

PAINT, POLITICS, AND DAUMIER'S ROCOCO

By

ELIZABETH SAARI BROWNE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ART

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2012

© 2012 Elizabeth Saari Browne

To Brendan Michael Browne

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to the chair of my committee Dr. Melissa Hyde, not only for her guidance on this project, but also for opening my eyes to the visual and intellectual pleasures of the Rococo during her fall 2011 “Rococo Echoes” graduate seminar. I would also like to thank all of my peers in that class for reviewing and providing crucial commentary on the term paper which laid the foundations for this thesis. For their reading suggestions, considerate revisions, and stimulating dialogue, I thank my committee members Dr. Joyce Tsai and Dr. Sheryl Kroen. My fullest appreciation also goes to Dr. Victoria H.F. Scott who guided me into the nineteenth-century and who has continued to guide me through graduate school: *forza!* My gratitude also extends to all of my family and friends for their willing ears and thoughtful conversation, but most importantly, my most heartfelt acknowledgements go to my ever patient husband and often unacknowledged reader and motivator, Brendan Browne.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
ABSTRACT.....	6
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	8
2 FROM RUBENS TO ROCOCO: DAUMIER AND IMITATION.....	21
Imitating Rubens’s <i>Imatatione</i>	22
Rubens the Red.....	25
Daumier “Copies” Rubens.....	30
Imitation Beyond ‘Purely Plastic Elements’	37
3 <i>AMATEUR</i> PAINTING: DAUMIER’S ‘HOMAGE TO FRAGONARD’ AND THE ROCOCO.....	39
Daumier’s ‘Homage to Fragonard’: <i>L’atelier</i>	41
Cultivated Looking: the <i>Esquisse</i> and the <i>Amateur</i>	46
The Aesthetics of the Sketch and Nineteenth-Century Collectors	51
Daumier’s <i>Amateurs</i> : Artists, Critics, and Collectors	58
4 FRAMING ROCOCO REVIVALS: ROCOCO SUBVERSION AND THE <i>IDYLLES</i> <i>PARLEMENTAIRES</i>	63
The ‘Parlementairians’: A Revival of Monarchical Politics and Style.....	64
The Subversive Rococo	69
Rococo Caricature	72
Framing the <i>Idylles Parlementaires</i> : Structure, Humor, Audience	77
APPENDIX: FIGURES	86
LIST OF REFERENCES	91
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	100

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

PAINT, POLITICS, AND DAUMIER'S ROCOCO

By

Elizabeth Saari Browne

December 2012

Chair: Melissa Lee Hyde

Major: Art History

Since Honoré Daumier's paintings were first publically shown at Durand-Ruel in 1878, critics and art historians have been drawing stylistic comparisons between Daumier's paintings and those by artists of the Rococo. Set in a view of Daumier as a staunchly and strictly political artist, few scholars have attempted to further contextualize these works in relation to the Rococo, a predominating version of which emphasizes monarchical and elite life and appears at odds with Daumier's Republican commitments. Yet for both Daumier and for artists of the Rococo, the distinction between art and politics was not so resolute. Beginning in the seventeenth century when Peter Paul Rubens and Roger de Piles brought the debate between color and line into the French context, the use of loose brushwork and effects of color—for which both Daumier and many Rococo artists were noted—carried political implications, as artists employing “Rubenist” *coloris* stood outside of the Academy, the traditional artistic, and at the time political, institution.

This independent stance continued into the eighteenth-century, when many Rococo artists such as Antoine Watteau, François Boucher, and Jean-Honoré Fragonard continued to explore (to varying degrees) this modern, anti-establishment style, and to work for independent patrons of non-noble classes. For these artists, the style of the *goût-moderne* could signify autonomy from traditional art practices as they were allowed to explore new genres and techniques, while

for patrons, purchasing such works might signify a financial and intellectual freedom from the French court. This accordance between paint handling and artistic/political freedom continued into the nineteenth century. It was reinstated and reinterpreted by artists and collectors particularly during the Romantic era and the Second Empire, the prime periods in which Daumier lived and worked. Moreover, institutional resistance did not just take the form of paint. Considering Daumier in relation to a tradition of Rococo subversion in print and in caricature, such as in the work of Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, reveals a shared Rococo spirit in his lithographic work and further complicates scholarly distinctions between Daumier's paintings as purely aesthetic and his lithographs as purely political.

This thesis takes seriously Daumier's engagement with the Rococo, and does so by exploring—through research in context, aesthetics, and provenance—his involvement with eighteenth-century influences, style, audience, and humor. This expanded notion of Daumier as a historically involved artist who brings the past “to his own time,” reveals in Daumier a more nuanced and complex involvement and thinking about art and politics from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

A prolific and well-known lithographer during his lifetime, Honoré Daumier's (1808-1879) efforts in other media remained virtually unknown to the public until the end of his life, when a retrospective solo exhibition was mounted at the Paris art gallery Durand-Ruel in the rue Le Peletier from April 17 – June 15, 1878. Of the numerous paintings, watercolors, drawings, and sculptures included in the show, most were loaned to the exhibition from outside sources.¹ Quietly collected by fellow artists, amateurs, and gallerists for decades, the sketch-like style, intimate scale, and absorptive themes of these works came as a shock to those only familiar with Daumier's more critical lithographs. Despite his lengthy career,² prior to this show only a few of Daumier's paintings, drawings, and watercolors had ever been publically displayed.³ Thus the Durand-Ruel show marked a moment of "discovery" of new genres and themes of work by Daumier. In light of this comprehensive revelation of his multi-dimensional talents, art critics and writers began to reconceive Daumier's standing in relation to other painters. No longer just a

¹ Richard Thomson tallies that seventy-seven of the ninety-four oils were from private collections rather than from the artist's studio. See "The Drinkers of Daumier, Raffaëlli and Toulouse-Lautrec: Preliminary Observations on a Motif," *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 2 (April, 1979): 29.

² Daumier's first lithograph, *Dimanche*, was published in August of 1822, when he was only fourteen years old. See Henri Loyrette et. al., "Chronology," in *Daumier, 1808-1879* (National Gallery of Canada, 1999): 545. The first painting by Daumier, *Un homme jetant son chien à l'eau*, is dated to 1834, though this date is disputed and the work thought to actually date to the late 1820s. See Gabriel Mandel, "Catalogue des Oeuvres," in *Tout l'oeuvre peint de Daumier* (Flammarion, Paris 1972): 87.

³ In 1848, Daumier's *La République* (Paris: Musée d'Orsay) placed eleventh out of over 700 entries for an official image of the State; to the 1849 Salon, Daumier submitted an oil entitled *Le meunier, son fils et l'âne* (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum); in 1850-51, three works by Daumier were on view at the Salon including the two paintings *Deux nymphes poursuivies par des satyres* (Montreal Museum of Fine Arts) and *Don Quichotte et Sancho Pansa se rendant aux noces de Gamaches* (Tokyo: Bridgestone Museum of Art), as well as the conte-crayon drawing *L'ivresse de Silène* (Calais: Musée des Beaux-Arts); in 1861, the Galerie Martinet exhibited the loosely painted *Une blanchisseuse* (Buffalo: Albright-Knox Art Gallery) and *Les buveurs* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art); lastly, in 1869, Daumier showed three watercolors at the Salon including *Visiteurs dans l'atelier d'un peintre* (Montreal Museum of Fine Arts), *Juges de cour d'assises* (location unknown), and *Les deux médecins et le mort* (Winterthur: Reinhart Collection).

political and social caricaturist, he was now a fine artist. Responding to the formal aesthetic qualities of brushwork and draftsmanship rather than elucidating explicit social content or narrative, critics compared Daumier's paintings to the works of artists such as Michelangelo (1475-1564), Francisco Goya (1746-1828), Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), and Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863).⁴ Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, Daumier was likened to a significant number of eighteenth-century artists as well. For instance, in an article by Edmond Duranty published shortly after Daumier's death in 1879, Duranty cites Charles Nicolas Cochin (1750-1790), Gabriel de Saint-Aubin (1724-1780), Philibert-Louis Debucourt (1765-1832), and Quentin de la Tour (1704-1788) as models and artistic equals of Daumier.⁵

According to French art historian Michel Melot, such comparisons with well-known masters were motivated by the political investments of the show's organizers.⁶ With Victor Hugo (1802-1885) elected as the presiding Président d'honneur, the show was conceived of and carried out by friends and fellow Republican artists, writers, and critics including Théodore de Banville (1823-1891), François Bonvin (1817-1887), Jules Castagnary (1830-1888), Jules Champfleury (1820-1889), Karl Daubigny (1846-1886), Jules Dupré (1811-1889), Adolphe-Victor Geoffroy-

⁴In "Daumier and Art History: Aesthetic Judgement/Political Judgement," *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1988): 3-24, Michel Melot explores a range of comparisons that arose in the wake of the exhibition. In Henri Beraldi's remarks alone, taken from his *Les graveurs du XIX^e*, Melot cites the following artists as listed in reference to Daumier's style: Jacob Jordaens (1593-1678), Pierre Paul Puget (1620-1694), François Marius Granet (1777-1849), the Flemish masters, Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), Thomas Rowlandson (1756-1827), Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669), Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825), Michelangelo (1475-1564), Camille Corot (1796-1875), Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788), Théodule Ribot (1823-1891), Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps (1803-1860), William Hogarth (1697-1764), Narcisse Virgilio Diaz (1807-1876), Tintoretto (1518-1594), Salvator Rosa (1615-1673), and Jean-François Millet (1814-1875). Another particularly striking example of a comparison between the "formal" properties of Daumier's paintings with that of other artists is given by Paul Foucher writing for *Le National* on the 1878 Daumier exhibition: "Il a tout: la largeur de la touché, le dessin, la couleur, le pensée. Telle toile semble dessinée par Michel-Ange et peinte par Delacroix." (It has everything: the breadth of paintbrush, drawing, color, thought. This canvas seems drawn by Michelangelo and painted by Delacroix).

⁵ Edmund Duranty, "Daumier: son point de départ, sa vie, son talent," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1879.

⁶ Melot's state of the field paper provides the fullest account of the 1878 exhibition and its effect on the art historical interpretation of Daumier. See Melot, "Daumier and Art History: Aesthetic Judgement/Political Judgement."

Dechaume (1816-1892), Nadar (1820-1910), and Camille Pelletan (1846-1915). According to Melot, by showing Daumier as a painter rather than as a caricaturist, the group sought to reconstitute Republican cultural and artistic ideals with the rise of the Third Republic (1870-1940). Through public acknowledgement of his paintings, Daumier the Republican caricaturist could be elevated and canonized as Daumier the Republican artist, rhetorically accomplished through writers' comparisons with other well-known and respected artists such as Michelangelo and Rubens.⁷

Melot's larger argument, upon which much of my research builds, is that this conflation between aesthetic and political judgments conferred on Daumier's works by his contemporaries has led to divisive and often reductive conclusions for his entire oeuvre. Framing his own scholarship in contrast to more recent studies, Melot argues that art historians dismissing this critical moment of the origin of interpretation of Daumier's oeuvre have split Daumier research into connoisseurial and political camps. Melot considers the connoisseurial scholarship to be that of the collectors whose interests lie in provenance, rarity, and style of prints and paintings, rather than in historical analysis. The political scholarship is almost equally uncritical, applying meaning of what scholars already "know" about Daumier to his art, attaching received dogmas to Daumier the individual rather than reconstituting the original ideological and historical construction of the works themselves. Instead of considering them in the context of Daumier's complete oeuvre, in the political model particular works are selected not necessarily for their individual value, intention, or meaning, but rather to prove Daumier's political ties. Thus

⁷Comparatively, the generally accepted alternative argument—that the show was intended to raise money for the elder artist—holds little weight. By the time of the show, Daumier was receiving an annual state pension of 1,200 francs and had a monthly income of about 650 francs through private sales of his paintings to regular collectors. Moreover, the show—which Daumier did not even attend—was a failure, given little press advertising, and accruing a debt of 9,150 francs. See Thomson, "The Drinkers of Daumier, Raffaëlli and Toulouse-Lautrec: Preliminary Observations on a Motif," 29.

Daumier's paintings were most often used to illustrate socio-historical art history arguments, solidifying his status as a through-and-through politically motivated Realist artist. The works chosen to represent this version of Daumier include *La République* (Figure 1-1), *Les Fugitives* (Figure 1-2), and *Un wagon de troisième classe* (Figure 1-3).⁸ However, such works comprise a very minor portion of Daumier's oeuvre. Rather, the majority of Daumier's painted subjects include familial scenes (*Le baiser*, Figure 1-4), children bathing (*Au bord de l'eau*, Figure 1-5), illustrations of Don Quixote (*Don Quichotte sur un cheval blanc*, Figure 1-6), theater scenes (*Scène de comédie*, Figure 1-7), readers (*La leçon de lecture*, Figure 1-8), and subjects examining print collections of their own and in shops (*L'amateur d'estampes*, Figure 1-9).⁹ The iconography of such intimate and banal images tends not to fit with the received notion of Daumier the ever politically engaged artist. Moreover, with their loose brushwork and private nature (rarely shown in the Salons), Daumier's paintings have also been dismissed by art historians as unfinished sketches and less worthy of serious academic study. They have therefore received less critical attention compared with his "finished" and widely published lithographic works and are certainly rarely considered in tandem.

Striving for more rigorous scholarship, Melot seeks to dissolve the division between the aesthetic/political camps by reconsidering Daumier's works of art on their own, rather than in

⁸ Though the New York version of *Third Class Carriage* is the most reproduced, there are other versions in existence as well as renditions of *Second Class Carriage* (*Un wagon de deuxième classe*, 1863, oil on canvas; present location unknown) as well as *First Class Carriage* (*Un wagon de première classe*, 1863, oil on canvas; present location unknown). For images and provenance of the first and second class carriages as well as for other versions of the *Third Class Carriage* see *The Daumier Register Digital Work Catalog* managed and kept up to date by Dieter and Lilian Noack. For a discussion of Daumier's watercolors of first- and second class carriages, see Bruce Laughton, *Honoré Daumier* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996): 110-111.

⁹ See Gabriel Mandel, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Daumier*. Mandel's book includes thumbnail images of all Daumier's paintings, including a section dedicated to works that may have been/are confirmed to be forged. The text also provides brief accounts of provenance, technique, state of conservation, location, and, in some cases, exhibition history. While this text is ideal for visually comparing Daumier's paintings all at once, the *Daumier Register* is the most up to date and therefore more useful for analyzing provenance, current location, and current conditions.

preconceived, terms. Thus, to look closely at Daumier's individual works of art and to attend formally to the "value judgments they provoke"¹⁰—such as comparisons with other artists and styles—still demands a careful examination of the context in which the works were created and also received. Returning to the 1878 Durand-Ruel exhibition to reconsider this divisive moment for later scholarship on Daumier, I argue that reexamining the responses to the show and taking seriously the critical comparisons made between Daumier and other artists actually sheds light on the historical context in which he worked, as well as on his aesthetic and political practices in both painting and print. Given the frequency with which Daumier's work has been compared with that of the eighteenth-century, I will particularly focus on the associations made with Rococo art and artists, probing them for visual validity and meaning. In addition to exploring how Daumier's sustained engagement with the Rococo throughout his career influenced formal and philosophical elements of his work, this thesis will also strive to elucidate how Daumier engaged and transformed such stylistic and thematic elements to express and reflect on specifically nineteenth-century artistic, political, and social concerns in his paintings as well as in his lithographs.

First articulated in 1878, throughout the twentieth-century scholars have been struck by Daumier's stylistic and thematic affinities with canonical Rococo art and artists. French art historians such as Claude Roger-Marx (son of art critic and playwright Roger Marx, a friend of Daumier's and collector of his paintings and drawings), Pierre Georget, and, more recently, Jean-Pierre Cuzin have consistently related the brushwork of Daumier's paintings to that of Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732-1806).¹¹ Drawing a more contextual rather than purely formal

¹⁰ Melot, "Daumier and Art History," 19.

¹¹ For example see Claude Roger-Marx, *Peintres, aquarelles, dessins* (Paris, Orangerie, 1934), idem., "Un Grand Peintre du Mouvement Daumier," *Jardin des Arts* vol 44, (1958): 513-520, and idem., *L'Univers de Daumier* (Paris:

association with eighteenth-century painting, Hervé Lewandowski compares Daumier's *La blanchisseuse* (Figure 1-10) to paintings of Rococo washerwomen: "Stripped of the playful, gracious air that Boucher, Fragonard or Hubert Robert gave their washerwomen in the 18th century, Daumier's *Laundress* [*La blanchisseuse*] epitomizes a social type characterized by grueling repetitive toil."¹² Though contrasted by narrative differences, setting Daumier in juxtaposition with these Rococo artists rather than comparing *La blanchisseuse* with similar subjects by nineteenth-century contemporaries like Edgar Degas, speaks to a noticeable eighteenth-century visual tradition apparent throughout Daumier's oeuvre.

American scholars too have addressed these Rococo resemblances as they have appeared in subject matter as well as in style. In his 1966 social-historical account of Daumier's life and work, *Daumier: Man of his Time*, Oliver Larkin stated:

If Daumier continued to haunt the Louvre now as he had earlier done, he could have found analogies between himself and others. The dignity and strength of a blacksmith at his flaming forge had impressed Louis Le Nain before him. His *Scapin* was in the spirit of the *Gilles* of Watteau. His preoccupation with the strange effects of candlelight paralleled that of Georges de La Tour; and the women who carry their laden baskets home from market in his water colors are descended from those of Chardin. The caricaturist had become in the early 1860s a master in the fine tradition of French genre painting, a fact more evident to us than it probably was to him.¹³

Like recent scholarship, this thesis will argue, contrary to Larkin, that Daumier was in fact aware of and explicitly worked within various strictures of this eighteenth-century French tradition that

H. Scrépel, 1972); Pierre Georgel "Daumier Peintre" in *Tout l'œuvre peint de Daumier*; and Jean-Pierre Cuzin and Dimitri Salmon, "Daumier et Monticelli, 'Baroques Provençaux,'" in *Fragonard: Regards/Croisés* (Paris: Mengès, 2007): 135-137.

