that artists should make colored sketches directly from nature.72 However, the author of an 1859 article in *The Crayon* discussing the relationship between geology and landscape painting disagreed, concluding that painting should not imitate nature but interpret it, to communicate moral principles.73

Ruskin’s *Modern Painters* may have inspired Lane’s interest in the depiction of rock formations and shorelines. Ruskin’s book included a chapter on “Stones,” stressing their importance to the artist: “There are no natural objects out of which more can be learned than out of stones . . . For a stone, when it is examined, will be found a mountain in miniature.”74 Among the engravings of different rock shapes included in this chapter, one based on a work of Titian (c. 1488-1576) includes a group of rocks protruding from water, of which Ruskin enthused, “a stone, with an eddy around it, is nearly as well drawn as it can be in the simple method of wood-engraving.” Ruskin’s depiction of stones may have been inspired by Friedrich’s drawings (fig. 35). Lane’s graphite field sketches of rocks from the 1850s (fig. 36), as well as the abundance of detailed images of small stones, formations, and jetties in his paintings, attest to his interest in stones, their reflections, and their shadows.
Linda Andrus notes the possible influence of the writings of British watercolorist John Varley (1778-1842) on Lane’s depiction of shadows and his alternation of light and dark tones. In-depth technical research on how Lane depicted reflections and shadows remains to be done.

According to his friend Joseph Stevens, Lane had an art library: “Lane’s art books and magazines were always at my service and a great inspiration and delight—notably the *London Art Journal* to which he long subscribed.” An 1849 issue of that journal included an article by Henry Twining, who influenced Ruskin through his book *The Philosophy of Painting: A Theoretical and Practical Treatise*, in which he stressed the importance of studying nature. Twining’s 1849 book *The Elements of Picturesque Scenery, or Studies of Nature Made in Travel*, included a section on “Geological Formations, Outlines of Mountains, Rocks,” in which he described how to render “effects on rocks which result from the sea’s action, color and markings of rocks.”

As noted, Church owned a copy of Humboldt’s book *Cosmos: A Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe* (published in New York in 1855), in which the author stressed the importance of accurate and detailed observations of nature. Given its popularity, Lane would probably have been aware of this book as well. While emphasizing the need for objective observation of one’s environment, Humboldt wrote that nature caused a “reflection of the image impressed by the senses upon the inner man, that is, upon his ideas and feelings.” In addition to being a scientist, Humboldt was also an art historian and he devoted a chapter to landscape painting, beginning with ancient Greek and Roman art. He wrote that the greatest artists succeed in combining “the visible and the invisible in our contemplation of nature.” In a chapter on rocks, Humboldt described three classes of
“erupted, sedimentary, and metamorphic rock.” Granite, abundant in the Gloucester region, is probably the type of stone that constitutes Brace’s Rock. Humboldt described the formation of granite and its qualities, including its common arched, ellipsoidal forms and its tendency to fracture, features that Lane depicted in his paintings.

7. German and Danish Influences: Caspar David Friedrich and Christoffer Eckersberg

Stebbins credits Robert Rosenblum with noting close parallels between the work of Caspar David Friedrich and the American luminists. He notes that Friedrich’s View of a Harbor (c. 1815; Schloss Charlottenhof, Potsdam) “resembles” Lane’s Boston Harbor (c. 1850-55; MFAB). Novak writes that Friedrich is surely the single European landscapist whose sensibility most closely matches that of the Americans. Some of his quiet sea pictures parallel works by Lane and Heade. She notes that the American Transcendentalists were “deeply steeped in German philosophy,” and to illuminate the links between the artists she reproduces the CAM version of Lane’s Brace’s Rock alongside Friedrich’s Mist (fig. 37). However, Margaretta Lovell doubts that Lane was familiar with Friedrich’s work, noting that few of the German artist’s works were exhibited in the United States during Lane’s lifetime. Novak notes that Friedrich developed a near scientific precision in his depictions of nature while he was a student at the Copenhagen Academy, between 1794 and 1798: “Like the luminists he most resembles, he relied strongly on measure, numbering off areas in his drawings, using rulers to control his horizons, compasses to insure the circularity of his
moons, and probably the camera lucida or obscura to render landscape contours.”

Following similar visual evidence, Stebbins writes that “Danish work at times resembles American luminism more than German art does.” He cites the importance of the work of Christoffer Wilhelm Eckersberg (1783-1853), the so-called “father of Danish painting.” Eckersberg enrolled in the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Copenhagen in 1803, and after studying in Paris and Rome was made a professor at the Royal Academy in 1818.

Eckersberg was influenced by two moonlight paintings of ships by Friedrich that he saw at Copenhagen’s Charlottenborg Palace in 1821. Stebbins writes that Eckersberg’s paintings of the American Sailing Ship (1831) and the Russian Ship at Anchor (1829), both in the collection of the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, “are as crisp and luminous as anything Robert Salmon ever did.”

