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Claude Monet’s experiments in rendering effects did not find broad appeal until the 1890s, which was consequently when Monet was finally free from the financial burdens that plagued him during the first half of his professional life. This change in circumstances is linked directly to the rise of the American nouveau riche at the end of the nineteenth century. Although wealthy Americans preferred landscapes by the Barbizon school of painters, they considered Monet a “safe” investment among the Impressionists, and he was the most widely collected member of the group in the United States. Collectors in New York, Boston, and Chicago eagerly sought his works after seeing them on display at the American Art Association exhibition of 1886, at the St. Botolph Club in Boston in 1890, and at the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. Even Monet’s dealer Paul Durand-Ruel (1831–1922) said, “Without America, I would have been lost, ruined, after having bought so many Monets and Renoirs. The two exhibitions there in 1886 saved me. The American public bought moderately… but thanks to that public, Monet and Renoir were enabled to live, and after that the French public followed suit.” Monet, however, was not as keen on Americans buying his paintings. He complained to Durand-Ruel in a letter dated July 28, 1885: “I have two canvases which I have been working on for a month, but I confess that certain of these pictures I would regret to see sent to the land of the Yankees. I would prefer to reserve a choice for Paris, because it is above all and only there that a little taste still exists.” Despite Monet’s misgivings, necessity drew him and Durand-Ruel to Gilded-Age America and its new class of collectors.

Throughout the 1870s, Monet was an itinerant and impoverished painter. While Paris was the center of the art world at the time, the great expense of living in the city forced him and his family to live in the suburb of Argenteuil. He; his wife, Camille; and their son, Jean, would stay there until the end of 1878, when their second son, Michel, was born and Camille’s health began to fail. During the course of their stay, Argenteuil was both a new industrial center and a popular weekend destination for Parisians, who liked to spend their leisure time boating on the Seine. Since it was only a fifteen-minute trip from Paris’s Gare de l’Ouest train station, Argenteuil earned the nickname “la colonie parisienne” (the Parisian colony).

From 1871 to 1878, Monet painted approximately 150 canvases featuring Argenteuil, of which about eighteen depict the snowfall of 1874–1875, including these two snowy landscapes, both titled Snow Effect at Argenteuil. These pictures were part of Monet’s lifelong obsession with capturing effects. We can see this in the interchangeable titles he gave his works within his various series; he titled many of his snow scenes simply Effet de neige (Snow Effect). Forms and subject matter play a secondary role to the ambience of weather and time, a feature of Monet’s work that is evident from his early landscapes in Argenteuil to his late paintings of the water lily pond at Giverny.

In the winter of 1874–1875, large snowstorms blanketed Argenteuil, and Monet worked quickly to capture the various effects created by the snow. In Snow Effect at Argenteuil (44-41/3), Monet used an icy white-and-blue palette to depict a blisteringly cold wind assailing...
pedestrians as they trudge up the curving path of the Boulevard Saint-Denis. Our vantage point in this picture is the second story of Monet’s home on that street.\textsuperscript{7} From his window, he could see the townscape of Argenteuil,\textsuperscript{8} with its scattered rooftops and chimneystacks, and the Argenteuil train platform. (This easy access to trains to Paris was a necessity for Monet’s regular visits to Durand-Ruel.) When the flurries subsided, Monet ventured out of his home to seek new sites for what would become *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (2015.13.14). In that work, he used earthy browns and greens to render the melting snow. It has a much warmer palette overall and appears to have been painted in early spring. As T. J. Clark has shown, Monet only painted the environs of Argenteuil, and not the town itself, until early 1875.\textsuperscript{9} Thus, when Monet first sought a buyer for these Argenteuil snow paintings, they were less than two months old, which speaks to his need to turn a profit.

Following the disastrous critical reception of the First Impressionist Exhibition in April–May of 1874, in which he received particularly harsh rebukes, Monet and his fellow Impressionists needed to cultivate a new class of clientele for their avant-garde pictures. On March 24, 1875, Monet, along with his friends Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919), Alfred Sisley (1839–1899), and Berthe Morisot (1841–1895), put their works up for sale at Paris’s esteemed Hotel Drouot auction house.\textsuperscript{10} Amid a hostile crowd, the sale only reaped around 11,000 francs for the artists to share.\textsuperscript{11} Of the twenty works Monet submitted, seven went unsold, including *A Corner of the Apartment* (Fig. 1), forcing Monet to buy them back from the auction house.\textsuperscript{12} Durand-Ruel, who served as an expert at the sale, purchased four of Monet’s works. After meeting Monet while both men were in exile in London during the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71), Durand-Ruel would go on to support the artist both financially and creatively for the duration of his career. At great financial risk to himself, Durand-Ruel purchased many of the Impressionists’ works that suffered derision in France throughout the 1870s and 1880s. At the Hotel Drouot sale of 1875, Durand-Ruel purchased Monet’s lot no. 2, titled *Effet de neige*, for his personal collection, at the price of 300 francs. This painting may be *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (44-41/3), since the dimensions in the sales catalogue match those of the Nelson-Atkins picture.\textsuperscript{13} Durand-Ruel also purchased two other Argenteuil snow scenes at the sale: *La Mare, effet de neige* (Fig. 2), which is now privately owned, and *La neige* *[Argenteuil]*, which is most likely the work now held by the Kunstmuseum Basel (Fig. 3). *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* remained unseen by the public until Durand-Ruel lent the work to the Fourth Impressionist Exhibition in Paris in 1879.\textsuperscript{14}