¹² Hervé Lewandowski, "Honoré Daumier, *The Laundress*," Accessed 29 April 2012. http://www.musee-orsay.fr/en/collections/works-in-focus/search/commentaire_id/la-blanchisseuse-158.html?no_cache=1&cHash=9ba0affcb0.

¹³ Oliver W. Larkin, *Daumier: Man of his Time* (New York, Toronto, London: McGraw Hill, 1966): 153-154.

Larkin describes.¹⁴ For instance, through their exhibitions, scholars such as Colta Ives and Henri Loyrette have been revealing more and more of the “facts” of Daumier’s engagement with eighteenth-century French painting, making his artistic involvement with the Rococo even “more evident to us.” In a 1992 show of Daumier’s drawings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Ives posited that, “Drawings such as *The Kiss* [Figure 1-11], with its sinuous, caressing lines, may bring to mind the work of Boucher.”¹⁵ Revealing a strong sensuality, in *The Kiss*, an athletically nude male supports a swooning female relaxed in his strong embrace, the imminent consummation of their passion set amidst a sketched suggestion of landscape. Surprising as this sexually suggestive image may seem with what is generally known about Daumier, such eroticism was rare and Daumier’s nudes are limited to a handful of works including the drawing *Trois femmes nues couchées* (1849-52, Musée d’Orsay, Paris) and never exhibited oil paintings such as *Femme sous un arbre* (date unknown, Cairo Modern Art Museum, Cairo) and the now lost *Femme nue avec un enfant*.

Similar Rococo thematic connections have been drawn between Daumier’s paintings of saltimbanques and Commedia dell’Arte figures such as *Head of Pasquin* (1862-1863, Dallas Museum of Art) and *Scène de comédie*, with those by Antoine Watteau (1684-1721). Most comparative analyses, such as those by Richard Brettell and Helen O. Borowitz, draw on the difference of class as depicted by each artist; Daumier is said to represent the actual menial class position of the performers while Watteau illustrates galante fictions set in elite contexts.¹⁶ This

¹⁴ See in particular *Daumier Drawings*, edited by Colta Ives (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992) and *Daumier, 1808-1879*, edited by Henri Loyrette et. al. (National Gallery of Canada, 1999).

¹⁵ Ives, “Drawing at Liberty,” in *Daumier Drawings* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992): 9.

¹⁶ See the description of *Head of Pasquin* by Richard R. Brettell and Julie Lawrence in *Impressionist Paintings Drawings and Sculpture from the Wendy and Emery Reves Collection* (Dallas Museum of Art, October 1995): 28-29. See also Helen O. Borowitz, “Three Guitars: Reflections of Italian Comedy in Watteau, Daumier, and Picasso,” *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (Apr., 1984): 116-129.

opposition may hold for Daumier's mixed media melancholic clowns as they are depicted as nomads moving from place to place,¹⁷ but is complicated and seems reductive when compared to his more vibrant oil paintings of stage performers, such as *Scapin et Silvestre* (1863, Paris: Musée d'Orsay) or *Le troubadour* (Figure 1-12).

In the most recent comprehensive display of Daumier's works—a 2000 exhibition organized by the National Gallery of Canada, the Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais in Paris, and the Phillips Collection in Washington D.C.—Henri Loyrette wrote of Daumier's stylistic and topical likenesses with the eighteenth-century painter Jean-Baptiste Greuze (1725-1805): “In its very technique (ink and wash, highlighted with watercolor) as well as its subject (the powerful figure of a nursing mother), *The Soup* could be a drawing by Greuze, as could his intimate variations on the theme of the young mother.”¹⁸ Though similar to Greuze in feeling, *La soupe* (Figure 1-13) more closely resembles Fragonard's *Preparing the Meal* (1760, Pushkin Museum, Moscow). This reveals not only a general commitment to comparable Rococo aesthetics (Fragonardian brushwork) and themes (Boucher-esque nudes, Watteau-esque performers), but to a direct engagement with specific compositions as well.¹⁹ Yet, granting these identifications and visual comparisons with eighteenth-century Rococo artists, themes, styles, and compositions,

¹⁷ See *Le Déplacement des Saltimbanques* (charcoal, gray wash, watercolor, Hartford: Wadsworth Atheneum), *The Wandering Saltimbanques* (oil on panel, Washington DC: National Gallery of Art), *Les Saltimbanques* (charcoal, pen and ink, wash, watercolor, and conté crayon, London: Victoria and Albert Museum) and *Saltimbanque jouant du tambour* (black chalk, pen and ink, wash, watercolor, gouache, and conté crayon, London: The Trustees of the British Museum). These images are reproduced in Ives, *Daumier Drawings*, 222-227.

¹⁸ Henri Loyrette, “Situating Daumier,” in *Daumier, 1808-1879*, 16.

¹⁹ Daumier's *Soup* is also closely related to Jean-Francois Millet's 1861 etching and painting *Woman Feeding her Child* (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Marseille). Like Daumier, Millet was also probably looking at Fragonard and other Rococo artists. As Simon Kelly notes, “Over the course of his career, Millet repeatedly sought to develop chosen motifs, often giving his repetitions an ever-increasing sense of monumentality and producing these out of a desire to ‘improve’ on his imagery rather than as necessarily the result of a collector commission. Over three decades, for example, he gradually developed his treatment of milkmaids from the neo-rococo works of the early 1840s to the heroic figures of contre-jour of the 1870s.” See Simon Kelly, “Strategies of Repetition: Millet/Corot,” in *The Repeating Image: Multiples in French painting from David to Matisse*, edited by Eik Kahng (Baltimore: Walters Art Museum, 2007): 55.

little research has been done to explicate their meaning or historical conditions. As Loyrette entreaties in his catalogue essay, “Daumier’s relationship to the old masters—What could he have seen? What allusions did he make? What had he read?—warrants more careful study, as do the connections between him and his contemporaries. But here, too, research is only just beginning.”²⁰

Rather than asking these questions or questioning *why* such similarities existed, early scholars were more confounded by the problems of chronology that they posed.²¹ Regarding this obscurity of meaning evidenced by the thematic classification through which this influence was initially identified, in 1954 French scholar Jacques Feydy asked:

Taken together, they [the paintings] rank, as it were, all alone in series of subjects or genre scenes, such as print lovers, lawyers, or saltimbanques. Such an assembling of documents tells us about the inspiration of Daumier by providing us with classification. But this clarity is darkness. Necessarily a problem arises: why did Daumier, who painted only for himself, and because he willed it, return to explore a number of subjects rather than others? How do we reconcile the discontinuity of the series with the impression of continuity and identity that gives us a feeling that cannot be explained entirely by a way of interpreting or style of execution, i.e. by purely plastic elements?²²

²⁰ Loyrette, “Situating Daumier,” 16.

²¹ For example, see K.E. Maison, “Daumier’s Painted Replicas,” in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, (1961). In this connoisseurial article, Maison questioned why, in light of his prodigious output and limitless imagination, Daumier so often “repeated fairly exactly an appreciable number of his paintings and drawings” (369). Taking *Le Fardeau* as an example, at the time of the article Maison identified existing versions to the Gerstenberg Collection, the Collection of Frau Lisa Jäggl-Hahnloser in Winterthur, one in Paris in a Private Collection, one in the Národní Galerie in Prague, the Burrell Collection in Glasgow Art Gallery, and one in London in the collection of Mr. Robin Howard (a clay version of the grouping was also traced to the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore). Maison’s problem with these versions is not so much what they mean (they must be “peculiarities of the artist’s character,” 377) but rather that numerous copies make it difficult to trace the provenance and specific histories of Daumier’s paintings. See also René Jullian, “Sur la chronologie de quelques peintures de Daumier,” *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de l’art français*, (1965): 223-229.

²² “Réunies en volume de reproductions, elles se classent, pour ainsi dire, toutes seules en séries de sujets ou de scènes de genre, telles que les amateurs d’estampes, ou les gens de justice, ou les saltimbanques. Un tel assemblage de documents nous renseigne sur l’inspiration de Daumier en nous fournissant une classification. Mais cette clarté est une obscurité. Un problème se pose nécessairement: pourquoi Daumier, qui ne peignait que pour lui-même, et parce qu’il le voulait bien, a-t-il refouillé un certain nombre de sujets plutôt que d’autres? Comment concilier la discontinuité de ces séries avec l’impression de continuité et d’identité que nous donne l’ensemble, impression qui ne peut s’expliquer entièrement par une manière d’interpréter ou un style d’exécution, autrement dit par des éléments purement plastiques.” M. Jacques Feydy, “Plastique et Psychologie dans les Peintures de Daumier,” *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de l’art français*, (1954): 86-87.

Feydy raises two particularly pertinent questions for this thesis: Where does this impression of continuity with other (particularly Rococo) artists come from, and is there more to it than stylistic similarity?

In Chapter 2, I will begin to answer this question by first situating Daumier's relationship with the one artist who he actually copied, rather than with those whom he appears to share a stylistic affinity. This was Peter Paul Rubens, the artist also considered by many to be the "father" of the Rococo. Though not Rococo himself, Rubens's works were interpreted and promoted by the French critic and amateur Roger de Piles (1635-1709) who focused on their fresh coloristic effects and viewer engagement, an understanding which influenced the coloring and compositions of many Rococo artists to whom Daumier would later directly look.

Further, Rubens's artistic stance as expressed in *De Imitatione Statuarum* and his effects taken up by several Rococo artists were not only aesthetic, but political as well. The division between "color" and "line," or "ancients" and "moderns," was compounded with the politics of the Academy and its art practices. As the Academy was tied to the court, for an artist to be on the side of "color" or to employ loose brushwork was to situate himself outside of traditional artistic, and therefore political, institutions. Moreover, for Rubens, historical continuity of stylistic similarities (or imitation) opposed mimicry and encouraged progress through building on the art of the past by adjusting it to present political, social, and/or cultural concerns. Thus, accounting for this ideological adaptive manner in which Daumier imitated the art of Rubens and appears to have taken to heart his beliefs, provides us better tools to understand how Daumier then later interpreted the art of the Rococo, beyond "purely plastic elements." In the spirit of Melot, understanding this "politically-aesthetic" tradition complicates notions of Daumier's paintings as

strictly for visual pleasure or as overtly political in subject. Style matters, and, for Daumier like Rubens, politics and aesthetics were not mutually exclusive.

Moving into the eighteenth-century, of all Rococo artists, Daumier is most frequently compared with Fragonard, on account of their similarities of “sketch-like” style. Chapter 3 will examine Daumier’s late painting *L’atelier* (1874, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles) as an ideal case study for exploring the relationship of Daumier’s work with Fragonard’s paintings, taking into account the aesthetics of the sketch as well as how Daumier “translated” Fragonard into his own nineteenth-century artistic vision, in the tradition of Rubens’s *Imitatione*. Examining the significance and meaning imbued in Daumier’s painted surfaces for which they were originally—but mostly uncritically—praised, reveals formal and historical ties not only to particular histories of art and ideologies, but also to a particular audience, the audience for whom Daumier painted prior to the 1878 Durand-Ruel exhibition and his subsequent canonization. This chapter will argue that for Daumier, the loose brushwork and free paint handling associated with the “sketch” was part of an eighteenth-century tradition that appealed to the *amateur*, whose appreciation and judgments were inspired by works in which contemplation, imagination, and intimacy were of more value than explicit social content or narrative. Yet, as loose brushwork could signify independence from institutional and academic restraints, collecting such works could also be politically implicative, as the revived style of the Rococo came to be associated with aristocratic, intellectual, and/or national ideals. Thus, while it is imperative as an art historian studying Daumier to heed Melot’s warning and “go beyond the contemplative or proselytizing tone of the amateur,”²³ it is ironically exactly this context in which a study of Daumier’s oil paintings must be reconceived to understand their aesthetic and political reception.

²³ Melot, “Daumier and Art History,” 19.

Daumier did not only interpret the Rococo in painting. Many of his lithographs and drawings engage with Second Empire Rococo revival culture and fashion, and particularly with such themes as “crinolinomania.”²⁴ But unlike painter-lithographers such as Paul Gavarni (1804-1866) or Eugène Lami (1800-1890) who have been considered “true heirs of the eighteenth-century” by nineteenth- and twentieth-century critics and scholars, Daumier’s print work is mostly viewed as antagonistic to such taste.²⁵ Chapter 4 will consider Daumier’s most public “Rococo” work, a rarely discussed series of twenty-seven lithographs titled *Idylles parlementaires*, to unpack the ways in which Daumier engaged with the Rococo in his lithographs differently than he did with his paintings. With censorship laws lifted during their time of publication, Daumier was able to depict identifiable politicians in a humorous light, and in the *Idylles parlementaires* he did so by presenting them as obese and slovenly grotesque “Venuses,” romping in pastoral settings. Set within elaborate and ornamental Louis XV inspired frames, the *Idylles parlementaires* initially appears to exploit some of the negative connotations of the Rococo for political purposes, tying the political excess of the eighteenth-century to the political abuses of the reign of Louis-Napoléon at the start of the Second Empire. However, identifying the particular politicians Daumier chose to represent time and again and the specific paintings and sculptures which inspired the lithographs complicate such assumptions. Certainly, he mocks a version of the Rococo revival that politicians were adapting for their monarchical aspirations. Yet, taking the specific iconography into account and considering the history of

²⁴ See Therese Dolan, “The Empress's New Clothes: Fashion and Politics in Second Empire France,” in *Woman's Art Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring - Summer, 1994): 22-28.

²⁵ For Lami and particularly Gavarni as “true heir to the 18th century,” see Carol Duncan, *The Pursuit of Pleasure: The Rococo Revival in French Romantic Art* (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc, 1976): 89-105. Other painter-lithographers Duncan mentions, and who were also promoted by Baudelaire and/or the Goncourt brothers for their revival of eighteenth-century taste and style, include Achille Devéria (1800-1857), Tony Johannot (1803-1852), Constantin Guys (1802-1892), and Edmond Morin (1824-1882). Contrarily, Daumier’s lithographs which depict such subject matter portray them as “hypocritical, selfish and pretentious” (Duncan, 93).

eighteenth-century caricature, Daumier in fact appears to embody the spirit of, and share strategies with, a “subversive” eighteenth-century Rococo tradition, while also perhaps poking fun at his own love of the style.

Daumier’s lasting engagement with the eighteenth-century does not change the fact that Daumier was a politically engaged artist, but it does challenge the limited terms on which we take Daumier to be political. This reevaluation hopes to expand our understanding of Daumier’s influences and interests by considering him as a historically and aesthetically engaged artist, and how in turn this affected, or was affected by, his politics. Revealing his interest in Rococo aesthetics, conditions of viewing, and subtle humor as first seen in his paintings made public in 1878, allows us to see his other works, such as his more explicitly political lithographs, in a prismatic light, revealing other facets of Daumier, his work, and his time.

CHAPTER 2
FROM RUBENS TO ROCOCO: DAUMIER AND IMITATION

All of them descend from that founding father and that bold initiator: Watteau as much as Boucher, Boucher as much as Chardin. For a hundred years it seems that the painting of France had no other cradle, no other school, no other homeland than the gallery of the Luxembourg, the Life of Marie de' Medici: the god is there.

– Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *L'art du XVIIIe siècle*¹

“*Were you the prodigal son of Rubens*”

– Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *L'ivresse de Silène par Daumier*²

Daumier's engagement with the Rococo is best approached by first considering a source of mutual influence. As Edmond and Jules de Goncourt insisted in their multi-volume opus *L'art du XVIIIe siècle*, a revived interest in the Rococo art of the eighteenth century called for attention to the art of Peter Paul Rubens, from whom they posited the Rococo descended. Of Flemish heritage, Rubens was well-known in France since his own time. In addition to the twenty-four panels that comprised the allegorical account of Marie de' Medici's life to which the Goncourts allude, other paintings collected by the French monarchy as well as engravings made after his work became a source of artistic study for painters such as Watteau, Boucher, and Fragonard.³ In addition to culling thematic content from Rubens' oeuvre, the interest of these artists was seen in Rubens' superb use of color and compositional effects, a privileging first espoused by Rubens's

¹ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *L'art du XVIIIe siècle, deuxième série: Greuze, Les Saint-Aubin, Gravelot, Cochin* (Paris: Typographie Georges Chamerot, 1882):15-16. “Et ne faut-il pas toujours revenir à se nom, comme à la source de tous nos talents français? Tous descendent de ce père et de ce large initiateur, Watteau comme Boucher, Boucher comme Chardin. Pendant cent ans, il semble que la peinture de la France n'ait d'autre école, d'autre patrie que la Galerie de Luxembourg, la Vie de Marie de Médicis: le Dieu est là.”

² Jules and Edmond de Goncourt, “L'ivresse de Silène' par Daumier,” *Le Temps, Illustrateur Universel*, July 8, 1860.

³ See *Rubenism*, catalogue of an exhibition by the Department of Art, Brown University and the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, 1975.

greatest supporter, Roger de Piles.⁴ Also often “nodding” at knowledgeable spectators by strategically incorporating specific iconographic references to Rubens’s paintings, these Rococo artists translated the “spirit” of Rubens’s compositions within an eighteenth-century context.⁵ As Rubens’s paintings were eventually transferred to the Louvre after the French Revolution, Daumier too found these works to be an inspiration for his own painting. By considering the similar manner in which Daumier emulated aspects of Rubens’ work and the historical rhetorical values of such processes of imitation, we gain a better understanding of Daumier’s participation in Rococo revivals as well as with his later direct engagements with the art and artists of the Rococo.