Part Two: New Conservation Research on the Brace’s Rock Series

It is not within the scope of this report to survey the literature on the use of underdrawing in nineteenth-century American paintings, on which, however, relatively little has been published. For example, for the recent exhibition on Thomas Chambers curated by Kathleen Foster, Chambers’ paintings were examined under infrared light but the results have not been made public. Using the evidence of microscopic examination, infrared illumination, and X-ray imaging, this section will illustrate the similarities and differences in Lane’s approach to painting the NGA and CAM versions of Brace’s Rock.
III. Comparison of the National Gallery of Art and Cape Ann Museum

Versions of Brace’s Rock

1. Relationship of the Field Sketch to the Paintings: The Setting

Residents of Gloucester would have recognized the distinctive outline of Brace’s Rock. However, Lane depicted it as a decidedly personal place, in contrast to his monumental and recognizable paintings of Boston and New York Harbor. In a period map of Gloucester Harbor, Brace’s Rock lies just off the beach of Brace’s Cove, just above the north entryway to the bay (fig. 38). A detailed map of Brace’s Cove (fig. 39) published in 1877 shows where Lane likely positioned himself as he made his one known field sketch of Brace’s Rock: on the beach, facing southeast, with the rocky outcropping just to the right of center in his field of vision. Since the horizon lines to the right and left stop at the edges of the rock in his drawing, presumably he first drew the shapes of the stone. A detail of the horizon line on the right shows a faint pentimento above the drawn line (fig. 40), suggesting that Lane may have decided to move closer to the water, which provided a slightly lower viewpoint of the horizon. As noted, Lane was probably familiar with The American Drawing Book by John Gadsby Chapman (1808-89). Although Lane was a professional draftsman by the time the manual was published in 1847, he would have been aware of Chapman’s lesson for drawing a straight line freehand by beginning with a faint line and gradually reinforcing it. In his drawing of Brace’s Rock Lane drew both horizon lines freehand and settled on a final placement precisely in the vertical mid-point of the sheet. In the two painted versions, he lowered the horizon to a point equal to two-fifths of the total height of the canvas. In the
drawing, forms are shown on the same scale as in the CAM, NGA, and private collection painted versions of *Brace’s Rock*, which might indicate that Lane used some sort of a transfer technique to replicate the drawing on the canvas. However, examination of the backs of his drawings does not show evidence of any tracing or transfer system. While he sometimes gridded drawings for enlargement, his background as a lithographer endowed him with skill as a copyist.

In a slight change from the field sketch, Lane lowered the horizon in the painted versions as a way of increasing the sense of space.\(^9^4\) Comparison of the drawing with the paintings shows that he made several other slight compositional changes while working in the studio. In the paintings he brought the rock slightly forward and altered the configuration of the foreground beach by adding a scalloped cove. In all the paintings he added the symbolic wrecked hull of a small sailing boat after the paint layer depicting water had dried. There are slight differences between the three paintings as well, primarily in the orientation of the hulls, the color of the skies, and the treatment of the foreground rocks and plants. All three paintings share red and yellow fall foliage, although the privately owned image is the only one that depicts reeds or grass in the foreground. The wrecked ship turns what otherwise might be considered a romantic, peaceful seascape into a melancholy vision. Lane’s compositions reflect Brace’s Cove’s notoriety as a graveyard for boats, a place where numerous ships went aground in bad weather having mistaken the cove for the entrance to Gloucester Harbor, which was about one mile further south.
2. Absence of Reflections in Lane’s Drawings

Lane painted all the versions of *Brace’s Rock* with a rose-colored evening reflection in the water, a feature absent in the drawing. While he did not depict reflections in his field sketches, a possible vestige of his training in topographical drawing, he included them in paintings made in the studio, possibly working from memory. As we will see in the section on Lane’s painted reflections, he appears to have followed Chapman’s advice to create a mirror image of reality, based on an inward sense of sight.95 Linda Ferber notes that because Lane conceived his drawings in outline, usually without notation, he relied upon his memory to recreate color and light in his studio.96 In contrast, Church usually included at least schematic indications of reflections in his drawings, as well as making rapid on-site oil sketches of reflections and other transient or purely optical phenomena.97

3. Comparison of Painting Techniques in the National Gallery of Art and Cleveland Art Museum Versions of *Brace’s Rock*

3a. Canvas supports

For the NGA *Brace’s Rock*, Lane used a fine, plain-weave (17-18 vertical by 17-18 horizontal threads per cm.) linen, which has an off-white commercial priming, probably applied in two layers. Lane used a similar weight, pre-primed canvas for numerous other paintings.98 He appears to have always purchased canvas that was pre-primed and mounted onto keyable stretchers. In rare cases, on the back of the canvas one finds the stamp of an artist’s color man, such as the Boston firms of Charles A. Morris and Oliver Stearns.99 Given the small size
of these paintings, Lane chose a textile with little texture, which is some of the finest weave linen that he is known to have used. For a larger painting from this late period, *View of Gloucester Harbor and the Old Fort* (c. 1865; Sargent House Collection, Gloucester), Lane chose a pre-primed and stretched canvas of 16/16-17 threads per cm. This painting is in its original frame, which bears a label that reads “William Y. Balch, gilder, frame maker, and dealer in paintings and engravings.” Balch had a studio on Tremont Street in Boston, not far from Lane’s studio in Tremont Temple in the 1840s. Balch was Lane’s main dealer and hence may have also supplied him with pre-stretched canvases and other materials. An image of the reverse of the NGA picture (fig. 41) shows that the unlined canvas is mounted onto the original stretcher, which is a four-member, butt-join, keyable design. It bears an old MFAB label as it was deaccessioned by that museum in 1966 to help fund the purchase of Lane’s *Boston Harbor*. Dr. Wilmerding purchased this version of *Brace’s Rock* in 1966 and donated it to NGA in 2004.100