Unlike in Paris, the American reaction to Impressionism was not overtly hostile, and several notable collectors, such as Alexander Cassatt (1839–1906), older brother of the artist Mary Cassatt (1844–1926), and Henry O. Havemeyer (1847–1907), the “Sugar King,” lent paintings to Durand-Ruel’s American Art Association exhibition in 1886.\textsuperscript{15} This exhibition of Impressionist and Barbizon pictures opened on April 10, 1886, inspiring many American artists to travel to Impressionist haunts in Europe, such as Monet’s garden in Giverny. Motivated both by this success and by new tariffs on paintings purchased abroad, Durand-Ruel opened a New York branch at 297 Fifth Avenue in 1888 and turned over its
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*Fig. 2. Claude Monet, *La Mare, effet de neige* (*The Pond, Snow Effect*), 1875, oil on canvas, 23 3/5 x 31 9/10 in. (60.5 x 81.5 cm), private collection*

*Fig. 3. Claude Monet, Ponetoise Boulevard in Argenteuil, Snow, 1875, oil on canvas, 23 4/5 x 32 in. (60.5 x 81.5 cm), Kunstmuseum Basel, Switzerland, inv. 2320*
management to his sons, Joseph, Charles, and George. One of Durand-Ruel’s French rivals, the firm of Boussod, Valadon, et Cie, swiftly followed suit, opening its own Fifth Avenue venue just one block away in the fall of 1888.

The increasing appetite for Impressionist pictures, and the number of dealers jockeying to sell them in America and France, compromised the exclusivity of representation that Durand-Ruel had once enjoyed. By the late 1880s, he struggled to maintain his proprietary relationships with the artists he supported through their early years. Monet was especially anxious not to limit himself to one dealer, and, to Durand-Ruel’s dismay, Monet co-organized a large exhibition of his paintings at Galerie Georges Petit in Paris, which opened June 21, 1889. It was common practice for dealers of Impressionist art to feature their avant-garde painters alongside more established Barbizon landscape art in an effort to equate the two in viewers’ minds. However, in the case of the Galerie Georges Petit exhibition, Monet exhibited alongside Auguste Rodin (1840–1917), who defied categorization within any artistic movement and was considered the preeminent sculptor of his time.

Among the works Monet selected for this special exhibition was the Nelson-Atkins Snow Effect at Argenteuil (2015.13.14), which appeared in the catalogue without a lender. Several other paintings in the exhibition were in Monet’s private collection at this time, and it is possible that the Nelson-Atkins picture came from him directly. Durand-Ruel had often lent Monet’s work from his private collection to aid in sales; however, hurt by Monet’s perceived betrayal at mounting his own exhibition, he refused to lend the artist anything for this show.

Durand-Ruel retained Snow Effect at Argenteuil (44-41/3) in his private collection until 1891, when the value of Impressionist painting was newly recognized. In August 1891, he sold Snow Effect at Argenteuil to the Paris branch of his gallery, Durand-Ruel et Cie. They ultimately sold it five years later, on May 21, 1896, to a Kansas City publisher, William Rockhill Nelson (1841–1915), cofounder of The Kansas City Star and one of the two namesakes of the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. Nelson had embarked on a six-month trip to Europe in 1896, when he purchased many works of art, ranging from painting to photography, and it is likely that he stopped in at the Paris branch of Durand-Ruel that May to purchase Snow Effect at Argenteuil. Nelson also purchased Edgar Degas’s After the Bath: Seated Woman Drying Herself and Camille Pissarro’s Poplars, Sunset at Eragny from Durand-Ruel. As he did not consider himself a connoisseur of modern art, Nelson trusted this dealer who was most responsible for enhancing the Impressionists’ reputation internationally.