Imitating Rubens’s *Imitatione*

Before discussing in what ways Daumier and eighteenth-century artists looked to Rubens, it is significant to sketch out Rubens’ own theories on the imitation of art, about which he held a committed stance and which he outlined in a short theoretical essay *De Imitatione Statuarum* (1608-1610). As a proponent of imitation, Rubens was concerned mostly with the careful copying of antique statues for painting: “I conclude, however, that in order to attain the highest perfection in painting, it is necessary to understand the antiques, nay, to be so thoroughly possessed of this knowledge, that it may diffuse itself everywhere.”⁶ However, Rubens not only

⁴ See Svetlana Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, particularly chapter 2, “Making a Taste for Rubens” (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995): 65-100. For a thorough study of Roger de Piles’ ideas in his time, see Thomas Puttfarquin, *Roger de Piles’ Theory of Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁵ For instance, the dog in Watteau’s *Gersaint’s Shopsign* (1720, Berlin: Charlottenburg Castle) directly cites the dog from Rubens’s *Coronation of Marie de’ Medici* (1624, Paris: Musée du Louvre). See Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, 84.

⁶ Peter Paul Rubens, “De Imitatione Statuorum,” printed in full in *Art in Theory 1648-1815: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, edited by Charles Harrison, Paul Wood, and Jason Gaiger (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2000): 144-145. See also Jeffrey M. Muller, “Rubens’s Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art,” *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 64, no. 2 (June 1982): 229-247. Muller connects Rubens’s imitative theory and practice to the Renaissance tradition born out of a recovery of Aristotelian metaphysics and the writings of Quintilian.

copied ancient statues, but also reproduced paintings from the more recent past, including those by Mantegna, Caravaggio, and Titian, and even retouched their original drawings.⁷ Although he studied from these masters through copying their works, according to Rubens, unless “judiciously applied,” slavish copying would ruin a painting, as it ended up “smelling of stone” rather than of nature.⁸ Instead, Rubens saw his theory and application of imitation as a selective and intellectual process intended not to mimic but to improve upon the work of his predecessors, and he believed that the knowledge gained from studying and truly understanding the far and recent past—its “spirit” rather than simply its form—informed the best contemporary painting.

While other scholars and critics were certainly writing on issues of copying versus imitation, it was the critic Roger de Piles who translated Rubens’s *Imitatione Statuorum* from Latin into French in 1708 and whose own theories inspired by the effects of Rubens’s coloring influenced how many Rococo artists who engaged with, or imitated, Rubens.⁹ Primarily, this influence from Rubens to the Rococo has been seen as a stylistic relationship, the imitation of the effects of color. Along the lines of the *disegno/colore* argument, de Piles granted greater importance to color which “renders the Object sensible to Sight,” and he claimed that “Rubens is methinks the Man of all Painters who has made the Road to Colouring more easy and clear of incumbrances.” De Piles’ ideas upended the traditional intellectual privileging of line by

⁷ Muller, “Rubens’s Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art,” 243.

⁸ Rubens, “De Imitatione Statuorum,” 145. The liveliness of Rubens’s “nature” was noticed and written about in the nineteenth-century. For instance, Théophile Thoré wrote of the difference between Chardin and Greuze in relation to Rubens as: “Ici Chardin est, comme Rubens dans ses plus belles études d’après nature, un peintre charnu, tandis que Greuze, si admiré dans ses Fillettes, est souvent laiteux et superficiel.” See Théophile Thoré, “Exposition de Tableaux de l’École Française Ancienne, Tirés de collections d’amateurs,” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, vol. 7 (September 1860) and vol. 8 (November 1860): 335.

⁹ See in particular Roger de Piles, *Dialogue upon Colouring*, translated by John Ozell (London: Gale Ecco Print Editions, 2010) and de Piles, *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of above 300 of the Most Eminent Painters: Containing a Complete Treatise of Painting, Designing, and the Use of Prints*, translated by John Ozell (London: Gale Ecco Print Editions, 2010).

acknowledging and elevating the delightful illusion and artificiality of color in *coloris*-style painting.¹⁰ While later critics like Denis Diderot (1713-1784) condemned this as deceitful, the *beau-fard* of Rubens, of de Piles, and of color was notably taken up by Rococo artists like Boucher¹¹ in order to revel in color's sensual nature as well as to explore the "fundamental conditions and limitations of pictorial representation and imitation."¹² Also of significance to de Piles, and later to Rococo artists as well as to Daumier, was the nature of viewer experience, including their ability to "correct" color's "deficiency,"¹³ the effects of which will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

Another arena in which Rococo artists imitated Rubens was through subject matter, particularly of courtly, elite life and subjects. For example, Elise Goodman sees in Rubens' *Conversatie à la mode* (1632-34, Museo del Prado, Madrid) a depiction of "gallant society, fashion, and etiquette"¹⁴ (rather than just mythology, history, or allegory), which presumably inspired Watteau's *fête gallants* and specifically, his *L'embarquement pour Cythère* (1717, Paris: Musée du Louvre). Moreover, Watteau in particular is identified as having often incorporated iconographic references to Rubens's paintings within his own. To cite just two examples, these include the spaniel in the bottom right corner of *Gersaint's Shopsign* (1720, Berlin:

¹⁰ See Puttfarquin, *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art*.

¹¹ See Melissa Hyde, *Making up the Rococo: Francois Boucher and his Critics* (Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute Publications Program, 2006).

¹² Puttfarquin, 69. Hyde's analysis of Boucher's portrait of *Madame de Pompadour at her Toilette* is a clear example of a Rococo artist exploring the limits of painting and representation, in the visual and rhetorical compounding of make-up and paint, and sitter and artist. See chapter 3, "The Makeup of the Marquise," in *Making up the Rococo*, 107-144.

¹³ Puttfarquin, 70. "Correction, for them, referred to an intellectual process of improving a naturally deficient object to its own idea of perfection," and 71, "The painter can establish his own order and achieve effects according to his own imagination."

¹⁴ Elise Goodman, "Rubens's *Conversatie à la Mode*: Garden of Leisure, Fashion, and Gallantry," *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (Jun., 1982): 247-259.

Charlottenburg Castle) which Watteau lifted from Rubens's *Coronation of Marie de' Medici*, and a translation of a dancing couple from amidst the "vomiting, drinking, urinating, love-making"¹⁵ figures of Rubens's *La Kermesse* (Figure 2-1), into a chalk drawing as well as into the painting *La surprise* (1718-1719, Private Collection).¹⁶

Rubens the Red

Through de Piles's influence and through their own experiences with Rubens's paintings, Rubens's art clearly interested Rococo artists on many levels. Perhaps less acknowledged, was their political appeal and resonance. In her lengthy discussion of Rubens's *La Kermesse*, which not only Watteau but also Daumier would copy, Svetlana Alpers makes a strong case for the layered draw of the work on political, social, and aesthetic levels. Politically, Alpers claims that Rubens painted the work out of "his concern for the future of Flanders"¹⁷ in light of their tense relationship with Spain, and that the "bacchic energies and revelry was a positive image of Antwerp's prosperous peaceful past."¹⁸ Moreover, the focus on peasants served as a model for Flanders' agricultural development, but its non-specificity of time and place defined a more socially appealing "general view of humankind."¹⁹ Yet, Alpers also sees Watteau's isolation of the dancing couple as recovering moments of beauty amidst the "crude, vulgar details."²⁰ As Alpers posits: "Sustained by Rubens's example, Watteau captures and refines the powerful

¹⁵ Alpers, 10.

¹⁶ Watteau also reproduced the *Dancing Couple* (red chalk, 23.3 x 14.7, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris) in *La Surprise* (B. Audran, after Watteau, 1731/ Engraving, 31.5 x 41.5 British Museum, London). Both works are reproduced in Alpers, 69.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 20.

display of desire and sexual passion. Isolated in this way, the couple carries with them hardly a trace of their former surroundings.”²¹

Though perhaps Watteau isolated these figures from the overt political elements of the *Kermesse*, Rubens’s style itself—as espoused in Rubens’s *Imitatione* and in de Piles’ privileging of “Rubenist” color—also carried with it subversive qualities, which appealed to several Rococo artists including Watteau. The idea of Rococo “subversion” will be taken up in more depth in chapter four, but it is important here to identify part of its origin in Rubens, as it will be later transmitted through to Daumier.

As Jeffrey M. Muller points out, Rubens’s *Imitatione* connected the issues of artistic imitation within the “dynamics of past and present”²² and to “the larger debate then current over the relationship between modern and ancient culture.”²³ In this polemical context, Rubens’s *Imitatione* was not simply an aesthetic treatise. His stance and practice combatted the rigid authority of traditional artistic texts and images, by emphasizing thematic interpretation and historical progress through imitation rather than exact duplication and academic regulations. Further, as Jacqueline Lichtenstein demonstrates, de Piles’s campaign for colorists like Rubens, also called the “moderns,” was viewed as an attack not only against artists who favored drawing, but to the institution which supported it, the Academy, which was in turn supported by the King: “In France, where the institution that defends the primacy of drawing also serves to advance the greater glory of the monarchy, such aesthetic deviation also becomes... a political ‘affront.’”²⁴

²¹ Alpers, 20.

²² Muller, “Rubens’s Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art,” 231.

²³ *Ibid.*, 233.

²⁴ Jacqueline Lichtenstein, *The Eloquence of Color*, trans. by Emily McVarish (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1993): 149. Lichtenstein focuses on the political implications of the debates over *coloris*, in chapter six, “The Clash between Color and Drawing; or, the Tactile Destiny of the Idea,” 138-168.

Therefore, the Rubenists' elevation of color and its effects was not simply an upheaval of aesthetics but also overthrew the "political, social, pedagogical, and theoretical foundations that kept representation within the king's vision."²⁵

Rococo artists looked to Rubens for more than mere apolitical imitations of subject matter and/or *faire*. They also capture the "spirit" of Rubens's work in the manner espoused by Rubens in his ideas of imitation and progress, bringing it in to their own political and aesthetic moment. In addition to "color" appealing on an aesthetic level, color retained these political implications of institutional "freedom" into the Rococo; the brushwork and references to Rubens and his *coloris* signified independence from political and academic strictures. For example, Fragonard's sketch-like paintings were reserved for a select group of amateurs, rather than shown at the more restrictive Academy. Additionally, the collectors of Fragonard's work and others like his during the Rococo revivals of the nineteenth century—to be discussed at more length in the following chapter—were often interested in politically progressive ideas derived from the Enlightenment.²⁶ Similarly, Georgia Cowart contends that Watteau's *L'embarquement pour Cythère* and its ties to the ballet and the *Comedie-Italienne* protests Louis XIV's absolutism.²⁷ Looking directly at Rubens's *Conversatie à la mode* as well as other works, Watteau arguably picked up on the political resonance embedded in the coloristic effects to incorporate within his own paintings, however subtly.

Though the Rococo revivals of Daumier's age manifested in different ways, Daumier's own engagement with Rubens, and later with specific eighteenth-century artists like Fragonard

²⁵ Lichtenstein, *The Eloquence of Color*, 152.

²⁶ These collectors and their interests/ideals is the subject of chapter three.

²⁷ See Georgia Cowart, "Watteau's *Pilgrimage to Cythera* and the Subversive Utopia of the Opera-Ballet," *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 83, No. 3 (Sep., 2001): 461-478.

and Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, necessitates a similar understanding of imitation, and that such imitation could be politically tinted. As part of this history and tradition, Daumier's own engagement with Rubens, Rococo artists, and their aesthetics must be viewed through this transitional and historical notion of imitation, by considering what he takes as well as how he transforms Rubens and the Rococo into his own idiom.

While Daumier's canvases and drawings are often said to resemble those of Watteau, Fragonard, or Chardin,²⁸ the only known copy of a specific work by Daumier is after Rubens's *Kermesse*, the original purchased on behalf of Louis XIV in 1685.²⁹ Though Daumier's large oil sketch (Figure 2-2) was destroyed in a fire shortly after its discovery in a Paris flea market in 1950,³⁰ photographs of the painting show how it repeats Rubens' mass of reveling figures nearly verbatim, compressing the complex festival space only slightly.³¹ That Daumier copied Rubens is significant for aesthetic reasons, but also because of the date. The oil sketch is signed and dated 1848, a politically revolutionary year, particularly for Daumier who was previously jailed for criticizing the upper-class supporters of the soon to be overthrown Louis Philippe and who made similar class-conscious comments on the February Revolution in a series of lithographs during the brief lift of political censorship.³² From a canonical view, it appears contradictory that

²⁸ For specific examples of nineteenth and twentieth-century critics and scholars who have drawn these comparisons, see the previous chapter.

²⁹ Though Daumier started drawing by copying at the Louvre in 1821, it is unsure if Daumier was a registered copyist; while there is no current file to indicate this, it may have been destroyed when the library of the Louvre burned in 1871. However, while copying was illegal in the Louvre without the correct permissions, making small sketches was often excused. See Theodore Reff, "Copyists in the Louvre, 1850-1870," *The Art Bulletin* (Dec. 1964): 552-559.

³⁰ See Jean Adhémar, *Honoré Daumier* (Paris: P. Tisné, 1954): plate 27.

³¹ See Alpers, 45. Though her book is primarily concerned with Rubens and addresses Daumier's copy in just a brief sentence, Alpers is the only scholar I have come across who seems to have taken Daumier's version seriously.

³² Daumier was jailed from 30 August 1832 - 22 February 1833 for his *Gargantua* lithograph published on 9 February 1832 in *La Caricature*. See Jenny Wilker, "Chronology," in *Daumier Drawings*, edited by Colta Ives, 253-256. For the 1848 political lithographs, see for instance *Le Gamin de Paris aux Tuileries*.

Daumier would be interested in Rubens. Superficially they appeared differentiated by class and audience: Daumier's political lithographs and newspaper employment support working-class and Republican values, while Rubens was a distinguished scholar and diplomat who worked in a more aristocratic and courtly social milieu.³³ Clearly, that Daumier copied Rubens rather than an artist who shared his outspoken Republican politics, suggests for Daumier an additional interest in aesthetics.

As has been shown though, Rubens's aesthetics were in many ways inseparable from politics. The correlation between Rubens, *coloris*, and politics continued into nineteenth-century debates over line and color with the Romantics, to whom Daumier was closest in generation. Associated as he is with "originality," Delacroix still looked to de Piles's translation of Rubens's *Imitatione* and advised the study of Rubens through copying.³⁴ Delacroix undoubtedly also took into account Rubens's politico-artistic stance for *coloris* as a signifier of institutional freedom. In an 1849 caricature by Bertall, Delacroix and Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) ride at each other on hobby horses in front of the Academy, with pen and brush lances drawn. Ingres' shield reads "Color is Utopia, Long Live Line!," while an inscription on the base of his hobby horse reads "Rubens is a Red."³⁵ Blatantly, this caricature speaks to the pervasive ideas about politics and color as they connect Rubens to the continued polemical presence of *coloris* in the nineteenth century. Even more telling, in 1837, Daumier was referred to as the "Rubens of

³³ See Geraldine A. Johnson, "Pictures Fit for a Queen: Peter Paul Rubens and the Marie de' Medici Cycle," *Art History*, vol. 16, no. 3 (September 1993): 447-469. Rubens relationship with Marie de' Medici in constructing her royal and individual identity can be compared to that of Boucher and Madame de Pompadour.

³⁴ Reff, "Copyists in the Louvre," 552.

³⁵ Bertall (pseudonym of Charles-Albert, Comte d'Arnoux), "Revue comique du salon de peinture, de sculpture, d'architecture, etc.," *Journal pour rire*, July 28, 1849, reprinted in Andrew Carrington Shelton, "Ingres versus Delacroix," *Art History*, vol. 23, no. 5 (December 2000): 736.

caricature,” implicating Rubens (via Daumier) as a political figure.³⁶ Thus to consider Daumier in relation to Rubens and to the style he sired, is to deconstruct the account of Daumier as an artist limited to traditional politics and Daumier’s politics as limited to subject matter. Instead, in the rest of this chapter, I seek to examine Daumier’s aesthetics as first gleaned through his imitation of Rubens, aesthetics which may be politically more nuanced in their rejection of traditional artistic, and in turn governmental, institutions and practices.

Daumier “Copies” Rubens

Like Rubens, Daumier vehemently opposed slavish imitation, though this is not expressed in a theoretical tract. As Shao-Chien Tseng argues in her reading of Daumier’s lithograph *Les paysagistes: Le premier copie la nature, le second copie le premier* (Figure 2-3):

What is objectionable for Daumier is the slavish copying of art and nature. He not only questioned the viability of the mindless mimicking of the antique [in *Histoire ancienne*], but critiqued the act of aping the work of peer artists. For example, in his lithograph *Les paysagistes: Le premier copie la nature, le second copie le premier*, published in *Le Charivari* in 1865, shows an uninspired and opportunistic painter copying cunningly a landscape painting still in process by his fellow artist. Here copy is understood as servile transcription of both nature and art, and Daumier’s derision of this practice is vividly conveyed without recourse to the traditional *singerie* imagery. For more than two centuries, artists such as David Teniers, Antoine Watteau, Jean-Baptiste Chardin, and Daumier’s friends, Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps and J.-J. Grandville had used the analogy between copy and monkey to spoof the act of mimesis without imagination, originality, and reflection.³⁷

Yet copying and imitation were common during the nineteenth-century. Art students were encouraged to copy the masters at the Louvre in order to learn from them. However, *how* artists copied their predecessors, as Tseng’s passage alludes, was paramount. As Patricia Mainardi and

³⁶ “France is the home of wit and of caricature ... Let us then honour caricature. Daumier is the Rubens of this immortal and varied museum, Philipon is its Michelangelo,” as reprinted in Melot, “Daumier and Art History,” 20, note 3.