### 3b. Underdrawing

Infrared images of the NGA (fig. 42) and CAM (fig. 43) paintings of *Brace’s Rock* reveal Lane’s under-drawn lines and suggest that he used graphite and a ruler to indicate the horizon line in both paintings. This technique is similar to that used by his contemporary Heade.101 Lane’s painting *On the Wharves, Gloucester Harbor* of 1847 includes a ruled vanishing line to the “point of sight” on the horizon to give proper perspective to the foreground wharf (fig. 44).102 Lane also used a straight edge to make the inscribed lines of the ship masts. In other drawings and paintings, however, he would draw all or portions of the
horizon line by hand, as we have seen in his graphite field sketch of Brace’s Rock. In his field sketch of Norman’s Woe (see fig. 19) he used a ruler for much of the horizon but drew part of the horizon to the right of the island freehand. Infrared examination of his painted versions of Boston Harbor (MFAB, Amon Carter, private collection) indicates that although he used a ruler to establish the horizon, portions of the lines are underdrawn freehand. Likewise, he drew the horizon on the right of the TFAA Brace’s Rock freehand.

The differences in the NGA and CAM compositions are subtle. The horizon line to the right of Brace’s Rock in the CAM version matches the location or height of the horizon in the field sketch, passing just above the green area on the right. Lane made a slight compositional change to this line in the NGA version, as evidenced by a pentimento in the right section of the horizon. He first drew a line about 3 mm. higher than the final location of the horizon (fig. 45). This first higher line corresponds to the height of the horizon in the field sketch and CAM painting. Evidently he decided that a slightly lower horizon line than that in the drawing and CAM versions would enhance the dramatic effect of the rocks. This indicates that Lane painted the CAM version before the NGA painting (in which he decided to lower the horizon by 3 cm.) and offers an insight into his meticulous process of editing his compositions.

Lane made tick marks on the horizon to the right of the rock and at the far left edge of the painting, presumably measuring from the top or bottom of the canvas as well as from the right edge of the pre-stretched canvas, in order to align his ruler. The infrared image of the CAM painting shows just one alignment mark on the right horizon—which, curiously, is in the exact same location on the right edge as the mark in the NGA version, suggesting he
used a standard scale from the right edge for both paintings even though the NGA painting is five inches wider.

In the CAM painting, the horizon line intersects the left edge of Brace’s Rock by about 1.5 cm., at point (A), that is, at the exact middle of the canvas (fig. 46). This may be considered a type of pentimento, resulting when the artist first drew the horizon line up to the center of the canvas and then edited it slightly by superimposing the outline of the rock. The practice would be contrary to that used for the field sketch, where he drew the outline of the rock before the horizon. If one were to draw diagonal lines from the four corners of the drawing, they would intersect on the horizon line at point (A). In the two paintings, Lane lowered the point where the diagonals meet to the place where the base of the rock meets the water. This intersection of the diagonals suggests that the artist planned the vanishing point for the center of the composition. However, no foreground vanishing lines have been detected in either painting in infrared light, although, as noted, they have been identified in other paintings and watercolors by Lane. In the NGA version, the horizon line does not intersect the left edge of the rock but stops before its outline, suggesting that Lane was working from a previously painted image. A transmitted normal light image of this painting, with the canvas illuminated from behind (fig. 47) shows that the horizon line stops just before the left edge of the rocks. This is further evidence that Lane painted the CAM picture before making refinements to and enlarging the NGA version.
3c. X-Radiographs and Paint Handling

Comparison of the X-ray (fig. 48) and normal transmitted light images of the NGA painting yield a few clues as to how Lane built up the paint layers in this work. The X-ray shows that the artist used lead white sparingly, reserving it for the horizontal band just below the horizon and the clouds. In addition, there is evidence of a subtractive process, such as the dark diagonal line at the lower right in relation to the foreground jetty of rocks, where he may have scraped away paint while it was still wet. There is also a dark rectangular shape in the area of Brace’s Rock, which suggests that the artist used solvent to remove paint, including upper portions of the lead white ground, possibly as he reworked the image. The X-ray image shows that Lane did not add lead white to his palette to create the shape of Brace’s Rock, in contrast to the white clouds. By painting the rock formation thinly, allowing the white ground to show through, he created more luminosity than a thicker painted layer would have allowed. The transmitted light image of the unlined NGA picture shows that it is thinly painted, with a prominently drawn horizon line. Light shines through the thinly painted central rock, whereas the black added to the rocks of the two jetties, as well as the foreground ship, blocks the light.