It should be noted that, while Durand-Ruel’s New York exhibitions and the Impressionist works featured in the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago cemented Impressionist art in the American zeitgeist, the grim realities of the 1893 financial crash and the ensuing depression put a damper on art sales for a time. The Panic of 1893 had a substantial effect on art collecting. Notably, New York’s Henry O. Havemeyer, the aforementioned sugar tycoon, had always been wary of investing in Impressionist pictures; he preferred Dutch Old Masters, such as Rembrandt van Rijn (1606–1669), and Barbizon painters, like Jean-François Millet (1814–1875). The financial crisis had only heightened his unwillingness to take risks. This is evident from the pictures he purchased from Durand-Ruel in 1893, which included a Millet pastel titled Peasant Children at Goose Pond (Fig. 4). Durand-Ruel struggled to get Havemeyer to consider Impressionist art. However, Havemeyer’s wife, Louise (1855–1929), had loved the Impressionists since she purchased her first picture, Edgar Degas’s Rehearsal of the Ballet, around 1877 on the advice of her friend Mary Cassatt. As America rebounded from the depression, Henry was more willing to purchase works that suited his wife’s tastes. On April 15, 1898, the Havemeyers bought Snow Effect at Argenteuil (2015.13.14) from the New York branch of Boussod, Valadon, et Cie, under the title Entrée de Village, neige (Entrance to the
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Village, Snow). America’s moneyed class brought Impressionism into their homes more readily than their French counterparts did.

Glynnis Stevenson
June 2018

Notes


6. Of Monet’s primary artistic concerns, the French art historian Louis Gillet wrote, “This study of l’enveloppe, this analysis of the proper role of light, what it adds or takes away from the colors of the real world . . . Light becomes the main character of the painting. Everything else is of secondary importance” (Cette étude de l’enveloppe, cette analyse du rôle propre de la lumière, de ce qu’elle ajoute ou qu’elle ôte aux couleurs du monde reel. . . . La lumière devient le personnage principal du tableau. Tout le reste n’a plus qu’une importance secondaire). Louis Gillet, Trois variations sur Claude Monet (Paris: Plon, 1927), 52–53. Translation is my own.


8. Argenteuil was home to twenty factories, which Monet blends into the fabric of his scenes without letting them dominate. His urban landscapes are rarely subsumed by industrialization, a fact that Clark bemoans. He compares this elision of labor to Monet’s later works done at Giverny, which were never marred by the train tracks that cut through his garden. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life, 174, 188.


11. There is some debate about the exact amount earned by the combined efforts of Monet, Renoir, Sisley, and Morisot, but in every case, the amount was a fraction of what they had hoped for. Merete Bodelsen, “Early Impressionist Sales 1874–94 in the Light of Some Unpublished ‘Procès-Verbaux,’” Burlington Magazine 110, no. 783 (June 1968): 331.


15. Havemeyer had joined his family's sugar refining business at age fifteen and turned it into one of America's largest trusts, the Sugar Refineries Company (known as the Sugar Trust), in 1887. The fortune he accrued enabled him and his wife, Louise, to amass one of the country's most significant art collections. For more on the Havemeyers, see Weitzenhoffer, The Havemeyers.

16. Weitzenhoffer, The Havemeyers, 43. The exhibition was subsequently moved to the National Academy of Design following a campaign by American dealers to impose a 30% tax on foreign paintings intended to be sold. The National Academy of Design was a purely noncommercial space and thus posed less of a threat to for-profit American galleries. In 1883, the United States Congress passed a law imposing a 30% tariff on artwork produced abroad, although they often gave exemptions to works created by American expatriate artists. Robert E. May, “Culture Wars: The U.S. Art Lobby and Congressional Tariff Legislation during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era,” Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era 9, no. 1 (January 2010): 1.

17. Weitzenhoffer, The Havemeyers, 84.

18. Gilded-Age Americans were passionate collectors of Salon-approved French Barbizon artists such as Constant Troyon (1810–1865) and Charles Daubigny (1817–1878). By exhibiting Impressionist art alongside Barbizon landscapes, dealers drew connections between these two modes of painting. For more on Gilded-Age collecting, see Gabriel P. Weisberg, DeCourcy E. McIntosh, and Alison McQueen, Collecting in the Gilded Age: Art Patronage in Pittsburgh, 1890–1910, exh. cat. (Pittsburgh: Frick Art and Historical Center, 1997).

19. In his glowing review of the 1889 exhibition, the critic Theodore Child wrote of Rodin, “He is the great sculptor of our day and his name will figure in the annals of this century after those of Rude, Barye and Carpeaux.” Although his comments on Monet are less adulatory, they are still very positive. Theodore Child, “Two Notable French Artists,” Art Amateur 21, no. 4 (September 1889): 67.
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**Monet, Snow Effect at Argenteuil, 44-41/3**

**Citation**

**Chicago:**


**MLA:**


Snow Effect at Argenteuil (44-41/3) was completed on a fine, plain-weave canvas that was commercially prepared with an even ground that extends to the...
tacking margins. The painting was fully lined in 1976, preventing access to the original canvas reverse; however, a photograph documents a canvas stamp for Alexis Ottoz at “RN Dame de Lorette 46” in Paris (Fig. 5). All four tacking margins are still present to some extent, but there has been significant loss to the canvas on all margins. Cupping is present on all four edges, and the canvas size corresponds with a standard-format no. 15 figure.