³⁷ Shao-Chien Tseng, “Honoré Daumier and the Institution of Art,” (PhD Diss., University of Iowa, 1998): 33-34.

others have shown of the nineteenth-century—and Rubens and de Piles advocated in the seventeenth and eighteenth century—imitation opposed mere mimicry.³⁸ Quoting from the *Dictionnaire de l'académie des beaux-arts*, Mainardi distinguishes between copies as replication (“the exact reproduction of an artist’s work,”³⁹ for instance, Daumier’s copy of *La Kermesse*), copies as translations and variations (from one medium to another, or to “isolate some aspect of the work”⁴⁰), and copies as imitation. In this final category, imitation implies interpretation more than it does strict visual correspondence, and artists and critics during the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries privileged this notion of imitation among these distinctions. Mainardi cites the 1775 *Encyclopédie* in which Denis Diderot defines imitation as “a continual invention. It must, so to speak, transform its model and embellish its ideas; through the transformation that the artist gives to these ideas, he appropriates them. Whatever he takes, he enriches.”⁴¹ “Transformed” and “enriched,” these imitations (also called *répétitions*) were then judged for their own merit, on their own aesthetic terms, as “new inventions,” rather than for how closely they reproduced the original.⁴² Similarly, Johann Joachim Winckelmann argued in his *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* that, “There is but one way for the

³⁸ Patricia Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade: Copies, Variations, Replicas,” *Van Gogh Museum Journal*, (2000): 63-73. See also Richard Shiff, “Representation, Copying, and the Technique of Originality,” *New Literary History*, vol. 15, no. 2 (Winter, 1984): 333-363; and Shiff, “The Original, the Imitation, the Copy, and the Spontaneous Classic: Theory and Painting in Nineteenth-Century France,” *Yale French Studies*, no. 66 (1984): 27-54.

³⁹ Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade,” 64.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁴¹ Denis Diderot, *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers par une société des gens et des lettres*, 1775, cited in Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade,” 69.

⁴² Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade,” 68.

moderns to become great, and perhaps unequalled; I mean by imitating the ancients.”⁴³ By “imitating the ancients,” Winckelmann did not mean to imply that all art ought to look like that of Polyclitus or Praxiteles. “To become great and perhaps unequalled” suggests changes, contemporary interpretations; otherwise “moderns” would merely “equal” ancients. Under the belief that unique and personal ideas or forms could manifest themselves through studying and copying the art of the past—and not only that of ancient Greece and Rome but also of more recent generations as Rubens practiced—Ingres could then claim that “Raphael, in imitating endlessly, was always himself.”⁴⁴

It was in this sense of imitation that Daumier was said to capture the essence of Rubens’s work as translated and interpreted from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. As indicated in the quotation at the beginning of the chapter, the Goncourt brothers—discerning promoters of eighteenth-century taste and its revival—considered Rubens to be a “founding father” of the Rococo. So too for many was Rubens considered to be a “founding grand-sire” of the nineteenth-century Rococo revival, for both aesthetic and political reasons. After all, it was in 1851 during the Second Empire when Louis Napoleon, who as a “Rococo revivalist” favored Rubens as a painter of the glorious French court, had the panels of the Marie de’ Medici series moved from the Luxembourg Palace to the Louvre.⁴⁵ Théophile Thoré likewise proclaimed the lineage of French art from Rubens in his review of one of the first major exhibitions of eighteenth-century French painting during the nineteenth-century, the “Exposition de tableaux de l’école française

⁴³ Johann Joachim Winckelmann from his *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Mehlerei und Bildauer-Kunst* (1755), quoted in Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade,” 68-69. See also James L. Larson, “Winckelmann’s Essay on Imitation,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 9, No. 3 (Spring 1976): 390-405.

⁴⁴ Mainardi, “The 19th-Century Art Trade,” 69.

⁴⁵ For a detailed study of the “Rococo Revival” during the Second Empire, see Allison Unruh, *Aspiring to la Vie Galante: Reincarnations of Rococo in Second Empire France* (PhD diss., New York University, 2008).

ancienne.”⁴⁶ Like de Piles, Thoré recognized this tradition in the manner of making art rather than in its subject: “There remains only the manner of *faire*, the art, the artifice which with one expresses any subject.”⁴⁷ To Thoré, “color” mattered. As a political journalist, he was also interested in Netherlandish works and small genre scenes, art which inspired many Rococo artists and which was also far from the strictures of history painting and the Academy. Therefore, for Thoré, *faire* could presumably be replaced with “freedom,” in art as in politics, in Rubens as in the Rococo.

This same political/aesthetic spirit was specifically pointed out in Daumier by the Goncourt brothers. In response to a woodcut reproduction of *L'ivresse de Silène*, in 1860 the Goncourt brothers declared Daumier to be an artist in the tradition of Rubens, as they had earlier proclaimed of Watteau, Boucher, and Chardin. After ekphrastically describing the scene, they announce:

Here is the picture; and were you Rubens! Were you the prodigal son of Rubens, of Jordaens, you would not give him more movement, nor more life; and were it signed by these great names, that Silenus would not be more richly paunchy, painted more brilliantly, and the satyrs would not have a prouder appearance! Between the sagging and the fever of wine you would seek in vain an opposition more powerfully made, and a landscape as thick, as prehistoric, as worthy of the mythological scene.⁴⁸

While the Goncourt brothers emphasize Rubenesque composition and theme by alluding to the frequent appearance of Silenus and satyrs in the earlier artist’s oeuvre, they also do not fail to

⁴⁶ Thoré, “Exposition de Tableaux de l’École Française Ancienne,” 258 : “Est-il sûr que cette école du XVIIIe siècle soit plus originale que celle du XVIIe? Est-il sûr que Watteau soit plus français que Lebrun? Mais cela saute aux yeux! A peu près comme Rubens et Jordaens sont plus de leur pays que leur prédécesseurs.”

⁴⁷ Ibid., 264: “Reste donc seulement la manière de faire, l’art, l’artifice avec lequel on exprime un sujet quelconque.”

⁴⁸ “Voilà le tableau; et seriez-vous Rubens! seriez-vous cet enfant prodigue de Rubens, Jordaens! vous ne lui donneriez ni plus de mouvement, ni plus de vie; et serait-il signé de ces grands noms, ce Silène ne serait point plus grassement pansu, plus magistralement entripaillé, et ces satyres n’auraient point une plus fière tournure! Entre l’affaissement et la fièvre du vin vous cherchiez vainement autre part une opposition plus puissamment formulée, et un paysage aussi touffu, aussi préhistorique, aussi digne de la scène mythologique.” Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, “‘L’ivresse de Silène’ par Daumier.”

note how Daumier brings the subject matter into the contemporary era,⁴⁹ as well as considering the work “inspired” rather than “copied.”⁵⁰ As “the prodigal son of Rubens,” these rhetorical cues suggest more than their observations of a visual affinity with the Flemish colorist, but an intellectual one as well, evident when examining Daumier’s continued visual engagement with Rubens.

Copying Rubens’s *Kermesse* was not the only instance Daumier looked to the Flemish master. In the following years, several of his paintings share “Rubenesque” qualities. These range from “diffusing” his canvases with Rubenesque composition and color, to respectfully, but progressively, exploring underlying contextual meaning and historical differences. For instance, Henri Loyrette observed the figure of Marie de’ Medici from Rubens’ *The Felicity of the Regency* (Figure 2-4) in Daumier’s sovereign for his *La République*, made shortly after he had copied *La Kermesse*.⁵¹ Here, this variation, this “appropriation” of figure, is transformed and emblematically brought from the seventeenth into the mid nineteenth century. Personified as Justice, Marie de’ Medici raises a scale with her extended right arm while cradling a globe in the crook of her left arm, symbolizing the rightness of her divine reign. Seen monumentalized from the same diminutive perspective, Daumier’s *La République* mirrors this pose, but rather than a globe suggesting worldly power, she clutches the children of France to her breast; and rather than

⁴⁹ de Goncourt, ‘L’ivresse de Silène’ par Daumier’: “C’est le miroir grossissant des laideurs morales aussi bien que des laideurs physiques du XIXe siècle, cet Œuvre de Daumier où le grotesque va jusqu’à l’épouvante et où le comique s’élève au châtement d’un vers de Juvénal. Et je ne sais vraiment si notre siècle produira une satire plus saisissante que cette satire dessinée qui touche à tout, qui va de l’alcôve à la tribune, et qui aura dressé sur le piédestal de Pasquin, la grande figure du temps, le Prudhomme-Farnèse-monsieur Véron!”

⁵⁰Ibid., “ Dans ce dessin du caricaturiste, on voit que, pour ne point copier Raphaël ou le Vinci, pour n’être point de la troupe des peintres officiels, classés, médaillés, enrubannés, peintres à commandes et en voie d’institut, Daumier n’en avait pas moins, à toucher à Silène, les droits que Prudhon avait à toucher à Psyché.”

⁵¹ See Henri Loyrette, “Major Projects and the Salons of 1848-1852,” in *Daumier, 1808-1879*, 247.

a scale indicative of divine jurisdiction, *La République* wields the tri-color for the more socially progressive equanimous politics of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

Other imitations are less directly thematically connected. In 1849, Daumier submitted a painting entitled *Le meunier, son fils et l'âne* to the Salon (Figure 2-5). Illustrating a scene from one of La Fontaine's fables, the chiaroscuro of the fabrics in motion, the composition of spiraling figures turned in every direction, and the glowing warm colors have all been compared with Rubens.⁵² Oliver Larkin even makes a case for the translation of the woman on the left in Daumier's painting with Lot's daughter from Rubens' *Family of Lot Departing from Sodom* (Figure 2-6). Though compositionally reversed, such mirroring is probable given that Rubens' *Family* was then hanging in the Louvre.⁵³ The bodily contortions of Daumier's figures could equally draw from Rubens's physical spiraling and sculptural organization of space. The lead female looking over her shoulder and the woman behind her reaching backward as she simultaneously is led forward by her companions are gesturally and spatially equivalent with the postures of Rubens's Lot and Angel.

In sharp contrast to the Realist political and class controversies that works such as Gustave Courbet's *Burial at Ornans* (1849-1850, Musée d'Orsay, Paris) and Jean-François Millet's *The Sower* (1850, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) were thought to embody and with

⁵² In "Catalogue des Oeuvres," in *Tout l'Oeuvre Peint de Daumier*, Gabriel Mandel claims: "le tableau avec son groupe de femme rubéniennes," 90; Bruce Laughton, in *Honoré Daumier* concurs with the designation of the central figures as "Rubensian": "Although the colors of this painting are now much darkened, it is doubtful whether they were ever particularly bright: the woman's figures may be seen as Rubensian but the colors are cooler," 27.

⁵³Larkin, *Daumier: Man of his Time*, 87: "Both *The Miller, His Son and the Ass*, shown in 1849, and *Two Nymphs pursued by Satyrs*, hung in the show of 1850-51, confess an indebtedness to Rubens in the liveliness of their movement, the ruddy-warmth of their flesh tones and the brilliant red-oranges and green-blues of their flying drapery. In the former, he uses one of his favorite compositional schemes, a group of large foreground figures in contrast with a small and more distance one. Out of Rubens' *Family of Lot Departing from Sodom* or Jordaens' *Christ Driving the Money Changers from the Temple*, both in the Louvre, comes the girl who balances a basket of fruit on her head, against a sun-warmed wall." See also Mandel, "Catalogue des Œuvres," 90: "Le groupes des femmes a peut-être été étudié directement dans un tableau de Rubens."

which Daumier is often associated, to the 1850/51 Salon, Daumier's submissions seem to have nothing in common with such sociopolitical works. They are notable for their Rubensian formal properties and mythological subject matter, and the connection between the formal and the political in Rubens work is not often made in relation to Daumier. Instead, analysis concentrates on compositional similarities. For instance, focusing particularly on the brilliant colors of *Deux nymphes poursuivies par des satyres* (Figure 2-7), Bruce Laughton points out how the composition and paint handling is reminiscent of Fragonard, while the heavier physical proportions of the women are Rubenesque.⁵⁴ In another of Daumier's submissions to the Salon that year, a mixed media watercolor called *L'ivresse de Silène* (Figure 2-8), Laughton highlights how the iconography in the tightly wound composition directly refers to an engraving made by Nicholas Delaunay the Elder after Rubens's *Triumph of Silenus* (Figure 2-9).⁵⁵ Like Rubens, Daumier frames the young woman in the background, left of center with an airborne sash to suggest movement, as she likewise faces away from the viewer, here to gesture at two lusty runaway companions. Daumier also maintains a wiry satyr with sharp features, further evincing Daumier's borrowings from Rubens's work, but with no explanation as to why.

My point is not to argue for any definitive interpretation of these works, to take away from their aesthetic appeal, or to try to identify historical figures in Daumier's painted nymphs and satyrs.⁵⁶ But based on Daumier's practices of imitation in the tradition of Rubens and of

⁵⁴ Laughton, *Honoré Daumier*, 29-31.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 31. Though unproven, Laughton agrees with Robert Rey's 1966 comparison of the face of Silenus with Dr. Louis Véron, supporter of Louis-Napoleon and editor of *Le Constitutionnel*, forcing a politically iconographic interpretation on Daumier's work. As Laughton states, "It would seem that while Daumier was anxious to appear like a regular Salon artist working in a neo-Baroque style on the one hand, the politically aware cartoonist was never far away." As articulated in Melot's article, it is this type of analysis, this imposition of what we "know" about Daumier on his work, which prevents the work from "speaking for itself." As this chapter has tried to argue, Daumier's paintings were political, though not necessarily in such an overt, one-to-one iconographic fashion.

⁵⁶ See note 55.

Rococo artists following Rubens, I would like to suggest that by virtue of their “Rubensian” coloristic effects and direct references to Rubens, these paintings might be considered both aesthetic and political. Remembering Watteau, perhaps Daumier too saw that a more effective means of expressing dissatisfaction with political and artistic institutions during these Revolutionary years was through subtle aesthetic subversion embedded within the work.

Imitation Beyond ‘Purely Plastic Elements’

In her introductory essay in the catalog accompanying the 2008 Walters Art Museum exhibition *Déjà vu? Revealing Repetition in French Masterpieces*, Eik Kahng proposes an answer with which we can respond to the question asked in 1954 by Jacques Feydy about the apparent repetition in Daumier’s oeuvre—“How do we reconcile the discontinuity of the series with the impression of continuity and identity that gives us a feeling that cannot be explained entirely by a way of interpreting or style of execution, i.e. by purely plastic elements?” In her discussion of the unremitting practice of artists repeating images and series over the centuries, Kahng asserts that, “Repetition...has become a necessity for the activation of meaning and value. It provides the possibility of evaluation and thus a means of validation, not in terms of distance from a prior original, but in terms of its very perception.”⁵⁷

Even more significant for the study of Daumier and his frequent comparisons with eighteenth-century Rococo artists and styles, Kahng continues by arguing that this perception of repetition “ought to be retrospectively meaningful and not merely incidental.”⁵⁸ Thus the emergence of *répétition* in Daumier’s oeuvre, the appearance of variations, translations, and

⁵⁷ Eik Kahng, “Repetition as Symbolic Form,” *The Repeating Image: Multiples in French Painting from David to Matisse*, edited by Eik Kahng (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007): 20.

⁵⁸ Kahng, “Repetition as Symbolic Form,” 19.

imitations of Rubens and the Rococo, should likewise not be seen as “merely incidental” or simply as “purely plastic elements.” In Daumier’s work, repetition has meaning, and that meaning is a representation of his involvement with the eighteenth-century. The prevalence of imitation, and of imitation of eighteenth-century artists, aesthetics, and ideals, plays a definitive role in Daumier’s work and thus must be approached seriously. While sharing a certain “spirit” with Rubens—or as we will see particularly with Fragonard and Charles-Germain de Saint Aubin—Daumier’s works are meant to progress on their predecessors, by appropriating and enriching their ideals and spirit apposite to the nineteenth-century. Building on well-known works (like Rubens’s *Marie de Medici*), styles (sketch-like brushwork), or types (Fantasy Figures) Daumier generates an instinctive feeling or perspective that pairs the past with the present. Works serve as inspiration to interpret modern events or situations, harnessing the power of recent masters to identify the realities of modern society. Paradoxically, during Daumier’s lengthy career, such realities of modern nineteenth-century society included the revival of cultural and artistic values of the eighteenth-century.

CHAPTER 3

AMATEUR PAINTING: DAUMIER'S 'HOMAGE TO FRAGONARD' AND THE ROCOCO

Despite Daumier's explicit references to Rubens's compositions, Daumier's paintings have been compared with those by Fragonard more than of any other artist. Though working over half a century apart, it is inarguable that Daumier would have had access to view Fragonard's works through a series of exhibitions mounted in the 1860s and the 1870s, if not earlier. Held in 1860 at Louis Martinet's gallery, the "Ancienne école française"¹ exhibition featured eighteenth-century paintings and drawings from the collections of *amateurs* and collectors such as Louis La Caze, the Goncourt brothers, the Marcille brothers, and the Marquesse of Hertford.² A year later, on one of the few occasions where his paintings were publicly shown, Daumier himself would display canvases at the Galerie Martinet, including the loosely painted *Une blanchisseuse* (Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo) and *Les buveurs* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York). During 1867, an exhibition of Rococo art was held at Petit Trianon and on Sundays during the *Exposition universelle*, La Caze opened the doors of his home to the public, which was filled with eighteenth-century masterpieces.³ After his death, La Caze donated his entire collection to the Louvre. The Salle de La Caze opened on March 15, 1870 and included over 600 paintings by artists such as Watteau, Chardin, and Fragonard, making it even more likely that Daumier was exposed to Fragonard's work.

¹ The longer, official title being "Tableaux et dessins de l'école française, principalement du XVIIIe siècle, tirés de collections d'amateurs."