3d. Lane’s Painted Reflections

Lane was a master of painting reflections in water, but he did so only in his studio, as they never appear in his drawings. In the case of the Brace’s Rock series, the outcropping is reflected as a mirror image in unnaturally glassy water. Lane painted the reflection in
extremely thin washes (which are only partly visible in the X-ray image due to only a slight amount of lead white stippling) on top of a thin blue opaque wash, while he slowly built up the surrounding water into thicker layers. In *The Elements of Drawing*, Ruskin advised the artist to study water when it is least agitated because he felt it nearly impossible to paint the sea, given the difficulty of capturing its movement and color. He believed that an artist’s best chance to depict the sea truthfully was to paint it when it was calm.\textsuperscript{103} Noting the need for depicting ambiguity in water, he wrote, “you ought not to see where reality ceases and reflection begins.”\textsuperscript{104} He also advised that when artists study the reflection of ships in calm water, they devote more attention to the reflection than to the actual ship. However, Lane departed from Ruskin’s advice on depicting shallow water: Ruskin wrote that rocks beneath the surface should be visible, but Lane depicted the water uniformly reflecting the sky, with the sun to his back. Ruskin noted that the closer the eye is to the level of the water and the farther away the perceived object, the greater the reflection. He also wrote that light objects cast the best and largest images in water. In certain circumstances, water could appear like plates of metal reflecting the sky.\textsuperscript{105} Lane’s invented and abstracted painted shadows more closely follow Chapman’s advice to create a mirror image of the object reflected as “an inverted duplicate, not of the picture, but of the reality.”\textsuperscript{106}

Lane often depicted ships in agitated water in the early part of his career, while in his maturity he increasingly chose to paint reflected images in calm waters, as in *Entrance of Somes Sound from Southwest Harbor* (1852; private collection), *Becalmed off Halfway Rock* (1860; Mellon Collection), *Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay* (fig. 56), *Stage Fort across Gloucester Harbor* (1862; Metropolitan Museum of Art), and particularly *The Western*
Shore with Norman’s Woe (1862; CAM). In the years he painted these works, Lane clearly sought out locales that offered the best opportunities to create reflections in his studio. His eye searched for the special moment that combined clear, calm weather and a site close to the level of the water, with a distant rock casting its image in the water.

IV. Brace’s Rock in the Collection of the TFAA

1. Viewpoint

The TFAA painting is presumably based on a field sketch that is now lost. To get to the vantage point shown in the painting, Lane would have walked over the small green bluff visible on the right in the CAM and NGA scenes and looked back at the other side of the rock, in a north-easterly direction (see fig. 38). According to the 1877 topographical map, Brace’s Rock was connected to the coast by a narrow spit of land. However, the foreground cove in the TFAA picture does not correspond to what is depicted in that map. There may have been a change in the coastline between 1864 and 1877, or perhaps Lane invented the foreground, as he is known to have done in paintings such as Gloucester Harbor (1848; Virginia Museum of Fine Arts). Since the field sketch for the TFAA picture is lost, the exact viewpoint it shows remains something of a mystery.

Although the CAM and NGA paintings place the viewer at roughly the same distance from Brace’s Rock, in the latter Lane has given the outcropping a more monumental aspect, increasing its height and width and the scale of its reflected image while keeping the horizon at the same level. By making the reflection of Brace’s Rock larger than the actual
rock, Lane created an eerily still image. Chapman’s *American Drawing Book* includes a section on creating reflections in which the author notes that a reflection can be the same size as the original object, but only when the viewpoint is exactly on a level with the horizon.\(^{107}\) Since the reflection is larger than the rock in Lane’s painting, the artist’s eye may have been slightly below the horizon. In another illustration of how to establish “point of sight,” Chapman’s book reproduces three images of a figure atop a rock, with several ships on the left and a distant horizon at different levels (fig. 49). The top engraving shows the viewer looking at the person waving from a point far below; in the bottom image, the viewer has climbed up to a level where his eye aligns with that of the waving figure as well as the horizon, and slightly above the top of the rock. As Chapman wrote: “the line that limits our view of the ocean answers to our line of the horizon; it is on a level with our own eye, as well as his, and touches all other points or objects of the same height.”\(^{108}\) Following Chapman’s logic of using the location of the head of the waving figure in the middle ground as a sighting device to establish the relation of the viewer’s eye with the horizon, Lane’s “point of sight” in the TFAA picture may be the precise point where the ship’s mast intersects the horizon.

2. Canvas and Ground

The canvas support is a plain-weave (approximately 14/15 vertical by 14/15 horizontal threads), commercially primed and pre-stretched canvas similar to what Lane used for the NGA’s *Brace’s Rock* and numerous other paintings. The tacking margins are present, indicating that the size of the painting has not been altered through conservation, but they are covered with heavy tape. The artist’s color man took care to align the canvas weave so it
was perpendicular to the original stretcher, which was replaced with a new one in a
conservation treatment. The off-white, slightly beige ground probably contains lead white, as
evidenced by the density recorded in the X-ray image.