While not used as a significant feature within the composition, the ground layer is visible with the naked eye around buildings and within the trees. Off-white in color, the ground layer may have originally been a brighter white that darkened slightly during the lining process. No underdrawing was found when the piece was examined with infrared reflectography (IRR). Additionally, no underpainting or sketching out of the composition was detected. Instead, it is believed Claude Monet worked directly onto the canvas while looking out his window.

Snow Effect at Argenteuil is made up of a wide variety of strokes, from thin dry passages, to dots and dabs, to flat blocks, to incised lines. With both wet-over-wet and wet-over-dry paint applications found throughout the composition, it is clear that Monet worked quickly at times, but also revisited the painting in numerous sessions, likely from the comfort of his home. Monet’s work is often described as alla prima (Italian for “at first attempt”) and école de plein-air (French for “open-air school”) because of his frequent work outdoors, completing paintings in a single sitting. However, his contemporaries described his multiple painting sessions per canvas, returning to make changes until he was satisfied. During his various outdoor “Effet” series, such as this painting, there would be only a small window of time to capture the scene with the desired lighting, preventing long painting periods, and encouraging multiple sessions. Here, as in Boulevard des Capucines (1871), the wet-over-dry applications clearly indicate time passing between painting sessions. It is possible that this was more manageable with these two paintings, as they were both painted looking out from artists’ studios, and therefore could be revisited easily from their respective vantage points.

There is some slight impasto, mostly found in the white regions of piled snow, that contrasts with thinly painted elements. For example, the buildings at center right are painted with broad, flat blocks of color, while the impasto of the snow-covered rooftop creates the
illusion of snow resting atop the architecture (Fig. 6). The same is true with the nearby trees, where there are often few or no indications of the branches, but the impastoed dabs of white paint imply the tree’s structure. Conversely, in the lower center tree, both thin, translucent brown paint and incised lines in the still-wet snowy foreground form the branches (Fig. 7). A similar divergence in how Monet painted compositional elements is evident among the various structures. While the buildings’ sides were painted with broad, flat strokes and few details, the center right building that eclipses the horizon has a single dark mark in the center of each window, a detail unique to this structure (Fig. 8).

The buildings appear to have been the first shapes painted, with the heavily bodied rooftops added as final touches to the composition. Most of the middle ground and foliage were quickly laid in wet-over-wet within this region, after the background had dried. For example, the trees were added over the already dried buildings but exhibit wet-over-wet application where the trunks meet the distant path. In one session, the blue fence on the left was painted in unison with the snowy field on its left and path on its right (Fig. 9). The central fence appears to have been blocked in loosely with a mauve color. The snow was then painted, slightly covering the initial fence posts. Brown, blue, and purple fence posts were then added, dragging through the snow wet-over-wet.

The large tree on the left side of the foreground was added while the underlying snowy paint was still quite wet, forming marbleized swirls, loosely painted in blues and violets (Fig. 10). Although the central foreground tree was painted into the still-wet snowy backdrop, Monet added the light blue brushstrokes as a final detail after the underlying paint had dried (Fig. 11).

![Fig. 8. Detail of background building in which there is a dark stroke placed in each window, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 44-41/3)](image)

![Fig. 9. Photomicrograph of blue fence painted wet-over-wet with surrounding and underlying paint, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 44-41/3)](image)

![Fig. 10. Photomicrograph of left foreground tree, illustrating wet-over-wet dragging through the underlying snow paint layer, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 44-41/3)](image)
The foreground and near middle ground figures were added to the still wet path, with their brushstrokes pressing in and displacing the paint beneath. The distant figures near the fork in the path were painted in a later session, incorporating the texture of the already dried path (Fig. 12). In all instances, the figures are little more than silhouettes, with well-placed dabs of orange to signify the faces of the two rightmost figures (Fig. 13).

![Fig. 11. Photomicrograph of blue brushstrokes on foreground tree, illustrating wet-over-dry application, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 44-41/3)](image1)

In the sky, a gray-blue layer was thinly applied across the entire region. The hills were then painted on top of this layer, with the gray-blue clearly visible throughout the scumbled brushstrokes. Compared to the overall cool winter scene, the clouds provide warmth with yellow, bright blue, and pink, again with the cool gray-blue visible beneath (Fig. 14). In contrast to the muted underlayer, the bright colors of the clouds are especially lively and striking. Minimal blending of colors in the sky retains the freshness of the paint and the crispness of winter.