² See Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*, particularly the section on "L'Ecole Française ancienne on the Boulevard des Italiens," 244-253.

³ Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*. For the Petit Trianon exhibition see "Marie Antoinette returns to the Petit Trianon," 253-261 and for Louis La Caze, see "Gilles arrives at the Louvre: the legacy of Louis La Caze," 262-270.

Daumier and Fragonard are typically associated based on their mutual affinity for loose, virtuosic brushwork, formal similarities which resonate with the traditional “de Pilesian” conception of Rubens’s technique for “fresh colors”:

To preserve the Colours fresh, we must paint by putting in more Colours, and not by rubbing them in, after they are once laid; and if it could be done, they should be laid just in their proper places, and not by any more touch’d, when they are once so plac’d; it would be yet better, because the Freshness of the Colours is tarnish’d and lost, by vexing them with the continual Drudgery of Daubing. All they who have coloured well, have had yet another Maxim to maintain their Colours fresh and flourishing, which was to make use of white Grounds, upon which they painted, and oftentimes at the first Stroke, without retouching any thing, and without employing new Colours. Rubens always us’d this way, and I have seen Pictures from the hand of that Great Person, painted up at once, which were of a wonderfull Vivacity.⁴

For Fragonard, this easy and unfussy style has often been associated with his “genius” or “enthusiasm”; his virtuoso technical ability to paint “at the first Stroke,” or “in an hour.”⁵ By contrast, “not rubbing them in” and “without retouching any thing,” Daumier’s similarly relaxed painterliness has been viewed as “unfinished,” his compositions just painted “sketches,” and thus inconsequential in light of his “finished” and widely published lithographs, as discussed in the introduction. Yet, of the ninety-four oils exhibited in 1878, seventy-seven were from private collections, indicating a devoted audience to his free paint handling and non-*fini*.⁶ Identifying

⁴ Roger de Piles, *De Arte Graphica*, 175-176.

⁵ In her book, Mary Sheriff discusses the eighteenth-century notions of “genius” and “enthusiasm” in relation to Fragonard’s work. See Sheriff, *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1990). The myth that Fragonard’s *Figures de Fantaisie* were painted in an hour was promulgated by the Goncourt brothers: “More than any of his contemporaries, Fragonard cultivated the rapid manner of painting which grasps the general impression of things and flings it on to the canvas like an instantaneous image. There are extant, in this genre, miracle, tours de force, figure-pieces in which he reveals himself as a prodigious *Fa Presto*. In the Lacaze collection, there are four half-length, life-size portraits. On the back of one is inscribed—according to my opinion, in the painter’s own handwriting—the following: ‘Portrait of M. de la Breteche, painted by Fragonard in 1769, in the space of an hour.’ An hour! No more.” See Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *French Eighteenth-Century Painters*, 290.

⁶ See Thomson, “The Drinkers of Daumier, Raffaëlli and Toulouse-Lautrec: Preliminary Observations on a Motif,” 29.

this audience, for whom Daumier painted throughout his career, reveals an eighteenth-century tradition of the collector *amateur*, who looked at the aesthetics of the sketch in the terms associated with Fragonard and who favored the immediacy and intimacy of loose brushwork. Further, by taking into account the historical-context in which Daumier worked, this chapter will demonstrate that Daumier and Fragonard painted for a similar class of audience, and that their affinities also go beyond “style of execution and purely plastic elements.”

Daumier’s ‘Homage to Fragonard’: *L’atelier*

Suggestively, Daumier’s *L’atelier* (Figure 3-1) is also referred to by the contemporary alternative title *Homage à Fragonard*.⁷ In this work, Daumier is at his most “Fragonardian,” as he translates “Fragonard” into his own idiom by evoking the Rococo master’s brushwork and style and by transforming his thematics. A small canvas, *L’atelier* depicts a scene that explores the relationships between figures in an artist’s studio. Absorbed in his composition, the artist is relegated to the background of Daumier’s painting, obscured in darkness and a palette of muted browns and ochers. Though the artist’s composition (the painting within the painting) is indiscernible, the young woman in the foreground presumably acts as his model despite the fact that the artist appears more interested in his work than in her beauty. The young woman’s luminous skin, her sensuality, and the shimmering materials of her dress with reflective bright whites and oranges captivate not only the viewer, but another man as well, stealing into the scene from behind the warming studio furnace to the left of the composition. Gripping the stove pipe to lean in closer, he listens intently as the model gesticulates with her left hand to emphasize her

⁷ Cuzin and Salmon, *Fragonard: Regards/Croisés*, 135.

point in conversation, turning her body from the viewer toward her suitor, as the painter in the background remains oblivious or unconcerned with this meeting.⁸

Though the scene is translated into Daumier's idiom, it is operatively in "Fragonardian" terms. The soft, gallant humor in the juxtaposition between the two figures engaged in conversation, versus the artist distracted by his work echoes certain Rococo compositions of eighteenth-century artists including those by Fragonard. More erotic than Daumier's conversation piece in its suggestions of the studio as a site of an illicit sexual encounter between artist and model, Fragonard's *The New Model* (Figure 3-2) nonetheless exhibits similar playfully humorous relationships between the three figures. Lifting her skirt with his mahl stick, the artist here attempts to undress the model, while her female companion likewise grabs at the revealing garments. Leaning over and revealing her own décolletage, the companion's ambiguous frozen gesture could be read as either helping the artist by exposing the young woman's breasts or protecting her friend's modesty by covering her back up and even perhaps seeking the attention of the artist herself. While one of the model's hands is at her skirt where the artist is trying to reveal more skin, her passivity does not determine whether her hand is weighting down or pulling the fabric up, and the erotic tensions as to who is interested in whom remains unresolved. In *L'atelier*, Daumier displaces this overt eroticism, though similar ambiguous relationships are produced in the triad. For instance, is the painter absorbed in work ignorant of, or merely unconcerned with, the potential amorous relationship between the young woman and the other man who seems to hang on her every word as he hangs on the chimney post? And is the model,

⁸ While the Daumier literature is extensive (over 1,750 titles according to the Daumier Register), it is necessary to be careful about how scholars read the life of the artist versus how they read the actual artwork. For instance, in a description of *L'atelier*, Roger Passeron states that "This important painting was undeniably influenced by Fragonard, not only in its style, but in its feeling. Apart from this unique occasion, Daumier, like Picasso, always treated the subject of painter and model by showing the painter interested exclusively in his work, even if he is looking at the model. The painter is more absorbed in the beauty of the model than in his work." See Roger Passeron, *Daumier* (New York: Rizzoli, 1981): 240.

whose conversational gesture seems quite casual, even interested in this man? Based on compositional ambiguities, like Fragonard's *New Model*, such questions cannot be unequivocally answered.

L'atelier's "Homage to Fragonard" further imitates the Rococo master and his time by translating figures and conventions. With her hair upswept into a loose chignon and her scintillating warm-hued orange-yellow dress lined in white, the young woman in *L'atelier* looks to be a citation of Fragonard's *New Model*. It is as if Fragonard's young girl has covered herself back up and adjusted her pose for a new painting. Though depicted in casual conversation, her turned head explicitly imitates the *profil perdu*. In this eighteenth-century convention, the specific facial features are lost to the viewer, as the figure is turned inward toward the painting. This trope can be seen in works by Fragonard such as *The Game of Hot Cocks* (1767, National Gallery of Art, Washington DC), in which the woman in the cerise *robe-volante* turns her head almost 180 degrees from the spirited participants to converse with the man reclining behind her, to her left. With such pointed eighteenth-century allusions, one wonders what the artist in the background of Daumier's painting renders. Is he just any painter, a necessary component of studio scenes as popularized during the eighteenth-century, painting objects arranged before him or from his imagination? Could the painter be a self-portrait, a meta-representation of Daumier as artist, painting a canvas just as the actual Daumier colors *L'atelier*? Or since *L'atelier* represents Daumier at his most "Fragonardian," might the painter in the background be Fragonard himself? Perhaps Daumier depicts him, in "homage," applying the finishing touches to *The New Model*.

Daumier's focus on gazing and conversation instills the scene with an emphasis on sensual pleasure and accentuates elements of ambiguity and intimacy, another trope common to

Rococo painting.⁹ The inaudible conversation between the two foreground figures and the indistinct gazes—the woman is turned such that the viewer cannot see her eyes as she looks toward the middle-ground man; the artist stares at his painting, the creamy white strokes of paint indistinguishable as form to us; though we can see the other man’s eyes, the paint handling renders them blank and inarticulate—allow the viewer to “complete” the scene by imagining what those eyes could see or what those mouths might say, a function originating with the aesthetics of the *amateur* and the eighteenth-century.¹⁰ With this effect, the intimacy of the painting exists not only between the model and her probable suitor engaged in close conversation and between the artist and his work, but also between the beholder and this small painting in which these compositional elements demand viewer participation. Measuring only thirty-one by twenty-five centimeters, the small oil on canvas invites the viewer to a physical closeness with the painting, a viewing position that beckons slow contemplation and attention to the relationships within the scene, where potentials for multiple narratives can be discerned.

While compositional similarities might seem substantial enough to consider this particular painting an homage to Fragonard, it does not fully explain why Daumier’s other paintings are so often compared with this particular eighteenth-century artist. Of his almost five hundred oil paintings, few deal so explicitly with such “typical” Rococo imagery. In fact, rather than theme or motif, more often stylistic comparisons are made between the two artists. In their recent book *Fragonard: Regards/Croisés*, Jean-Pierre Cuzin and Dimitri Salmon explore the many revivals and re-interpretations of Fragonard’s work from the eighteenth-century to the

⁹ For a discussion on the role of conversation in Rococo paintings, particularly those of Antoine Watteau see Mary Vidal, “Style as Subject in Watteau’s Images of Conversation,” in *Antoine Watteau: Perspectives on the Artist and the Culture of his Time*, ed. Mary Sheriff (University of Delaware Press, 2006).

¹⁰ See chapter 4, “Easel Painting and the Aesthetics of Brushwork” in Sheriff’s *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 117-152.

twenty-first, focusing on the “analogies, transpositions, homages, and winks which [artists use to] renew the view we take of [Fragonard].”¹¹ Dedicating a small, two-page chapter to the stylistic similarities between Daumier and Fragonard, Cuzin and Salmon state:

There exist strong similarities between the two painters: the tireless reprisals of certain images at several points during their careers, the practice of leaving a painting in a sketch-like state and starting on another canvas. The love of chiaroscuro, the monochrome, and the taste of the simplification of forms exist in the one as in the other, as does a common fascination with Rembrandt: a taste of *contre-jours*, stormy effects, bursts of light in the darkness.¹²

However, as Cuzin and Salmon also point out, although these striking links have been frequently made between the two artists, they lack contemporary accounts to substantiate any closer, more unequivocal connection.¹³ While all of these attributes certainly can be found in works by both artists, in order to ground these claims art historically and move beyond vague assertions and simple and stylistic appreciation, it is necessary to consider these formal effects in relation to their broader historical contexts. In doing so, the formal connections that scholars and viewers see between Daumier and Fragonard can come to be understood more fully, complicating the canonical understanding of Daumier as a “purely” political artist and Daumier’s principles as political only in the traditional sense. That Daumier’s paintings are most consistently characterized as “sketches” (*esquisses*, *études*, and *ébauches*) and that such loose brushwork and “simplification of forms” relates to the work of Fragonard requires that

¹¹ Cuzin and Salmon, *Fragonard: Regards/Croisés*, back cover: “analogies, transpositions, hommages, et clin d’oeil qui renouvellent le regard que l’on porte sur artiste.”

¹² *Ibid.*, 135: “Il existe des analogies fortes entre les deux peintres: les reprises inlassables des mêmes tableaux à plusieurs moments de la carrière, la pratique d’une peinture laissée à l’état d’esquisse et recommence sur une autre toile. L’amour du clair-obscur, de la monochromie, et le goût de la simplification des formes existent chez l’un comme chez l’autre, dans une commune fascination pour Rembrandt: goût des contre-jours, des effets orangeux, des éclats de lumière la pénombre.”

¹³ *Ibid.*, 135: “Ils dépassent largement un goût pour le XVIII siècle propre aux années 1830-1840 que nous venons de noter, mais doivent être appréciées, faute de témoignages contemporains, avec prudence.”

consideration be given to the historical and revived meaning of the sketch, not just for the artist (since contemporary accounts are lacking) but for the specific audience who purchased and cherished the works in such an “unfinished” state.

Cultivated Looking: the *Esquisse* and the *Amateur*

The making of *esquisses*, or compositional sketches in oil, emerged in Venice in the sixteenth century and spread throughout Europe by artists who studied in Italy such as Rubens and Charles Le Brun (1619-1690).¹⁴ Considered to be the artist’s “first thought” (*première pensée*) for an inventive composition, the *esquisse* was often privileged over the *étude* (a study from nature, usually of a detail or a landscape which may not be utilized in the final work) and the *ébauche* (the sketched stage of the finished painting). Though all types of “sketches” were collected and prized before the eighteenth century (as were *croquis*, or “first thoughts” in pencil, pen, or chalk on paper), the freedom of handling associated with the *esquisse* came to be seen in and as completed works only in the eighteenth-century.¹⁵ Notable among these “finished sketches” were Fragonard’s *figures de fantaisie*, individual portraits (though not necessarily identity-specific) which exhibit Fragonard’s most fluid and abstract brushwork.

Though in the nineteenth-century the sketch came to public prominence as it appeared on a larger scale in the Salons and was often connected to social or avant-gardist purposes,¹⁶ the process and imagination associated with the *esquisse* initially attracted a particular, more private

¹⁴ For a history of the sketch in nineteenth-century art history, see Albert Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Phaidon Press, 1971) and John Minor Wisdom, *French Nineteenth Century Oil Sketches, David to Degas* (exh. cat. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The William Hayes Ackland Memorial Art Center at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978). For overviews of the sketch in earlier history, see Rudolph Wittkower, *Masters of the Loaded Brush: Oil Sketches from Rubens to Tiepolo*, exh. cat. (New York: Columbia University, 1967).

¹⁵ See in particular Wisdom, *French Nineteenth Century Oil Sketches, David to Degas* and Wittkower, *Masters of the Loaded Brush: Oil Sketches from Rubens to Tiepolo*.

¹⁶ See Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* and Boime, *Art in an Age of Civil Struggle, 1848-1871* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

audience of *amateurs*. This was both the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century audience for Fragonard's *figures de fantaisie*.¹⁷ As Mary D. Sheriff has argued:

Although we do not, in every case, know the individual patron who owned Fragonard's *portraits de fantaisie*, we do know that he often worked for a specific kind of clientele: the *amateurs*. Like the Abbe de Saint-Non, they were men well versed in the history of art, well read in aesthetic theory, and thoroughly familiar with the academic conventions of picture making. They formed a sophisticated audience interested in the fashionable issues of art and fully capable of appreciating the cleverness of painting that commented upon itself.¹⁸

The "cleverness" Sheriff alludes to in these paintings, which found their audience "among the connoisseurs, the amateurs, and artists who made, bought, sold, and wrote about painting,"¹⁹ is embedded in the surface quality of the paint itself. These amateurs were more interested in the artist's witty painterly self-referentiality and not necessarily in illusionistic representation. Rather than viewing the paint as a signifier of the "genius" of the artist (the inborn talent evident of the artist's creative process made clear in the spontaneous facility of the brush), the amateur was attracted to the way that the colors, lines, and brushwork were instituted signs of the artist's perspective made visible for the viewer to participate and to take delight in.²⁰

Sheriff argues that the early model for virtuosic sketch-like execution was an aristocratic one, which "[bound] together courtier and artist in the ideal of seeming to do naturally and easily a thing that requires art and effort."²¹ The "spontaneous," "sketch-like" effect is actually practiced artifice, concealing the vast amount of training and practice required to carry off such "ease." Slyly hiding the true skill and talent of the creator, a knowledgeable viewer might take

¹⁷ See Guillaume Faroult and Sophie Eloy, eds, *La collection La Caze: chefs-d'œuvre des peintures des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2007).

¹⁸ Sheriff, *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 183.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 124.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 146.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 122.

pleasure in this artistic conceit. Additionally, the “unfinished” state of such canvases leaves its “completion” to the viewer’s imagination. As Sheriff argues, “by avoiding a detailed and distasteful repetition, [the artist] lets the sophisticated imagine for themselves what he has only suggested.”²² Mentally filling in the specifics, refining the contours, even embellishing what was left “undone,” the work engages the viewer and allows him or her to participate, to step into the artist’s role and creatively imagine and finish the painting where it has been left off.

Fragonard’s *figures de fantaisie* are also the paintings most often cited as influencing Daumier.²³ Like *L’atelier*, in the *figures de fantaisie*, the “portraits” depict figures engaged in artistic practice or quiet engagement: they can be seen playing music (*Music*, 1769, Musée de Louvre, Paris), writing (*Inspiration*, Figure 3-3) and reading (*St. Jerome Reading*, 1765, Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg) among other imaginative pursuits. However, this emphasis on the senses is at one remove; the viewer cannot, of course, “hear” the music, nor “read” the texts, just as in Daumier’s *L’atelier* the viewer cannot discern what the artist depicts or listen to the model’s words. Instead, the viewer’s imagination is called upon to provide the words and sounds which cannot be fully expressed in paint, adding a degree of personal subjectivity to the painting. Additionally, the “enthused” touch of the artist, as signified by the sketch-like handling, accords with the figure depicted; both subject depicted and signifying style emphasize artistic, imaginative, and/or contemplative activity and processes. The intended sophisticated viewer is here not necessarily one of a certain financial or economic class, but rather of an intellectual,

²² Sheriff., *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 126.