The pre-primed ground layer visible in an X-ray photograph of Church’s *The
Afterglow* has a similar appearance to that of the TFAA and NGA versions of *Brace’s Rock*. A
cross-section from *The Afterglow* shows that after the canvas was sized, it was covered with a
layer of chalk and glue. This was covered in turn with a thin layer of lead white that appears
to have been scraped by the primer, leaving elevated canvas nubs bare of lead white. This
type of priming would have been considered absorbent and is similar to what one sees in X-
ray images of many of Lane’s paintings. While the grounds in these paintings by Lane have
not been analyzed (nor have cross sections been taken), they are likely to be similar to those
used by other artists at the time. However, Church obtained canvas in New York, whereas
Lane’s came from Boston.¹⁰⁹

Judging from the evidence in a small area of loss of sky joined by blue water along the
right edge of the canvas, Lane likely first applied an opaque reddish-brown layer of paint over
the ground using horizontal brushstrokes (fig. 50). While the artist used shades of pink (see
fig. 13) and yellow-toned layers beneath the paint in some paintings, this red layer does not
resemble that type of imprimatura.¹¹⁰ However, as one sees in the section on infrared
imagery below, this reddish paint layer lies beneath the sky in an area where Lane had
originally intended to paint distant mountains. The reddish color is probably the base tone of
the mountains, which Lane decided to cover up as he altered the composition.
3. Sequence

First, Lane outlined the land masses with graphite. Then he covered the sky area with extremely thin layers of a transparent, finely ground light blue pigment, mixed with white, which he dry-brushed to create the transition from darker blue in the upper sky to the light blue horizon. In addition, a few scattered particles of a transparent red pigment mixed in with the blue warm the cool tone of the sky. Once the sky had dried, Lane added the blue water. When the water layer had dried, he filled in the shape of the rocks, which were untouched in the initial stages. He added both the shipwreck and foliage after the base layer of water and rocks had dried (figs. 51 and 52). It is unclear at what point Lane decided to change the lower left and distant right portions of the painting, but infrared examination helps reveal the initial design for these areas.

4. Infrared Examination

The infrared image of the TFAA Brace’s Rock (fig. 53) reveals major compositional changes in both the right background and the lower left foreground. In the center right, above the horizon, is an unusually large pentimento of an outline of two sloping mountains (fig. 54). The center of the canvas corresponds with the summit of the tallest underdrawn mountain, which might represent a compositional device planned by the artist (fig. 55). Typical of Lane’s hand, the outlines of the mountains are self-assured, of a single line, with no changes in the shapes or erasing, the mark of an experienced draftsman and copyist. The quality of detail in the underdrawn mountain outlines in the TFAA picture surpasses that of the rather
schematic under-drawn mountain profile in *On the Wharves, Gloucester Harbor* (fig. 44). Lane drew the horizon line freehand, probably using graphite. Below the horizon are several parallel lines suggesting water. Although Lane decided to paint out the mountains, he kept the position of the horizon line of the TFAA’s *Brace’s Rock* at their base, at just over one third of the vertical dimension.

There are numerous possible explanations for the pentimento of the mountains. One might think that Lane worked closer to nature when he started the underdrawing of this painting. However, the artist routinely painted from field sketches, as opposed to *plein air* painting on site. The shape of the pentimento does not relate to the geography of the area north of *Brace’s Rock*, as there are only low hills situated at a considerable distance from Brace’s Cove. Curiously, the mountain pentimento resembles Lane’s drawings of Maine, such as *Mount Desert* (1850; CAM) and *Camden Mountains* (1855; CAM), but the match is not exact.

Around the summer of 1862, the summer before he made the drawing of *Brace’s Rock*, Lane was in the process of completing his painting *Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay, Maine* (fig. 56), where the profile of the distant mountains bears a strong resemblance to the pentimento in the TFAA picture. The MFAB painting has not been examined in infrared, but it might be helpful to compare the shape of the underdrawing in that work with the pentimento in the TFAA picture to determine if there is a relationship between the two compositions. Historians assume that when Lane returned to Maine on his final voyage, in 1863, he did not travel far enough north to encounter rugged terrain, as his work from that trip appears to consist of a drawing of Portland Harbor (CAM) and a field sketch (now lost).
that he used for his painting of Christmas Cove (c.1863, private collection), located not far from Portland. In 1864, facing deteriorating health and realizing that further travel to Maine was impossible, Lane first drew the mountain in the TFAA Brace’s Rock in a nostalgic homage to Owl’s Head, before changing his mind and painting it out. In addition, during the summer of 1862, while he was completing Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay, Lane had an argument with his brother-in-law and for a time moved out of their shared home, where he had his studio. This must have disrupted his work, and it is possible that the TFAA Brace’s Rock could have started as an incomplete, smaller version of Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay, which two years later he transformed into Brace’s Rock. Kelly notes that Lane was inspired by the memory of the mountains of Maine when he painted Brace’s Rock.111