![Fig. 12. Photomicrograph in raking light revealing texture of the lower paint layer under the figures and application of figures wet-over-dry, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 44-41/3)](image2)

The painting has undergone numerous restoration and conservation treatments. The canvas was lined in 1976 to stabilize the tacking margins, and a synthetic
varnish was removed in 2006. During the 1976 examination it became evident that regions of the painting had been reworked prior to the painting’s history at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. Aged overpaint, applied with broad, painterly brushstrokes, is readily visible throughout the composition based upon its dull green ultraviolet-induced fluorescence (Fig. 15). When examining the painting under a microscope, this paint appears heavily bodied but translucent, somewhat like a glaze. Monet, however, was known for his use of opaque paints and general lack of glazes. Strangely, in many places, the underlying original paint appears healthy making it unclear why this overpaint was added. Within the right fence line, some of the translucent brown posts appear to have been reinforced or added during this campaign. The overpaint appears to have discolored and aged differently from the original paint, indicating it was likely added by another hand after the painting was completed. However, as this painting was in the possession of Monet’s dealer, Paul Durand-Ruel, for over twenty years after its completion, it cannot be absolutely stated that these are not artist additions or alterations dating from between 1875, when it was purchased by Durand-Ruel, to 1896, when it left Durand-Ruel et Cie and arrived in Kansas City.

Fig. 14. Detail of the clouds with the exposed gray-blue underlayer, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 64-41/3)

Fig. 15. Ultraviolet-induced visible fluorescence photograph. Broad areas of “army green” indicate overpaint (outlined in green). Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875; 64-41/3)

Diana M. Jaskierny
September 2020

Notes

1. The Ottoz family had a long tradition as suppliers to artists, from 1827 to 1890. Alexis Ottoz was located at “Rue 46 Notre Dame de Lorette” from 1867 to 1875 and also worked as a painting restorer and dealer. Considering the dates at this location, the date of this painting, and the known provenance, it is likely that the stamp reflects Monet’s canvas purchase rather than a restoration or sale. Pascal Labreuche, “La maison Alexis Ottoz,” Bulletin de la Société des Amis de Jongkind (1819–1891), no. 45A, (December 31, 2014): 51.


3. While tinted grounds became common for Monet by the 1870s, white grounds were commonly used by the Impressionists to increase luminosity. Anthea Callen, The Art of Impressionism: Painting Technique and the Making of Modernity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 70. See also Anthea Callen, Techniques of the Impressionists (London: Tiger Books International, 1990), 55.

5. See the accompanying catalogue entry by Glynis Stevenson.


9. This is in comparison to *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (1875; The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 2015.13.14) which was painted *en plein air* and has predominantly wet-over-wet paint application.

10. Later in his career, Monet incorporated the texture of the underlying paint layer to a much greater extent. For a discussion on this later technique, see Robert Herbert, “Method and Meaning in Monet,” *Art in America* 67, no. 5 (April 1979): 98–100. See also Kirsh and Levenson, *Seeing Through Paintings: Physical Examination in Art Historical Studies*, 139.


14. Paint is visible in age cracks found throughout these posts indicating it was added after the painting had aged enough to form cracks.

15. Durand-Ruel sold the painting to his gallery in 1891. See accompanying essay by Stevenson.

### Documentation

#### Citation

**Chicago:**


**MLA:**


#### Provenance

Probably purchased from the artist at his sale, *Tableaux et Aquarelles par Claude Monet, Berthe Morisot, A. Renoir, A. Sisley*, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, March 24, 1875, lot 2, as *effet de neige*, by Paul Durand-Ruel (1831–1922), Paris, 1875–August 25, 1891 [1];

Purchased from Paul Durand-Ruel, Paris, by Durand-Ruel et Cie, Paris, stock no. 1323, as *Argenteuil, effet de neige*, 1891–May 21, 1896 [2];

April 13, 1915;

To his wife, Ida Nelson (née Houston, 1853–1921), Kansas City, MO, 1915–October 6, 1921;

By descent to her daughter, Laura Kirkwood (née Nelson, 1883–1926), Kansas City, MO, 1921–February 27, 1926;

Inherited by her husband, Irwin Kirkwood (1878–1927), Kansas City, MO, 1926–August 29, 1927;

Laura Nelson Kirkwood Residency Trust, Kansas City, MO, 1927–June 27, 1944 [3];


Notes

[1] It is very likely that Paul Durand-Ruel purchased this painting from Claude Monet at his March 24, 1875 sale, where he is listed as the purchaser of three other Argenteuil snow scenes. See Merete Bodelsen, “Early Impressionist Sales 1874–94 in the light of some unpublished ‘procès-verbaux’,” Burlington Magazine 110, no. 783 (June 1968): 333, 335. If that is the case, then the painting was probably in the Fourth Impressionist Exhibition, as cat. no. 159, Effet de neige (1875) à Argenteuil, which was lent by M. Durand-Ruel. See Catalogue de la 4e Exposition de peinture par M. Bracquemond—Mme Bracquemond—M. Caillebotte—M. Cals—Mlle Cassatt—MM. Degas—Forain—Lebourg—Monet—Pissarro—Feu Pictet—Rouart—H. Somm—Tillot et Zandomenighi, 28 avenue de l’Opéra, Paris, April 10–May 11, 1879.