²³ Pierre Georgel, in Mandel, *Tout l’œuvre peint de Daumier*, 6: “On comprend l’attraction qu’ont très probablement exercée sur notre peintre les “figures de fantaisie” de Fragonard, triomphe de la spontanéité jointe à la possession suprême du métier.” For Fragonard’s audience see Farouly and Eloy, eds., *La collection La Caze: chefs-d’œuvre des peintures des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*.

cerebral group, as the appreciation for the “sketch” exists in the interplay between representation and reality and an emphasis on contemplation and imagination.

In this sense, works by Daumier like *Pierrot jouant de la mandoline* (Figure 3-4) and *Le peintre* (Figure 3-5) seem to be nineteenth-century *figures de fantaisie*, as they emphasize the senses through their painterly tactility and call upon the viewer’s sensual imagination. In *Pierrot jouant de la mandoline*, the loose brushwork barely defines Pierrot’s form, engulfed as he is in the “energia” of the entangling lines of brushwork. Mouth open in mid-song, the blue streaks appearing to radiate from his mouth conflate sound and sight. As in Fragonard’s *figures de fantaisie*, the viewer decides what he “hears.” Likewise, the far-away gaze of the artist depicted in *Le peintre* as well as the light highlighting his countenance and his brushes, recalls Fragonard’s *Inspiration*. Just as the “Fantaisie Figure” clutches his quill inspired to write, *Le peintre*’s brushes are loaded for action, the blank canvas in the background poised to receive the spontaneous sketch of his *première pensée*. Incomplete, it is not *Le peintre*’s inspiration that provides the image to be painted, or “finished,” on the blank background canvas, but rather the viewer’s own imagination, fired by intimate engagement in reflecting on the *esquisse*.

Even works by Daumier featuring multiple figures such as *Un loge au théâtre* (Figure 3-6) or *Galerie de tableaux* (Figure 3-7) emphasize viewer participation and “seeing beyond” what is immediately perceived. In *Un loge au théâtre*, the viewer “sits” among the audience, perceiving them watching the show. A blur of yellows and greens, two figures vaporously appear on the stage, though no formal or iconographic qualities provide a discernible narrative; that remains for the viewer to determine. Similarly, in *Galerie de tableaux* three gentlemen stand in a room full of paintings, casually contemplating the artwork surrounding them, their viewing action mirroring the owner of the painting contemplating this work. As the men’s gazes

supersede the boundaries of Daumier's oil, the viewer is able to mentally "create" the work upon which the figures are focused, perhaps imagining them looking at the same painting he contemplates (in a very meta-representation fashion) or even another painting from his own collection. Like Fragonard's paintings, these images blur the distinctions between the artist representing and the figure represented, between imagination and reality, and between the senses expressed in subject matter with the viewer's visual sense. As such, these "sketches" demand the same particular, cultivated audience who would take pleasure in these interplays of representation.

However, painterly finish was not just restricted to intellectual and witty readings. In his erotic scenes, Fragonard used a similar painterly style of handling in which the textured surface arrests the viewer's attention on the sensuous nude bodies or even the water or cloth which "revealingly" conceals their nudity. Following the obvious movement of the brush in the visible skeins of paint in works like *The Bathers* (1767, Paris: Musée du Louvre), the viewer's eye strokes the flesh in the same way the paintbrush does and the painter's/viewer's "enthusiasm" is read as sexual desire.²⁴ A similar argument could be made for Fragonard's *New Model*, and it is important to distinguish Daumier from the erotic tradition of the sketch, as he instead translates the contemplative spirit of the sketch into scenes of everyday life.

As discussed in chapter two, in the nineteenth century and even earlier, the sketch was also of course equated with political subversion. Since the Renaissance, the debate between color ("painterliness") and lines has served political ideologies. For example, the Classicism of Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665) reigned in, or "disciplined," Rubens's coloristic mannerism, just as

²⁴ Sheriff, *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 149-152.

politically the “excess” of the Valois-Angoulême Kings was curbed by the Bourbons.²⁵ Similarly, Romantic artists such as Théodore Géricault (1791-1824) and Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863) rebelled against the restriction and oppression of the self-effacing Davidian “line” as the mandated style of the Academies. Though the imagery of Daumier’s paintings may appear innocuous, a taste for the eighteenth century during the nineteenth often encompassed political elements. On either end of the political spectrum, the eighteenth century served as inspiration for politicians, writers, artists, and collectors, as well as people of everyday life, who emulated Rococo fashions and *fêtes*. In large part, this blending of Rococo style and politics had to do with the many amateurs who remained devoted to collecting eighteenth-century art throughout the nineteenth-century, as they wrote about and later exhibited their collections.²⁶ As argued thus far, Daumier’s involvement with eighteenth-century aesthetics and style was certainly not apolitical. Moreover, as will be shown in the rest of this chapter, not just painting in this style but also collecting works with Rococo-esque “loose” brushwork carried multifaceted political resonances that will be important to keep in mind when considering the identity of the collectors of Daumier’s work.

The Aesthetics of the Sketch and Nineteenth-Century Collectors

The relationship between the amateur and the taste for the *esquisse* continued in the works of early nineteenth-century *petit-mâîtres*, Romantic painters, Realist artists, and Impressionists whose works were likewise purchased by the cultivated amateur, collector and fellow artist. In *The Persistence of Rococo*, Carol Duncan argues that the taste for sensuous brushwork associated with particular Rococo artists was never truly eliminated by the sharper,

²⁵ Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

²⁶ Unruh, *Aspiring to la Vie Galante*. For writing about and collecting eighteenth century art during the nineteenth century, see particularly chapters one and four.

more clearly defined line of Jacques-Louis David's Neoclassicism. Describing the "finesse of [Louis-Léopold Boilly's] brush"²⁷ or the number of amateurs collecting paintings featuring the "suavity of [Pierre-Paul Prud'hon's] brush,"²⁸ Duncan highlights the pleasure that painterly media affected. To Duncan, this continued use of sketch-like style allowed for the depiction of scenes "to be grasped through sense experience and feeling...such sense experience [being] valuable and pleasurable in itself."²⁹ Like Fragonard's *figures de fantaisie*, these modest early nineteenth-century works dedicated to the senses, emotions, and the imagination, were likewise purchased by the cultivated amateur, collector, and artist.³⁰

In her unpublished 2008 dissertation, *Aspiring to la Vie Galante: Reincarnations of Rococo in Second Empire France*, Allison Unruh builds on Duncan's breakthrough study to explore the revival of interest in eighteenth-century art in later years, between 1852 and 1870. Politically, this renewed interest represented a historicizing moment during the reign of Napoleon III in which the remnants of the glorious French past were reincorporated into the present. This stylistic-historical link was also seen in the previous chapter with Louis-Napoléon's favoring of Rubens as a painter of the noble French court and will be explored later in this chapter in the case of the Goncourt brothers who considered themselves progeny of the aristocracy and fashioned themselves as such through their writing and collecting of eighteenth-century work. Thus to some, the revived taste for the art, fashions, and fêtes of the *ancien régime*

²⁷ Carol Duncan, *The Persistence of Rococo*, (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1970): 30.

²⁸ Duncan, *The Persistence of Rococo*, 32.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 34.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 216.

during the Second Empire aligned with a revitalized aristocracy and indicated an allegiance to monarchical rule, particularly during this pinnacle of Rococo revival style.³¹

On the other hand, in addition to the historically rebellious political connotations of a sketch-like style discussed in the previous chapter with Rubens's *coloris*, taste for the eighteenth-century, like the Rococo itself, was not limited to courtly life. These tastes could also denote a more self-conscious middle and upper-middle class interest in politically progressive ideals inherited from the Enlightenment.³² Similar to how Thore' wrote of *faire* as the only thing that mattered, referring to Rococo painterly effects, loose finish and color became a marker of freedom and originality, artistically and politically during the monarchical restorations.³³ For instance, according to Dominique Jacquot, for wealthy amateurs like Francois Hippolyte Welferdin (1795-1880) and Henri Rochefort (1832-1913) who collected Rococo art but who as leftists opposed the politics of the Second Empire, "the eighteenth-century was the era of

³¹ For the fullest account for the taste for all things eighteenth-century during the Second Empire, see Unruh, "Aspiring to la Vie Galante." See also Melissa Hyde, "Rococo Redux: From the Style Moderne of the Eighteenth-Century to Art Nouveau," in *Rococo: The Continuing Curve, 1730-2008*, edited by Sarah D. Coffin, et. al. (New York: Cooper Hewitt National Design Museum, 2008): 14.

³² For the growing middle class's taste for the Rococo, see William Park, *The Idea of Rococo* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992). Though Patricia Crown's essay, "British Rococo as Social and Political Style," *American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Spring, 1990): 269-282, discusses the rise of the middle class and Rococo in England, her discussion of Rococo and caricature in the model of Hogarth is particularly interesting to compare with what is now known about Charles-Germain Saint-Aubin and, later, Daumier. For Saint-Aubin's political caricatures and their audience, see Colin Jones, Juliet Carey and Emily Richardson, ed., *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures': Drawing Satire in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2012). Finally, Michel Melot also discusses the rise of caricature (particularly with *Charivari*) as it occurred with the rise of the middle class following the French Revolution. Though Melot does not directly refer to the Rococo, his essay helps to connect nineteenth-century caricature and their empowered audience with what was initiated in the eighteenth-century though kept private through monarchical censorship. See Michel Melot, "Caricature and the Revolution: The Situation in France in 1789," in *French Caricature and the French Revolution*, edited by James Cuno (Los Angeles: Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, Wight Art Gallery, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988).

³³ See chapter 1 of Duncan, *The Persistence of Rococo*, as well as Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century*.

philosophers, hence of freedom.”³⁴ This Republican attitude toward the Rococo and its aesthetics is also evident in collectors of Daumier’s paintings, as will be portrayed in the rest of this chapter.

Examining the collections and writings of prominent nineteenth-century collectors and amateurs reveals a taste for eighteenth-century art in which the formal properties of line, brush, and more modest scale were valued for a variety of political, financial, and aesthetic reasons. In addition to paintings, prints and drawings were also prized items to be collected by the amateur. For instance, the Goncourt brothers thought of themselves as eighteenth-century aristocrats *manqué*, and therefore collecting Rococo works politically associated them with elite *ancien régime* society. Likewise, purchasing drawings by eighteenth-century masters constituted a way to collect more liberally within given financial restraints. Nevertheless, their writings on these works reveal the same passion and interest in the formal qualities of the “sketched” painting, such as an emphasis on intimacy and cultivated, imaginative viewing. As Unruh points out, Edmond and Jules de Goncourt “particularly appreciated the special intimacy of the drawn image, for its ability to reveal the hand of the artist, and his process of working through an image...Having faith in the expository power of the telling fragment, sketches were as valuable if not more intriguing than fully finished compositions for the brothers.”³⁵

This interest is more specifically revealed in the brothers’ series of essays on French eighteenth-century painters. These serially-published essays were composed in a poetic, literary fashion, based in biography and meticulous historical and archival research, though much

³⁴ Dominique Jacquot, “Cette Fraîcheur de l’esquisse qui est la beauté du diable de la peinture,” in *L’apothéose du geste: L’esquisse peinte au siècle de Boucher et Fragonard*, edited by Philippe Le Leyzour and Fabrice Hergott (Éditions Hazan, Paris, 2003): 61-63. Walferdin’s collection of over eighty paintings and 700 drawings by Fragonard were bequeathed to the Louvre at the time of his death.

³⁵ Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*, 231-232.

embellished and fictionalized. Despite this, their descriptions of the works they concern themselves with reveal their taste for seemingly speedily executed works, loose brushwork, evocative line, and sketches: Watteau's drawings are "rapidly executed," and display an "inexpressible quality"³⁶; ignoring conventional academic rules of *fini*, Quentin de La Tour is intentionally "oblivious of all rules and regulations, forgetting all he has learnt for the sake of what he sees," delighting instead in a "confection of little touches," "marks," and "effects"³⁷; Jean-Baptiste Greuze's "passages of painting [are] instinctively executed, the expression of a momentary intuition"³⁸; Boucher's drawings are "projects, sketches from nature, the germ of an idea, a line, the inspiration of a moment thrown boldly on to the paper by a hand in haste"³⁹ and his paintings are likewise "lively, facile sketches produced by the painter without effort"⁴⁰; rather than taking the "trouble to compose his picture, [Chardin] simply flings upon [the canvas] the bare truth that he finds around him,"⁴¹ the unfinished, "buttery quality of his touch," a genius impasto rather than a conventionally polished oil.⁴²

³⁶Jules and Edmond de Goncourt, *French Eighteenth Century Painters*, translated with an introduction by Robin Ironside (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 43: "What draughtsman, indeed, has been able to endow the most rapidly executed drawings with that inexpressible quality we find in Watteau's?" Also, 44: "Here are pencil strokes which, we may confidently and resolutely assert, could have been drawn by nobody but Watteau, and whose quality needs no signature. Look at the *pulsations of the pencil* on these heads of men and women, at this *complexity of slashing strokes* over the original stumpings, *tiny reiterated touches*, *accents* put in with a blunted point, rounded indentations following the contour of a muscle, observe these trifles, *these little felicities of art which are all-important*—an agglomeration of minutiae, inspired and spontaneous, discovered as he worked from the model, enlivening his drawing with a thousand details from nature, vivifying the full tone of the flat paper with the relief and solidity almost of paint" (italics, mine).

³⁷ de Goncourt., *French Eighteenth Century Painters*, 188-189.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 216.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 69.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 69.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 116: "He scarcely seems to trouble to compose his picture; he simply flings upon it the bare truth that he finds around him."

⁴² *Ibid.*, 126.

Of all the artists about whom the Goncourt brothers wrote though, Fragonard appears to be the artist who best exemplifies their aesthetic opinions. As Robin Ironside points out in the introduction to his translation of the Goncourt's *French Eighteenth-Century Painters*, the brothers required that "painting should, in the first place, delight the eyes, that it should not aspire to effect much more than the recreation of the optic nerve, that the pleasures it provides are, in the main, sensuous in a materialistic sense,"⁴³ a very "de Pilesian" conception of art's function. With Fragonard, the brothers' emphasis is completely on the cognitive evocations induced by the sketch through their "unique charm of partial revelation,"⁴⁴ "suggestions" and "hints"⁴⁵ induced by the brush or the pencil more than by the particular subject matter. The Goncourt brothers crowned Fragonard the "sketcher of genius,"⁴⁶ his cultivated *esquisses* not merely a stage of painting but instead "it's ideal."⁴⁷ The Goncourts' emphasis on the sketch privileges "genius" and "originality" rather than an instantiated system of meaning, or as Sheriff characterizes it, a "performance" whose sketch-like "improvisation depends on a prior mastery of technique [and] a learned command of aesthetic principles."⁴⁸

⁴³ Robin Ironside, "Introduction" to *French Eighteenth Century Painters* by Jules and Edmond de Goncourt, vii-viii.

⁴⁴ de Goncourt, 286: "It is the unique charm of partial revelation. His decency consists in the lightness of his touch. His colors are not the pigments of a painter but the suggestions of a poet."

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 287: "He sketches the movement, hints at the rhythm of a body."

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 288: "Fragonard was a sketcher of genius. It is in his sketches that the fullness of his talent bursts upon us." Also, see 290: "More than any of his contemporaries, Fragonard cultivated this rapid manner of painting which grasps the general impression of things and flings it on to the canvas like an instantaneous image."

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 288: "But the *esquisse* is more than the excuse for Fragonard's art, more than its veil; it is, in a way, it's ideal. A writer who is himself a painter and a poet, M. Paul de Saint-Victor, has charmingly said: 'The touch of Fragonard resembles those accents which, in certain languages, give to mute words a melodious sound. His figures, though merely indicated, live, breath, smile, and delight. Their very indecisiveness has the attraction of a tender mystery. They speak in low voices and glide past on tiptoe. Their gestures are like furtive signs exchanged by lovers in the darkness. They are the voluptuous shades of the eighteenth century.'

⁴⁸ Sheriff, *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 184.

Other nineteenth-century amateurs were equally enamored by this style of handling. According to Unruh, for physician and avid art collector Louis La Caze whose collection of Rococo works would later establish the Louvre's eighteenth-century wing, the sketch "represented the aesthetic principles to which he was dedicated in his collection of other schools, particularly a sensual handling of paint, modestly scaled pictures and intimately treated subjects."⁴⁹ Collecting *esquisses* distinguished La Caze as a knowledgeable collector/amateur.⁵⁰ Most exemplary of this is his ownership of Fragonard's *L'Abbé de Saint-Non* (1769, Musée de Louvre, Paris), one of the *figures de fantaisie*, in which the freedom of handling associated with the sketch, appears in a highly finished work. In addition to appreciating Fragonard's aesthetics, as a member of the nouveau-riche, for La Caze to collect Fragonard might also symbolize upward class mobility. As already indicated, for Hippolyte Walferdin, collecting Fragonard was expressly political. Making a gift to the Louvre of *The Music Lesson* (1769, Paris: Musée du Louvre) during the early days of the Second Republic he stipulated that "to the Republic I make this gift."⁵¹ Richard Rand argues that the appeal free paint handling of this painting and others like it which he collected, was its signification for liberty and Enlightenment.⁵²

⁴⁹ Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*, 265. Unruh also notes how La Caze's collection included artists such as Rembrandt van Rijn, Frans Hals, and Chardin, all artists known for their "loose" handling of paint and/or drawn sketches. These artists have also been connected to Daumier; see Melot "Daumier and Art History."

⁵⁰ Unruh, "The quality that perhaps most united his eclectic array of works was their resistance to conventional classicism, and their emphasis on a sensuously tactile handling of paint. Far from the staid character of neo-classical formulas that favored cold clarity of line and didactic themes, La Caze's painting cabinet was suffused by rich coloration, a distinct suppleness of paint, and a vivid sense of touch. He favored the spontaneity of *esquisses*, an interest which distinguished him as a collector of paintings at the time, yet harmonized with the Goncourt's priorities in their privileging of drawings. Fragonard's *L'Abbé de Saint-Non*, one of his legendary swiftly-executed portraits, is paradigmatic of this taste for the sketch."