The numerous pentimenti in the outlines of the shape of the foreground reveal that the artist had originally intended to include massive rocks in the lower left portion of the composition. The quality of the line is similar to that seen in the large foreground rocks in Lane’s drawing Ten Pound Island in Gloucester Harbor (fig. 57). He apparently decided to enlarge the scale of the cove by covering these underdrawn rocks with water. Traces of rock outlines are also found beneath the boat, continuing to the lower right corner, which he covered with the sandy beach. Such major pentimenti, particularly in such a small picture, are unusual for Lane. These features lead to the conclusion that Lane made major changes to the original composition, as Kelly notes, remembering Maine through Brace’s Rock.
5. Comparison of Photomicrographs of the Versions of *Brace’s Rock* in the Terra Foundation for American Art and the National Gallery of Art

Recent microscopic examination of the TFAA *Brace’s Rock* reveals numerous similarities with the painting techniques that Lane employed for the NGA version. We were not able to confirm the presence of a toned ground layer in the NGA painting, but the sequence of the application of paint is similar to that in the TFAA picture. In both, Lane applied the base layers of the sky layer with little visible brushwork, except for an area where he used an approximately 3.5–mm. filbert brush in somewhat dry brushwork to blend the gradual transitions of colors. Before this layer was completely dry, he added delicate wisps of clouds with very fine brushes, the smallest of about 1 mm. The detail of the pentimento of the horizon line in the NGA painting shows that he applied the blue water over the base tone of the sky when it was dry. The edges of the rocks, in turn, were applied over portions of both sky and water after those layers had dried.

In both paintings Lane first indicated the shapes of Brace’s Rock on the canvas not by underdrawing but by a thin reddish-orange oil wash. This distinction is critical to understanding the difference between drawing and painting in Lane’s *Brace’s Rock* series. The upper edges of the rocks were brushed into the sky while it was still slightly wet, with some slight additive changes over more than one working session. For example, he added a slight amount of orange paint along the top of the rocks at least one week after the blue paint of the water had dried. In both paintings, Lane created the rocks’ crevices and shadows with a fine brush dipped in a dilute gray (figs. 58 and 59). He then toned down the gray outlines
with an off-white scumble. The artist created the waterline shadow at the base of the rocks with an extremely fine brush (1 mm. or less) dipped in black paint. He first sketched the shapes of the small foreground rocks with a fine brush using black paint. When dry, he covered them with a thin brown wash and used an almost pure black to intensify the equal-sized shadows they cast (figs. 60 and 61). The detail images of the rocks and reflections in the TFAA and NGA *Brace’s Rock* paintings are also similar. Lane’s technique of creating rock shadows with a brush dipped in dilute dark paint is visible in an infrared detail of the island in *The Western Shore of Norman’s Woe* of 1862 (fig. 62). Here, he ruled the horizon to the edges of the rock, and after outlining the shape of the island he underpainted the reflections in a thin, dark wash. Lane based this painting on a field sketch of 1861 (fig. 19), which he squared for transfer. As usual, none of the reflections are indicated in the field sketch.

Granular, roughly ground bright red transparent pigment particles (possibly natural vermilion) are scattered throughout the brown rocks in the TFAA picture. Similar red particles have been observed in other paintings by Lane, such as *The Old Fort, Gloucester* (Sargent House, Gloucester, MA). In addition, a few slender brilliant red fibers of unidentified origin were noted in the upper layer of dark brown paint (such as in the foreground beach to the right of the rock); these fibers are similar to those found in the *Old Fort* picture from the Sargent House Museum (figs. 63 and 64).

In all three *Brace’s Rock* paintings, no underdrawing can be detected tracing the shapes of the three beached hulls, which appear to have been painted freehand towards the end of each painting project. A raking light photomicrograph of the ship’s mast in the TFAA version (fig. 65) shows that Lane first underpainted the mast on top of dry sky and water in a
very dilute, transparent brown with a delicate touch and a steady hand. There may be traces of an extremely fine line scored into the malleable upper layer of underlying paint, possibly using a straight edge, to guide the application of the brown mast and its white highlight. Lane used scored lines for ships’ masts in numerous other compositions, particularly in large paintings with elaborate juxtapositions of several vessels, such as his *Boston Harbor* in the MFAB, with its complicated maze of masts and rigging. Sometimes these scored lines are connected by tiny pinpricks that Lane made into the ground layer. In some larger and more complex compositions, the water stops on either side of ships, showing that these vessels were planned from the beginning of his work (as in the MFAB *Boston Harbor*). In contrast, as noted above, in the NGA and TFAA *Brace’s Rock* paintings, Lane added the shipwreck on top of the dry water layer freehand, leaving the placement of the boat as a final issue to resolve.