[3] As early as 1927, art advisor to the NAMA trustees, R. A. Holland, noted the painting in the contents of Oak Hall, Nelson’s mansion, as one to keep for the budding museum’s collection. Letter from Fred C. Vincent, Laura Nelson Kirkwood Trustee, to Herbert V. Jones, NAMA Trustee, December 28, 1927, NAMA curatorial files. However, the painting was not given to the museum until Laura Nelson Kirkwood’s household goods and personal effects were finally dispersed in 1944.

Exhibitions


Haagsche Kunstkring: Tentoonstelling van schilderijen en beeldhouwwerken van werkende leden der 1ste afdeeling en van werken van Claude Monet, Renoir, Sisley en C. Pissarro, The Hague, The Netherlands, October 8–November 6, 1893, no. 46, as Argenteuil (effet de neige.).

Exposition triennale de Beaux-arts de Gand 1895, Ghent, Belgium, September 1–October 28, 1895, no. 449, as Argenteuil. Effet de neige.

Oak Hall Exhibition, Oak Hall, Kansas City, MO, October 5–9, 1927, no cat., as Silvered Effect of Snow.


Masterpiece of the Month, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Arts, Kansas City, MO, October 1937, as View of Argenteuil [sic].

Fine Arts Festival, Allyn Art Gallery, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL, February 26–March 10, 1956, no. 10, as View of Argenteuil [sic] and View of Argenteuil.

Impressionist Paintings, Roberson Center for the Arts and Sciences, Binghamton, NY, October 21–November 18, 1956, no cat.

“One Hundred Years of Impressionism: “A Tribute to Durand-Ruel: A Loan Exhibition For the Benefit of the New York University Art Collection, Wildenstein, New York, April 2–May 9, 1970, no. 34, as Vue d’Argenteuil, Neige.


Claude Monet, Musée d’art moderne, Liège, Belgium, March 12–May 31, 1992, no. 5, as Vue d’Argenteuil, sous la neige.


Monet and Japan, National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, March 9–June 11, 2001; Art Gallery of Western Australia, Perth, July 7–September 16, 2001, no. 9, as View of Argenteuil, Snow.


References


Exposition triennale de Beaux-arts de Gand 1895, exh. cat. (Ghent, Belgium: Salon de Gand, 1895), 95, as Argenteuil. Effet de neige.


“Oak Hall Open Wednesday,” Kansas City Star 48, no. 15 (October 2, 1927): 2A, as Silvered Effect of Snow.


“Art,” Kansas City Star 55, no. 62 (November 18, 1934): 12A.


M[ina] K. P[owell], “Art: Paintings from Oak Hall Viewed by Public for First Time—A Large Ribera, Several Interesting Dutch Canvases, Portraits of the English School and a Few French Moderns Are Shown,” Kansas City Times 97, no. 277 (November 19, 1934): 8.


“Music and Musicians: Concerts for Clubs,” Kansas City Star 64, no. 205 (April 9, 1944): 15C.

Fine Arts Festival, exh. cat. (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1956), unpaginated, as View of Argenteuil [sic].


“One Hundred Years of Impressionism:” A Tribute to Durand-Ruel; A Loan Exhibition For the Benefit of the New York University Art Collection, exh. cat. (New York: Wildenstein, 1970), unpaginated, (repro.), as Vue d’Argenteuil, Neige.


Kristie C. Wolferman, *The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art: Culture Comes to Kansas City* (Columbia, MO: Columbia
University of Missouri Press, 1993), 186–88, as View of Argenteuil, Snow.

Mary Anne Staniszewski, Believing is Seeing: Creating the Culture of Art (New York: Penguin, 1995), 183, (repro.), as View of Argenteuil, Snow.


Alice Thorson, “Traveling treasures: Some gallery favorites to go on tour as Nelson gears up for expansion,” The Kansas City Star (December 13, 1997): E1, as View of Argenteuil Snow.


Mary Mathews Gedo, Monet and his Muse: Camille Monet in the Artist’s Life (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 155.

Daniel Wildenstein, Monet or the Triumph of Impressionism (Cologne: Benedikt Taschen Verlag GmbH, 2010), no. 358, p. 114.


Possibly Jean-François Demestre, Monet en Creuse: Le printemps d’une méthode (Limoges, France: Éditions Culture et Patrimoine en Limousin, 2011), 38, as Effet de neige à Argenteuil.


“Nelson-Atkins to unveil renovated Bloch Galleries of European Art in winter 2017,” artdaily.org (July 20,


**Monet, Snow Effect at Argenteuil, 15.13.14**

**Technical Entry**

**Citation**

**Chicago:**


**MLA:**


*Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (2015.13.14) provides us with important information about the working style of Claude Monet and his use of materials, not only from the year this painting was completed, but also the years prior. Completed on fine-weave canvas, the painting corresponds with a standard-format no. 15 *paysage*, and likely retains its original size and format. Paper tape on all four tacking margins limits visibility; however, there is pronounced cusping on at least the right and bottom margins. The current stretcher, which was commercially planed and has mortise and tenon joins, appears to be original to the painting.