⁵¹ As quoted in Richard Rand, "Painted in an Hour: Impressionism and Eighteenth-Century French Art," in *Inspiring Impressionism: The Impressionists and the Art of the Past*, edited by Ann Dumas (New Haven and London: Yale University Press): 137.

⁵² See Richard Rand, "Painted in an Hour: Impressionism and Eighteenth-Century French Art," 137.

While the Goncourt brothers, La Caze, and Walferdin represent more affluent and elite amateurs, the rise of the middle class in the Second Empire produced a new population of collector/amateurs.⁵³ Though their wealth might not have been extensive enough to purchase paintings by the eighteenth-century masters, collecting more modest works by nineteenth-century artists allowed these new amateurs to participate in the culture of collecting as well as to indulge their own aesthetic appreciation. Regardless of finances, the consumers of Daumier's oil paintings during this time period analyzed by Unruh share the same preoccupations as the audience discussed by Sheriff for Fragonard's paintings: "connoisseurs, amateurs and artists who made, bought sold and wrote about painting," albeit in the nineteenth-century.

Daumier's *Amateurs*: Artists, Critics, and Collectors

In his introduction to Gabriel Mandel's *catalogue raisonné* of Daumier's paintings *Tout L'Oeuvre Peint de Daumier*, Pierre Georgel focuses on Daumier's painterly "finish" in accordance with how the paintings should be viewed. According to Georgel, Daumier's paintings are personal, private images for reflection.⁵⁴ Unlike the social and political epoch depicted in his lithographs for *Charivari*, Daumier's paintings are of "poetic and contemplative times," speaking to a private audience rather than the public.⁵⁵ Combined with the sketch-like brushwork, the banal subject matter of peopled landscapes, lawyers, artists at their easels, children, etc. become

⁵³ Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*, 223.

⁵⁴ Aaron Scharf also considers this line of interpretation, suggesting that Daumier's paintings represent more contemplative images. As Scharf says: "The good-natured disdain and sometimes the indignation with which Daumier executed his lithographs and water-colours is seldom to be found in his paintings. His painted world is a private world." With his "preference for softer, more fluid forms, [which break] the rigid barriers of enclosed contours," Scharf suggests the images as "highly personal." See Aaron Scharf, "Daumier the Painter," *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 103, No. 701 (August 1961): 356-359.

⁵⁵ Georgel, 5: "Temps poétique et contemplative: l'artiste, las de suivre la minute qui passe, se retire, prend *son* temps... Que cet art n'ait pas rencontré, du vivant de Daumier, l'approbation de la multitude, il n'y a pas de quoi s'étonner. En fait, il ne lui était pas destiné. Au caricaturiste de s'adresser au plus grand nombre; le peintre, lui, se parle d'abord à lui-même."

objects of poetry, for intimate, and perhaps even unconscious, reflection and reverie.⁵⁶ Daumier achieves this end of personal aesthetic meditation, through the “spontaneous” and “intimate” brushwork, the unfinished surface space as the place “where ones’ self seeks, frees himself, pours himself, secretly, passionately”⁵⁷:

In the painting (like in many drawings), the graphic quality, instead of defining a form at first, goes on an adventure. It searches for space, raises trembling lines, confuses a tangle of strokes, of masses, that the imagination sometimes likes to clarify, sometimes to conserve in its suggestive ambiguity. It spreads and is reabsorbed in a play of brush, of touch, of spots, in deep mysteries of perspective, of chiaroscuro, of color, in a delectable thickness of the material picture... One understands the attractions that Fragonard’s *figures de fantaisie* very probably exercised on our painter, a triumph of spontaneity joined to the supreme possession of craft.⁵⁸

This description of Daumier’s paintings agrees with the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century amateurs’ interest in the *esquisse*. Intimate, somewhat ambiguous, and relying on the beholder’s imagination, like Fragonard’s paintings Daumier’s images appear impulsive but are “joined to the supreme possession of craft”; they are carefully constructed, the “spontaneous” line intentionally articulated in alignment with the “simple” subject matter for deliberate contemplative purpose.

Though Georgel argues that Daumier painted these images for himself rather than for an audience, investigating the provenance of these paintings reveals their connection to artists, critics, and collectors similar to the eighteenth-century amateur, which will be the focus of the

⁵⁶ Georgel., 7: “Il trouve dans la banalité moderne un objet de poésie, qu’il pénètre de réflexion et de rêverie, qu’il charge de signification intime, inconsciente peut-être,”

⁵⁷ Ibid., 8: “...espaces où le moi se cherche, se délivre, s’épanche, secrètement, passionnément.”

⁵⁸ Ibid., 6: “Dans la peinture (comme dans beaucoup de dessins), le graphisme, au lieu de définir une forme a priori, part à l’aventure. Il fouille l’espace, suscite de tremblants linéaments, embrouille un écheveau de traits, de masses, que l’imagination se plaît tantôt à préciser, tantôt à conserver dans leur ambiguïté suggestive. Il s’étale et se résorbe dans le jeu de pinceau, de la touche, de la tâche, dans les profondeurs mystérieuses de la perspective, du clair-obscur, de la couleur, dans la délectable épaisseur de la matière picturale... On comprend l’attraction qu’ont très probablement exercée sur notre peintre les ‘figures de fantaisie’ de Fragonard, triomphe de la spontanéité jointe à la possession suprême du métier.”

rest of this chapter. As mentioned in the beginning of this thesis, while Daumier's paintings may have been "discovered" by the broader public with the 1878 Durand-Ruel exhibition, most were loaned from private owners who had been quietly purchasing these never-exhibited works years before they were "revealed." These owners include prominent collectors who also purchased eighteenth-century art and Impressionist paintings, similarly connected to eighteenth-century "amateur art" with their sensual and material brushwork⁵⁹; other artists who used "loose" paint handling, attentive to such formal and metaphysical purposes; and critics and writers sympathetic to the poetic, inward-looking qualities evoked and the wit of representation commenting on itself, features shared by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art associated with modernism.

All of Daumier's amateurs partook of the aesthetics of the sketch, not just collecting Daumier's work and eighteenth-century art, but also amassing other nineteenth-century paintings that likewise exhibited sketch-like brushwork. For example, Dr. Georges de Bellio (1828-1894), a physician and art collector, owned *L'atelier/Homage à Fragonard*.⁶⁰ De Bellio's collection of Impressionist paintings, gifted by his daughter in 1957, formed the foundation of the Musée Marmottan Monet in Paris. In the nineteenth century, Isaac de Camondo, a member of the wealthy Parisian Camondo family whose home and eighteenth-century art collection is preserved in Paris as the Musée de Camondo, owned Daumier's *Galerie de tableaux*. Blatantly, this work thematizes collecting and its pleasures and speaks to the collector by depicting three amateurs casually considering the work that surround them. As for the appreciation of painterly brushwork, like his family Isaac de Camondo also collected eighteenth-century Rococo art. However, Isaac's reputation as a collector lies in his amassing of nineteenth-century work

⁵⁹ See Richard Rand, "Painted in an Hour: Impressionism and Eighteenth-Century French Art," 135-155.

⁶⁰ For de Bellio's collecting practices, see Remus Niclescu, "Georges de Bellio, L'ami des Impressionnistes," *Paragone*, vol. XXI, issue 247 (Sept. 1970): 25-66.

including *The Fifer* by Edouard Manet (1865, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), *Rouen Cathedral* by Monet (1894, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), and *The Tub* by Edgar Degas (1886, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), artists renowned for the sensuous paint handling who have recently also been connected to eighteenth-century influences.⁶¹

Close friend Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot owned several versions of *L'amateur d'estampes*, including the one now housed in the Musée des Beaux-Arts de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais (Figure 3-8). As a landscape painter of the Barbizon school, Corot's own paintings are often referred to as *études*, exhibiting similar fluid brushwork to Daumier. Daumier's painting found favor among many other artists as well: Barbizon landscapist Charles-François Daubigny owned *Pierrot jouant de la mandoline*, *Un loge au théâtre*, and *Le liseur* (Figure 3-9); sculptor and goldsmith Adolphe-Victor Geoffroy-Dechaume lived near Daumier in Valmondois and purchased *Femme portant un enfant* (1873, Private collection of Peter Nathan, Zurich), as well as *Le peintre*; wood engraver and painter Hippolyte Augustin Lavoignat owned *Un lecteur* (Date unknown, USA: Private collection), balloonist and photographer Nadar had in his collection *Don Quichotte et Sancho Panza* (after 1850, Itami City Museum of Art, Japan) and Edgar Degas owned an early version of Daumier's *Don Quichotte lisant*. Art critics and writers Octave Mirbeau and Roger Marx each also owned oils by Daumier; Marx owned a version of *Don Quichotte et Sancho Panza sous un arbre* (1865, Abegg Foundation, Switzerland) and Mirbeau *La femme au ruban bleu* (1860, Dumbarton Oaks Foundation, Washington D.C.).

Paintings not sold directly to these collectors, artists and writers, were purchased by dealers such

⁶¹ Though I had seen the name of Isaac de Camondo mentioned in Mandel's *Tout l'Oeuvre peint de Daumier*, his family history and connection to eighteenth century art and collecting was brought to my attention by Dr. Sheryl Kroen during a lecture on 19 October 2011. For information on Isaac de Camondo, see: <http://www.lesartsdecoratifs.fr/francais/nissim-de-camondo/la-famille-de-camondo/la-genealogie/isaac-de-camondo-1851-1911>. For Monet, Manet, and Degas' connection to eighteenth century work see *Inspiring Impressionism*, edited by Ann Dumas as well as *The Private Collection of Edgar Degas*, edited by Ann Dumas (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997).

as Ambrose Vollard, Gaston Alexandre Camentron, Bernheim Jeune, and Paul Durand-Ruel, who sold similar style paintings to private collectors and amateurs.

Ignoring Daumier's emphasis on materiality and looking disregards the depth of Daumier's work and his influences. In addition to the biting satire for which he is known, Bruce Laughton correctly points out that during Daumier's lengthy career, the "lightness of French rococo comes to form one distinct strand in Daumier's development as an artist."⁶² This is true not only of his early paintings whose nymphs and satyrs recall Rubenesque and/or Rococo mythologies, or his later "Figures of Fantaisie" such as *Pierrot jouant de la mandoline* and *Le peintre* that seem to reply directly to Fragonard, but even extends to Daumier's scenes "of their time": of bourgeois subjects examining prints in shops, of theater goers intently gazing at the staged theater performance, of readers pondering the written word. Based on an engagement with eighteenth-century painting and audiences which had a continued presence throughout the nineteenth-century, Daumier appears as a more complex artist working as a "witness to the times" not just politically and socially, but artistically as well, engaged in the nineteenth-century continuation of Rococo visual and aesthetic ideals.

⁶² Laughton, *Honoré Daumier*, 31.

CHAPTER 4
FRAMING ROCOCO REVIVALS: ROCOCO SUBVERSION AND THE *IDYLLES*
PARLEMENTAIRES

In the short years of the Second Republic (1848-1852), press censorship was briefly lifted. During this time, Daumier created a series of twenty-seven caricatures titled *Idylles parlementaires*, sixteen of which were published in *Charivari* from September 1850- February 1851. In some ways, the *Idylles parlementaires* seem to be his most explicitly “Rococo” works, with iconography that evokes conventional eighteenth-century figured pastoral landscapes surrounded by Louis XV-style frames. However, given that the figures depicted are slovenly, nude politicians, at first look, the series seems antagonistic to the Rococo. As Jean Adhémar remarked and conjectured in 1954:

1850 shows Daumier interested in the same research, always in a Rubensian style. The lithographs of *Idylles parlementaires* are of fat, naked deputies dancing grotesquely or taking attitudes of mythological characters... This is a return to his farces about actors and mythology; they are also charges against the gallant mythologies of the eighteenth century back in fashion, and whose comedy is underscored by the ornate frames; he is delighted with these ‘triumphant, incredible’ frames. Huh, he said, ‘one cannot say that I do not do anything decorative and flashy,’ and he laughed heartily, delighted with his series and success.¹

Yet given what we know of Daumier’s artistic self-alignment with Rubens and the style he sired, and his positive engagement with Rococo aesthetics in painting, Daumier’s use of this particular visual iconography raises several questions. For instance, in what ways, in the *Idylles*

¹ Jean Adhémar, *Honoré Daumier* (Éditions Pierre Tisné, Paris, 1954): 42. “1850 montre Daumier intéressé par les mêmes recherches, toujours dans un style rubénien. Il lithographie des *Idylles parlementaires*, c’est-à-dire des députés dévêtus, gras, dansant de façon grotesque ou prenant les attitudes des personnages mythologiques. Buffet, dont la laideur est proverbiale, devient un Narcisse, le petit Thiers est travesti en Amour, l’énorme Boulay de la Meurthe en Zéphyr (d’après le tableau de Prudhon). C’est un retour à ses farces sur les acteurs et la mythologie; ce sont aussi des charges contre les mythologies galantes du XVIIIe siècle qui reviennent à la mode, et dont le comique est souligné par les cadres ouvragés; il est enchanté de ces cadres <<triumphantes, incroyables>>. Hein, dit-il, <<on ne dira pas que je ne fais pas de l’ornement et du tapé>>; et il rit de bon cœur, enchanté de sa suite et de son succès. En même temps, il peint des Nymphes, des Satyres, dont les têtes féroces et ironiques deviendront celles de ses *Bon Bourgeois*, jusque-là plutôt hébétés que tragiques. Il dessine l’admirable *Baiser* du Louvre, appelé aussi *Adam et Ève*, titre qui souligne sa beauté durable, hors de toute anecdote.” See also Ségolène Le Men, “1848 and the Second Republic,” in Henri Loyrette, ed., *Daumier, 1808-1879*, 242.

parlementaires lithographs, is Daumier engaging with the Rococo differently than in his paintings? In the *Idylles parlementaires*, does Daumier mock the Rococo or just a version of it, “the gallant mythologies of the eighteenth century back in fashion”? Conceived in a “Rubensian style,” are the *Idylles parlementaires* an example of Daumier using Rubens/Rococo strategies to subvert artistic/political authority? Or is he just showing his “colors”?

In this chapter, I argue that even in these lithographs which are explicitly political in subject matter (unlike most of his paintings), Daumier still shares a similar spirit with the Rococo and even uses some of their same strategies to express his political discontent. Rather than just mocking a politically and materially decadent version of the eighteenth century to draw comparisons with contemporary politics after the failed Revolutions, I argue that the *Idylles parlementaires* actually effectively takes up strategies of the “subversive Rococo,” as discussed by scholars such as Mary Sheriff, Katie Scott, and William Park, among others. Comparing the *Idylles parlementaires* with eighteenth-century political satire such as that of Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin (1721-1786), and to Rococo print culture which undercut the authority of high art and class, Daumier appears to recall, rather than contradict, the Rococo as an epoch of resistance and a nineteenth-century emblem of “freedom.”

The ‘Parlementairians’: A Revival of Monarchical Politics and Style

The *Idylles parlementaires* thematically and stylistically recall the pastoral Rococo of Boucher and Fragonard through the use of Louis XV inspired frames, an emphasis on fleshy human forms, and idyllic bucolic settings.² Looking at *Empire, Orléanisme et Légitimité* (Figure 4-1), a lithograph whose spirit and humor is emblematic of the entire series, one gets the

² Both Boucher’s and Fragonard’s oeuvres are of course much more diverse and are not limited to pastoral scenes. However, the pastoral style that Daumier’s lithographs recall include works like Boucher’s *Jupiter and Calisto* (1759, Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City) or *Mercury Confiding Bacchus to the Nymphs* (1732, Wallace Collection, London).

impression of viewing a copy of a painting hanging on a museum wall. Daumier pays equal attention to the depiction of the unique frame as he does to the internal image. Weighted with a proliferation of waves and sinuous curves, the inside edge of the frame undulates to give it a soft and organic feel. Within this highly-crafted frame, three winged men race across an open field, staggered such that the greatest amount of flesh of each of their bodies—save for strategically placed fluttering cloths protecting, yet calling attention to, their “modesty”—is on view. In the distance, three other winged figures look on. Rather than voyeuristically taking delight in these fleshy forms as one might with Fragonard’s unsuspecting bathing beauties,³ with arms crossed, the background figures look on the three running “graces” unimpressed.

And rightly so. The three running men are pointedly not the beauties of a Boucher. Instead of flowing, flaxen locks, the figure on the left has almost a bird’s nest for hair in contrast to his ridiculously luxurious mustache, and his sunken cheeks and aging, saggy body conflict with the more typically portrayed rosy complexions and supple forms. With such a short stature, pinched face, arched brows, and glasses, the right-hand “putti” is equally de-eroticized, though perhaps not as much as the central figure. The inflated jowls and grimacing visage of the largest mythologized figure seems to emit an audible groan as the group appears to fall rather than frolic, led by his protruding paunch.

Moreover, these are not just “un-idealized” types. Though the sparse landscape suggests the countryside far outside the governmental center of urban Paris, these characters are actually political celebrities, visually identifiable from left to right as Jean Ernest du Cos, Comte de Lahitte (1789-1878), Pierre Antoine Berryer (1790-1868), and Marie Joseph Louis Adolph

³ See Mary Sheriff’s description of Fragonard’s *The Bathers* (1767, Musée du Louvre, Paris) in *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*, 113-116.