Once Lane painted water over the previously outlined rocks in the lower left of the TFAA picture, he added branches of the foreground foliage with a fine brush dipped in dilute, transparent brown paint. While the shapes of the branches are delicate, the rust-red and yellow foliage have a certain repetitive quality. The foliage was applied towards the end of the painting process, when the base layers of water and dark foreground had dried. Photomicrographs of the foliage in the TFAA and NGA paintings (figs. 66 and 67) show a similar stippling or comma-like application of paint.

In the TFAA picture, Lane used a very thin and transparent brown paint, similar to Van Dyke Brown, to create the signature “F. H. Lane 1864” in the lower right corner (fig. 68); using a very fine brush (about 1 mm.), he signed the painting when the underlying paint
had dried. The script of the signature is consistent with that in other signed paintings from this period (figs. 69 and 70). Lane is known to have signed his paintings “F. H. L.,” “F. H. Lane,” and “Fitz H. Lane,” and in two paintings he signed with his full name, “Fitz Henry Lane.” Few of Lane’s paintings are signed, suggesting that the TFAA Brace’s Rock was one of the commissioned series paintings, on which the collector requested that Lane add his signature.

6. Evidence from X-Radiography

The X-radiograph (fig. 71) of the TFAA picture is somewhat obscured by the large expansion bolt stretcher used to replace the original in a conservation treatment. Lane used a plain-weave canvas with pre-priming that, judging by the X-ray image, contains a thin layer of lead white. Future sample analysis may confirm whether the ground is similar to that in other paintings by Lane and his contemporaries, such as Church—namely a chalk and glue layer, followed by a thin coating of lead white which, when the top layer was scraped, exposed the tops of canvas nubs. Curiously, there is a horizontal weave imperfection that corresponds to the base line of Brace’s Rock and a dark horizontal line visible in the X-ray image runs along the waterline of the rock. This may indicate scoring, or rubbing the primed canvas with a sharpened object, removing some of the lead white ground. The X-ray image of the NGA Brace’s Rock (fig. 48) also shows evidence of abrasion to the lead white ground along the diagonal base of the foreground jetty of rocks, which may be evidence of rubbing as the artist worked on the composition.
As is often seen in X-rays images of Lane’s work, almost no brushwork is visible, with only the slightest use of denser pigments such as lead white evident in the clouds and foreground shoreline. In the TFAA picture, however, Lane used a slight amount of lead white in the massive pink stones of Brace’s Rock, while it is nearly absent in the same rocks in the NGA picture.

Lane did not use the same batch of canvas for the TFAA and NGA *Brace’s Rock* paintings. As noted, he used a fine-weave canvas (17/18 by 17/18 threads per cm.) for the NGA picture. For the TFAA composition he chose a slightly more open-weave canvas (14/15 by 14/15 threads per cm.), although both paintings appear to have similar pre-primed grounds. The X-ray image of *Ships in Ice Off Ten Pound Island* (1850s; MFAB) shows a similar weave canvas (14/15 by 14/15 threads per cm.) to that used for the TFAA picture, with corresponding weave imperfections and a similar pre-primed ground. In both NGA and TFAA *Brace’s Rock* paintings, probably due to the small scale of the picture, the artist’s color man took care to align the canvas weave perpendicular to the stretcher while tacking it with an even tension, as there are only very slight irregularities, or garlands, along the edges.

V. Lane and His Student Mary Mellen

In 1860, Mary Mellen painted a pastiche copy of Lane’s image of *Norman’s Woe* (fig. 72). Conservators at the MFAB recently made the first infrared images of that painting (fig. 73). A detail of Mellen’s underdrawing of rocks and clouds (fig. 74) shows that her work is schematic and hurried and does not reflect actual study from life, while Lane’s underdrawing is based on patient and careful observation of nature. Although we have not had the
opportunity to conduct a technical examination of Mellen’s *Norman’s Woe*, the difference in the two artists’ painting techniques is clear from a comparison of the infrared images. The line in Mellen’s underdrawing is short and choppy, the result of tentative strokes, while his are confident. The forms she outlined, which include the island, clouds, and ship, are schematic and lack the conviction of Lane’s precise topographic studies.

In only one early painting by Lane (see fig. 13) have we found an abbreviated underdrawing of clouds. And unlike Church, who used some underdrawing for clouds in his paintings, as did Heade, no cloud sketches by Lane are known.115 The pentimenti in Mellen’s clouds show that she did very complete underdrawing of the cloud shapes. While copying the original by Lane, Mellen had originally intended to paint clouds behind the ship’s mast and sail. In the painted version, she truncated the cloud before it reached the ship, perhaps because she painted the ship before the cloud or because she could not resolve the problem of balancing the tone of the sail with the cloud.

Mellen drew the horizon freehand but without precision; Lane carefully drew the horizon, in the case of *Norman’s Woe*, with a ruler. Mellen’s outlines of the island do not match the painted version, and the shapes are not convincing. Lane’s rocks are clearly delineated; their interlocking joins are logical and based on actual observation. In contrast to Mellen’s version, there are no pentimenti in Lane’s rocks in *Norman’s Woe*. Critically, the master shows no signs of hesitation while Mellen’s merely student-level ability is evident in her tentative drawing style. In the reflection of the rock, Lane created a convincing mirror image of the whale-like rock in grisaille, probably using a brush. Mellen did not have the technical facility to do this and made no attempt to create a convincing reflection. Further,
Mellen added breaking waves to her composition, whereas Lane’s water is still, allowing for a glassy, reflective surface. By adding waves, she created a pastiche from other paintings by Lane, copying the surf in such works as Lane’s *Salt Island* of 1859 (fig. 75).