![Fig. 16. Claude Monet, *Snow at Argenteuil*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 21 1/2 x 29 in. (54.6 x 73.7 cm). The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston](image1)

![Fig. 17. Detail image of the pentimento found center-right, taken in standard viewing light, *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (1875; 15.13.14)](image2)
Compositionally, this painting is nearly identical to *Snow at Argenteuil* (Fig. 16; about 1874), located at The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Painted from the same vantage point, the Boston version depicts figures walking through a snow flurry early in the winter season, while the Nelson-Atkins painting is later in the season, with snow on the ground but the warmth of the coming spring present. Although the Boston version may have been painted earlier in the winter season, it is slightly larger, corresponding to a standard-format *paysage* no. 20, and it appears somewhat more rendered and detailed than the later Nelson-Atkins version.

When examining the painting under a microscope, it is clear that these structures were the first elements painted on the Nelson-Atkins version, directly on top of the ground layer, along with other shapes not clearly identifiable with a microscope or IRR. Consulting Monet’s oeuvre for the years prior to 1875 when this composition was completed, the vertical underlying shapes closely resemble his depictions of ship masts in maritime scenes. While it is unlikely the pentimenti in *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* directly correspond to a specific painting, of his completed and known maritime scenes the proportions and placements of these shapes echo masts in *Ships in a Harbor* (Fig. 19; about 1873; The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Similar in size, though a different format, this scene portrays several large ships near one another and filling the canvas so that no view of a distant horizon or land is visible. The ships’ masts span half the height of the canvas or more, similar to the vertical shapes found beneath the paint layers of *Snow Effect at Argenteuil*.

Pentimenti found throughout the Nelson-Atkins painting reveal that Monet abandoned an earlier composition and reused the canvas. Within the trees on the right, there is a vertical structure beneath the paint layer, still visible in normal viewing light (Fig. 17). Through infrared reflectography (IRR), two additional vertical shapes were found: one near the right edge of the painting, and one in the center left, peeking out from behind the trees (Fig. 18). In all instances, these shapes are mostly covered with sky and landscape paint, though glimpses of them are visible between compositional elements.
The similarities between the two compositions become even clearer when accounting for unidentifiable large, dark central shapes detected in IRR. X-radiography revealed some changes in the composition, mostly to the center and left. Although these changes could not be positively identified in relation to compositional forms, their placement falls in line with the hull of a ship. In a digital overlay illustrating the findings in *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (Fig. 20), blue lines indicate shapes detected in IRR and red lines indicate shapes detected in x-radiography. While the underlying image appears to be only a painted initial sketch, if the overlay is placed on *Ships in a Harbor*, the similarities between the shapes becomes clear, with the blue signifying the masts and the red likely signifying the structure of a ship’s hull (Fig. 21).

Monet began work on this canvas by sketching the underlying maritime scene in paint over an off-white ground layer, likely commercially applied. A few black strokes beneath the foreground paint, identified with a microscope and IRR, may also relate to the earlier composition (Fig. 22). Neither the ship masts nor these black strokes, some of which are “zigzag” in application and may have been placed to reference water, intermix with the upper paint layers of the current composition. This indicates that enough time had passed between uses of the canvas for the lower paint to dry fully and prevent wet-over-wet application. With the ground layer somewhat visible throughout *Snow Effect at Argenteuil*, it is clear Monet had only just started the underlying scene before setting the canvas aside. During the years prior to his time in Argenteuil, Monet found himself struggling financially, likely prompting him to retain and reuse a canvas of a composition he had abandoned.

While there is no overall underdrawing, thin black lines are found throughout the painting and likely relate to a partial underdrawing. These lines appear to have been created with charcoal, possibly oiled vine charcoal since the lines have been so well preserved. Some pressure was used to apply these lines, as the surrounding oil paint was displaced as they were drawn. In Figure 23, the green overlay corresponds to
the charcoal lines and indicates that most relate to the present wintertime scene. Along the building at the left, they appear to relate directly to the current compositional elements of the snow scene, and lie between the blue and brown paint layers of the buildings (Fig. 24). It is not as clear how the charcoal lines on the right side relate to the painting. On this side, they appear to lie below the blue paint of the sky of the current composition and above a lower gray-blue that could relate to the early maritime scene. However, they do not clearly follow any compositional elements of *Snow Effect at Argenteuil*.

![Image](image1.png)

Fig. 23. Digital overlay of charcoal lines detected with a microscope, superimposed on a desaturated standard light image of *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (1875; 2015.13.14)

![Image](image2.png)

Fig. 24. Photomicrograph of charcoal line between the blue and brown layers of paint within the buildings on the left, *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (1875; 2015.13.14)

Left were blocked in but were revisited with the mauve strokes and snowy rooftops added with wet-over-dry application and no blending to the lower paint. The town, sky, and foreground were likely painted together, with each of these elements displaying wet-over-wet paint application at their neighboring junction. At this time, Monet added to the outer branches of the trees, pulling through the still wet paint in the sky (Fig. 25). Within the town, Monet rendered the buildings two different ways. To the left, the windows were added as final details. But to the right, it appears the brown windows were painted first, and then the surrounding yellow of the building was painted, dragging the brown with it in many places (Fig. 26).

![Image](image3.png)

Fig. 25. Photomicrograph illustrating wet-over-wet paint application between the sky and outer branches (green arrow), and wet-over-dry paint application between the outer branches and initial laying in of the tree (blue arrow), in *Snow Effect at Argenteuil* (1875; 2015.13.14)

After returning to the canvas, Monet began with the placement of the trees, both to the right and left, covering much of the masts. Initially these trees were laid in quickly with thin scumbles, allowing the off-white ground to show through. The buildings on the

The painting is in good condition overall, with a glue-based lining likely from an early date, though there are no records of when this was performed. There is
minimal retouching present, with most relating to abrasions along the edges. In 1988, a synthetic varnish was applied, which remains in good condition.

Fig. 26. Photomicrographs illustrating the different window details, Snow Effect at Argenteuil (1875: 15.13.14). On the left, the windows were painted after the buildings. On the right, the windows were painted first, and strokes of beige paint forming the wall drag the brown window paint.

Diana M. Jaskierny
September 2020

Notes


2. Because of the paper tape, it is difficult to determine if cupping is present on the top and left tacking margins.

3. For more information on the series of Argenteuil snow paintings, see the accompanying curatorial entry by Glynnis Stevenson.


6. From the mid-1860s to the mid-1870s, Monet moved frequently, often finding himself in port cities such as Honfleur and Le Havre. During this time, he painting many scenes of ships and shipyards, with *Ships in a Harbor* being one example. *Monet: The Early Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 71–77.


8. Monet frequently purchased canvases with commercial grounds. Although he often applied a second tinted ground, paper tape around the tacking margins of the Nelson-Atkins painting makes it difficult to definitely state whether he followed this practice on *Snow Effect at Argenteuil*. The painting’s ground layer is off-white in color, and it is possible that no second layer was added by the artist. Bomford et al., *Art in the Making: Impressionism*, 144–45.


10. Most of the black strokes found in the foreground are beneath the current composition and thus have wet-onto-dry application. However, there is one black stroke in the center of the foreground that was painted contemporaneous to the current composition.

11. During the late 1860s Monet had immense financial struggles, frequently borrowing money from family and attempting suicide in 1868 because of his debts. Kermit Swiler Champa, *Studies in Early Impressionism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 22–24. It was not until Monet fled to London in 1870 that he met the dealer Paul Durand-Ruel and became more financially stable. George T. M. Shackelford,
With Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, by October 19, 1892;
Purchased from Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, by Boussod, Valadon et Cie, Paris, stock no. 22538, as Entrée de Village, neige, October 19, 1892 [2];
Transferred from Boussod, Valadon et Cie, Paris, to Boussod, Valadon et Cie, New York, by April 15, 1898;
Purchased from Boussod, Valadon et Cie, New York, by Henry Osborne (1847–1907) and Louise Waldron (née Elder, 1855–1929) Havemeyer, New York, 1898–December 4, 1907;
Inherited by Louise Waldron Elder Havemeyer, New York, 1907–January 6, 1929;
Purchased at their posthumous sale, Impressionist and Modern Paintings and Sculpture, Christie’s, New York, May 16, 1984, lot 8, as Neige a [sic] Argenteuil, by Alex Reid and Lefèvre Ltd., London, 1984–June 8, 1988 [3];

Notes

[1] The painting was exhibited at Claude Monet; A. Rodin at Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, which opened on June 21, 1889. Many of the other pictures exhibited have a specified lender, but not lot 18, titled Effet de neige; Argenteuil, which means that Monet probably lent the work from his private collection. Pictures owned by Georges Petit in 1889 were listed as such in the exhibition catalogue.


[3] See email from Darragh O’Donoghue, Tate Archives, to Glynnis Stevenson, NAMA, October 30, 2018, NAMA curatorial files.
Related Works

Snow at Argenteuil, about 1874, oil on canvas, 21 1/2 x 29 in (54.6 x 73.7 cm), Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Exhibitions

Claude Monet; A. Rodin, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, opened June 21, 1889, no. 18, as Effet de neige; Argenteuil.

A Loan Exhibition of Paintings by Claude Monet For the Benefit of The Children of Giverny, Wildenstein, New York, April 11–May 12, 1945, no. 10, as Rue de Village en Normandie.
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