**VI. Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research**

Comparison of the TFAA *Brace’s Rock* with the NGA version, in addition to examination of the infrared image of the CAM picture, show that Lane used similar preparatory and painting techniques in all three paintings. Eventually, it would be helpful to also examine first-hand the CAM version, the Lano oil sketch, and the other privately owned versions of *Brace’s Rock*. What remains a mystery is the pentimento of mountains in the TFAA picture. Comparative examination of infrared images of underdrawing in other works, such as the hill outline in the MFA painting of *Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay* (see fig. 56), and high-resolution images of drawings by Lane at CAM (such as *Camden Mountains from the Graves*) may allow identification of these mountain shapes. In preliminary contacts, staff members at the Farnsworth Museum in Maine have expressed interest in helping our research, which might include studies of local topography. The Castine Library has invited us to give a talk on Lane’s depiction of that town, and their collection may be a resource as well.

In addition, it might be interesting to investigate the new technology of X-ray study of pre-primed canvas weave mapping developed by Dr. Rick Johnson of Cornell University and Dr. Don Johnson of Rice University. We have been working with them to identify sections of pre-primed canvas that Vincent van Gogh cut from the same roll. Comparison of Lane’s and Mellen’s canvas types might be instructive.
Comparison of differences in the painting techniques of Lane and Mellen is important in distinguishing her collaboration on some of his paintings. It will be helpful to compare Mellen’s underdrawing techniques and paint handling, a project begun by colleagues at the MFAB (who we hope will continue and make available their research on Lane’s palette). For example, comparison of the detail of Mellen’s reflection of the rocks in her *Norman’s Woe* painting (fig. 76) with a detail of Lane’s painting of the same subject readily shows that the reflection in her work lacks the refinement of Lane’s. His reflections are sharp and clear whereas Mellen’s are schematic, dry-brushed, and lacking in detail. Her depictions of rocks are also lacking in form and nuance of color. Although one might contend that the handling of the foliage in the TFAA painting is somewhat methodical, overall the underdrawing and meticulous paint handling are consistent with Lane’s techniques.

The comparison of the three paintings of *Brace’s Rock* has provided an interesting opportunity to examine how Lane subtly varied one theme by lowering the horizon, shifting the vanishing point, and manipulating the shape and size of the rock’s reflection. In his *Brace’s Rock* series, Lane’s repeated images, with slight variations, were motivated by subtle artistic changes, friendship, and patronage. In creating these intimate, melancholy scenes, Lane returned to a formula that he developed at the beginning of his career as a painter, namely using a field sketch to create a series of paintings in the studio. This process served him well in his views of Boston and Gloucester Harbors as well as of Stage Rocks and the old fort at Gloucester. The significant difference between those paintings and the *Brace’s Rock images* is that in the former Lane filled the scenes with ships and life. The stillness of the
Brace’s Rock series can be interpreted as Lane’s metaphor for an intimate end of his voyage at a familiar Gloucester landmark. In support of the Lane catalogue raisonné project, we hope to continue to collaborate with colleagues at CAM, MFAB, TFAA, and elsewhere towards the advancement of research on Lane’s working methods.
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111 Franklin Kelly, “Lane and Church in Maine,” 153-154: “During the last years of his life he concentrated on the shoreline of his native Gloucester and Cape Ann . . . . But the lessons of
Maine were not forgotten. The steady progression in his art toward a distilled, rarefied vision of the natural world came to a remarkable conclusion in the culminating *Brace’s Rock* series. Reducing now even the actual size of his canvases, Lane concentrated on a single motif, as if this one small place embodied the entire reality of the natural world. The listing boat only hints at man’s presence, and the serene environment seems otherwise undisturbed. As in *Somes Sound*, this is a world we can easily comprehend visually, but also one that somehow far transcends ordinary existence. The *Brace’s Rock* paintings were the last true successors to Lane’s last Maine pictures.” On the dating of *Owl’s Head, Penobscot Bay, Maine* and Lane’s falling-out with his brother-in-law, see Wilmerding, *Fitz Hugh Lane*, 80.

112 For example, see the detail of his signature “F. H. Lane” in the lower right of *Lumber Schooners at Evening on Penobscot Bay* (1860; National Gallery of Art).

113 James Craig, *Fitz H. Lane*, 20. The two paintings that are signed *Fitz Henry Lane* are *The Clipper Ship Sweepstakes* of 1853 (Museum of the City of New York) and *The Golden State Entering New York Harbor* of 1854 (Metropolitan Museum of Art).


115 For Heade’s use of underdrawing for clouds, see Claire Barry’s technical notes in Cash, *Ominous Hush*.
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