Thiers (1797-1877). This identification is reinforced by the “Quatrain” printed below the image outside the frame, which reads:

Empire, Orleanism and Legitimacy
Contend for the prize in an active contest
Forgetting the saying so frequently cited:
At the end of the ditch, a somersault.
(Quatrain from the treasure of the Elysée.)⁴

This scene is thus not one of innocent, sensual amusement or diversion. Daumier’s proverb presciently and ironically indicates that by engaging in monarchical politics (the Elysée was the Royal palace) danger is imminent (“Au bout du fossé la culbute”) for Lahitte of the Empire, Berryer the Legitimist, and Thiers the Orleanist. Lahitte’s career as an officer of a military originally empowered by Napoléon would terminate with the end of the Empire; the possibility of an heir to Berryer’s Legitimist party, Henry V, ended with Charles X’s exile after the July revolution; and despite political promises, Thiers, who was active in the formation of the Orleanist Monarchy under Louis-Philippe, was shortly replaced.⁵

What immediately comes through is that here fine art—through the use of frame, text and derivative composition—is mocked at the expense of political satire. Moreover, Daumier does not just choose any fine art to simulate, but specifically a style strikingly similar to the art of the Rococo. The series was made during a time when Rococo art and decoration were rapidly

⁴ Empire, Orleanisme et Légitimité
Se disputent le prix en une ardente lutte,
Oubliant le dicton, si fréquemment cité,
Au bout du fossé la culbute.
(Quatrain trouvé dans la boîte de l’Elysée.)

⁵ For information on this print, see *H. Daumier: Lithographer-Satirist: Selected Illustrations, 1831-1872*. [exhibition], April 1 - July 9, 1978, New Jersey State Museum, Trenton. 1978 and Philippe Robert-Jones, “Honoré Daumier: critique d’art,” *Bulletin de la Classe des Beaux-Arts, Academie Royale de Belgique* (1975): 17.

returning to vogue with the rise of Louis-Napoléon and the Second Empire. In 1848, Louis-Napoléon was elected president through popular vote, but in 1851 he would initiate a coup to become Emperor Napoléon III by 1852, and the Rococo revival became a signature idiom of his Empire as it connected his reign to past monarchical glories. At this same time in which the *Idylles parlementaires* were printed, censorship against caricature and against the press had been lifted by the new constitution of November 4, 1848, once again providing Daumier the right to publically make his political opinions known via the press.⁶ Depicting a political regime of which Daumier was weary—despite the constitutional freedom of the press, between 1849-51 prosecutions of Republican printers continued regardless of new laws⁷—these caricatures seem to align with the moralizing message of those eighteenth-century critics who viewed the Rococo as decadent and dangerous.⁸

In his essay on “Caricature and the Revolution,” Michel Melot defines the practice of caricature as “a subversive weapon whereby a political model is dismantled by an aesthetic model...Hence, in caricature there is transgression (of an aesthetic norm) for the purpose of aggression (against a social model).”⁹ The *Idylles parlementaires* clearly “transgresses” a Rococo stylistic norm in order to challenge a current social/political model. As we saw with the continued debates over *colore/disegno* from Rubens to the Rococo, style and politics were often

⁶ Justin Robert Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France* (Kent, Ohio and London England: The Kent State University Press, 1989): 169.

⁷ Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France*, 171.

⁸ Unruh, *Aspiring to La Vie Galante*, 21

⁹ Michel Melot, “Caricature and the Revolution: The Situation in France in 1789,” in *French Caricature and the French Revolution*, edited by James Cuno (Los Angeles: Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, Wight Art Gallery, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988): 26. For Melot’s broader theories of caricature (which traces caricature particularly to sixteenth-century portrait painting), see Michel Melot, “La Caricature ou l’imitation contrariée,” in *L’imitation, aliénation ou source de liberté: Rencontres de l’Ecole du Louvre* (Paris: La Documentation française, 1985): 231-240.

compounded. Here, the timing and the iconography of the *Idylles parlementaires* is prophetic and critical of both revivalist taste and politics during the Second Empire. The context of the images and texts that Daumier included throughout the series, expressed through a humorous denunciation of contemporary taste for mythologized Rococo revivals, implicates past and present Imperial politicians.

Daumier may have been so bold as to mock Louis-Philippe in his infamous *Gargantua* lithographs, but in the *Idylles parlementaires*, Louis-Napoléon is not the subject of his ridicule. Instead Daumier directs his biting wit at specific politicians who by opposing the Republic were trying to reestablish a monarchical government based on an eighteenth-century model. As already stated, this political maneuver was propagandistically enhanced through the use of a revived visual culture to recall the glories of the French court. Returning to *Empire, Orléanisme et Légitimité*, Thiers is not merely an Orleanist who lost political favor. Thiers also supported the monarchist movement of Louis-Napoléon in 1848,¹⁰ and he appears in Daumier's caricatures more frequently than any other parliamentarian, illustrated in seven of the published lithographs and five of the unpublished ones. Berryer's flabby figure not only makes for an easy one to mock; he appears in four published *Idylles parlementaires* and four unpublished. As a lawyer and royalist deputy, Berryer also supported Louis-Napoléon's monarchical aspirations, as did Lahitte who Louis-Napoléon later appointed as State Secretary.

The other *Idylles parlementaires* caricatures all depict similar political figures who supported Louis-Napoléon and his Empire aspirations; all the lithographs are likewise styled with proto-Second Empire Rococo revival iconography and composition. For example

¹⁰ Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature*, 152.

“Cupidon” (Figure 4-2) depicts a dinner party *en plein air*, with Thiers coquettishly posing as a statue of cupid; also attending this mock-celebration are Louis-Mathieu Molé (1781-1855) and Charles Forbes de Thyon, Conte de Montalembert (1810-1870). Similarly, “Nymphs d’allentour” (Figure 4-3) features a river-bathing scene, à la Fragonard, but here Joseph Balthasar Gustave de Laboulie (1800-1867), Molé, and Marie François Emile Vesin (1803-1867), depicted at different stages of undress, are the showering nymphs. Other politicians represented throughout the series include Henri Georges Boulay de la Meurthe (1797-1858), Jules-Antoine Taschereau (1801-1874), Leon Leonard Joseph Faucher (1803-1854), Pierre Dupont (1821-1870), and Raymond Joseph Paul Louis Aguesseau (1803-1889) among others. Many of these politicians and writers originally supported the Republic, but later joined the more conservative faction of Louis-Napoléon, often due to political appointments and favors, a point at which Daumier took aim.¹¹

But in addition to targeting these parliamentarians of the rising Second Empire within the artistic idiom of the regime (the Rococo revival based on monarchical ideals), the aesthetic model Daumier employs to do so still shares a spirit with others aspects and media of the eighteenth-century Rococo. The next section will discuss the “subversive Rococo,” revealing parallel strategies of subverting authority, which Daumier probably understood owing to his life-long engagement with eighteenth-century art.

The Subversive Rococo

Several scholars have argued for a “subversive” side to the Rococo, often identified in the way in which it undermines that which it appears to be.¹² Such contradiction can be found, as

¹¹ Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature*, 176-178.

¹² A brief summary of the subversive Rococo can be found in Mary Sheriff’s entry on “Rococo” in *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, edited Alan Kors (Oxford University Press, 2003). Other motifs and genres within the Rococo which Sheriff identifies as (potentially) subversive include “Carnival, the grotesque, the comic, or the mixing of high and low genres.” In addition to scholars mentioned in chapter two, Katie Scott and William Park are two art historians who have stressed the subversive strain of the Rococo. In *Rococo Interiors*, Katie Scott suggests the

William Park points out, in even one of the earliest and most emblematic works of the Rococo, Antoine Watteau's *Gersaint's Shoppsign* (Figure 4-4).¹³ To begin with, the painting was not intended to be purchased by an aristocratic customer like those it depicts. *Gersaint's Shoppsign* is exactly that which its title suggests, merely an advertisement, "low art," for a picture shop. And though the two-piece panel depicts elegant figures milling about looking at possible paintings to purchase, it does so with a hint of satire, as several of the shoppers appear absorbed in themselves (gazing into a mirror on the counter) or in the beauty of the shop girl rather than the oils. The most striking contradiction of courtly and elite culture that Park highlights is the sideways portrait of Louis XIV being packed away in a box of straw, "caught in the unhierarchical moment in a most undignified position."¹⁴

This type of ironic humor is similar to that found in England, such as in William Hogarth's (1697-1764) six paintings for *Marriage à-la-Mode* (1743-1745, National Gallery, London), which elegantly depict, yet poke fun at, both aristocratic and bourgeois conventions, a biting humor equally evident in Hogarth's prints.¹⁵ A difference often alluded to between French and British Rococo forms of subversion is that, according to Patricia Crown, the buyers of British

power ornament and decoration had in subverting authority. For instance, the grotesques and cartouches on the margins "challenged the meaning of the central motif," and "inverted the hierarchical relationship of image and frame, and tacitly condemned the superior authority of heraldry" (181). Other examples of Rococo subversion of authority include *fête galantes* and pastorals (154-166), due to the shift relationship of the court with the country. In *The Idea of Rococo*, William Park considers the Rococo as particularly subversive of institutional authority and class. In Park's research, the *gout moderne* was a thoroughly modern style apart from the traditional Academy; with the production of Rococo works in all media (rather than just painting, sculpture, and architecture), people of lesser finances could still purchase Rococo objects. Seen revived in the nineteenth-century, Gail S. Davidson's essay "Emulation and Subversion: Nineteenth-Century Rococo Revivals in the Graphic Arts" deals with nineteenth-century print subversion, though her emphasis is on poster design, rather than lithography. See her essay in *Rococo: The Continuing Curve, 1730-2008*, edited by Sarah D. Coffin et. al. (New York: Cooper Hewitt National Design Museum, 2008): 169-179.

¹³ Park, *The Idea of Rococo*, 42.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 29-30.

Rococo art “belonged to social and economic classes close to and including the artisans themselves.”¹⁶ In his *Analysis of Beauty* (1753), Hogarth himself spoke for the Rococo as it was appreciated by the new middle class, and he did so in social and political terms by describing the style as one of freedom, invention, and variation, without rules or authority.¹⁷

Yet in many ways, this was also the case in France. As already seen, for many artists and collectors, the Rococo represented freedom from the Academy as well as from the French noble court. And as just discussed, *Gersaint’s Shopsign* was commissioned by a merchant, not by someone from a courtly social or economic class. Like Hogarth later, Watteau’s style also shirks rules and authority stylistically in his relationship with the French Academy,¹⁸ and also politically in his depiction of the overturned portrait of Louis XIV. The *goût moderne* of Watteau, a style contrary to courtly history or mythological painting, also quickly became the style of the non-noble elites and appealed to an audience of amateurs, like those described in chapter 3.¹⁹ Further breaking class and financial boundaries, even in the “purest form of Rococo,”²⁰ the decorative prints by artists like Juste-Aurèle Meissonier (1695-1750) or Jacques de Lajoüe (1687-1761), the blending of high and low art forms and courtly and bourgeois traditions appears. Unlike the paintings or elaborate interiors of the elite, these Rococo decorative prints were affordable and often purchased by a range of middle-class consumers,

¹⁶ Patricia Crown, “British Rococo as Social and Political Style,” *American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Spring, 1990): 270.

¹⁷ Crown, “British Rococo as Social and Political Style,” 279-280.

¹⁸ Julie-Anne Plax, “Interpreting Watteau across the Centuries,” in *Antoine Watteau: Perspectives on the Artist and the Culture of his Time*, edited by Mary D. Sheriff (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006): 28-40.

¹⁹ See also “Amateur Artists” in *Dictionary of Women Artists*, vol. I, edited by Delia Gaze (London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1997): 66-80.

²⁰ This would be according to Fiske Kimball who argues that Rococo only describes the decorative arts of the time period which literally displays the *rocaille* or shell-like forms, not any paintings or sculptures. See Fiske Kimball, *The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style* (New York: Dover Publications, 1980), 3.

appreciated as objects in their own right.²¹ This was particularly the case, since in their invention and abstract qualities many became autonomous objects, structurally impossible to manufacture the item depicted within the print. Conceivable only in paper form, these Rococo prints were affordable to a greater range of consumers.²²

Rococo Caricature

The type of political and class subversive humor evinced in the examples of Watteau and Hogarth is often associated with caricature. As a medium, this category of representation in France is typically considered to come into being with the Revolution and further developed shortly thereafter. Michel Melot argues its nascence with the French Revolution, in which a visual aesthetics and iconography developed around pro- and counter- revolutionary political and social debates.²³ As small objects privately kept in folios to be brought out in the company of family or friends or to be secretly passed around, revolutionary ideology could be surreptitiously shared among the like-minded. During the early decades of the nineteenth-century, printing techniques were further advanced with lithography and censorship laws were lifted sufficiently that a public, middle-class audience could rally behind journals in which they were published, such as *Charivari* and *Le Caricature*, solidifying caricature's status and allowing it to more freely develop.²⁴

²¹ Scott, *The Rococo Interior: Decoration and Social Spaces in Early Eighteenth-Century France*, 247.

²² Scott, *The Rococo Interior*, 249.

²³ For caricature and the French Revolution see James Cuno, ed., *French Caricature and the French Revolution, 1789-1799*, André Blum, *La Caricature Révolutionnaire (1789 à 1795)* (Paris: Jouve & cie, 1916), and Annie Duprat, *Histoire de France par la Caricature* (Paris: Larousse, 1999).

²⁴ “These attempts to create timely imagery linked with the press constituted the beginnings of what the bourgeoisie of the July Monarchy would achieve forty years later with *Le Charivari*. By that time the French middle class had become self-conscious and could recognize itself in Daumier’s caricatures. France had found its Hogarth, but for this to occur, a second revolution was necessary.” Melot, “Caricature and the Revolution,” 31.

Though repressed and censored to the extent that little now exists, and even less is known about it,²⁵ political caricature and print satire were nevertheless present in eighteenth-century France.²⁶ Moreover, these caricatures were known and written about during the nineteenth century, and owing to Daumier's continued engagement with Rococo art and his professional status as a caricaturist, it is likely that he knew of them. In an article for the first volume of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Thomas Arnauldé enumerated the tradition of satirical prints in the eighteenth century, many of which treated the subjects of art, taste, the Salons, and the Academy.²⁷ The examples Arnauldé cites reveal Rococo artists working in this tradition.²⁸ For example, these include the 1747 engraving by Jacques Philippe Le Bas (1707-1783) after a drawing by Boucher (*Painting Mocked by Envy, Stupidity, and Drunkenness*) that served as the frontispiece to a rebuttal directed at the critic La Font de Saint-Yenne. Arnauldé also cites engravings by Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin (1721-1786) from a series called *Papillonneries humaines*, in which butterflies absurdly perform gallant human activities, framed by elaborate Rococo floral arabesques and cartouches. Arnauldé specifically discusses one engraving that

²⁵ Michel Melot, "Caricature and the Revolution: The Situation in France in 1789," 25.

²⁶ Eighteenth-century caricature is often distinguished from nineteenth-century caricature based on its audience. Nineteenth-century caricature was printed in public journals, and is therefore often considered more democratic. On the other hand, based on material and its "sophistication," eighteenth-century caricature is considered the domain of a more elite audience. For example, Katie Scott has identified political caricature during this era on medals smuggled into France; however, "the fact that they were minted in gold and silver as well as baser metals suggests that they functioned as expensive and enduring jokes offered for safekeeping only to a comparatively narrow market of highly cultured court elites" (Scott, *The Rococo Interior*, 180). Writing about caricature in terms of class struggle, Melot concurs that "[Early French] Caricature was too sophisticated and perhaps suspected of a frivolity that was useless in the struggle of the lower classes. It found its public both in the comfortable and cultured segment of the bourgeoisie... and in the rebellious faction of the nobility, which was familiar with art and antagonistic toward absolute monarchy" (Melot, "Caricature and the Revolution," 28).

²⁷ Thomas Arnauldé, "Estampes Satiriques: Relatives à l'art et aux artistes français pendant les XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, vol. 1, no. 3 (1859): 342-361, and vol. 1 no. 4 (1859): 101-113.

²⁸ It is also important to note, that Arnauldé's examples reveal a taste for the Rococo during this point in the Second Empire. For instance, Arnauldé calls the painting on the easel by Boucher in the Le Bas engraving "un petit tableau charmant qui échappera du moins à leur critique" ("Estampes Satiriques," 107).

Saint-Aubin based on a drawing by Boucher, *L'Amour sacrifiant à l'amitié* (1753, Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale). In the engraving cited by Arnauld, Saint-Aubin depicts two ridiculous, loyal butterfly subjects presenting an embroidery wreath to Madame de Pompadour at the eternal altar.²⁹

The Goncourt brothers had likewise seen the caricatures of Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin and wrote positively about them in *L'art du XVIIIe siècle*.³⁰ In fact, the Goncourt brothers say of Saint-Aubin: “But Charles-Germain also had his day of inspiration and genius of his time, as to be worthy of his brothers. The writer of *The Art of the Embroiderer* made his *Essay de Papillonneries humaines*, and that is where his merits remain.”³¹ They also clearly delight in the lightness and humor of Saint-Aubin’s *Livre de caricatures tant bonnes que mauvais*, a private book of nearly 400 comic drawings, discussing the wit of several individual works, even ones which parody the compositions of one of their favorite Rococo artists, Boucher.³² There is no evidence that Daumier ever saw Saint-Aubin’s caricatures, yet nevertheless, as I shall show, the *Idylles parlementaires* share a spirit with Saint-Aubin’s caricatures. Using a similar visual

²⁹ Arnauld, “Estampes Satiriques,” 108-109. While embroidery was a hobby for which Madame de Pompadour was known and sometimes mocked, Charles-Germain himself was renowned as royal embroiderer at court. This caricature is certainly parodic due to its imitation of Boucher and the butterflies as surreal attendants (as well as the dog in the corner licking its lips while observing the group of winged creatures) as well as Saint-Aubin’s other caricatures in his *Livre de caricatures* which more critically mock Madame Pompadour; however, their relationship is more complicated than there is room to discuss. See Humphrey Wine’s “Madame de Pompadour” and Juliet Carey’s “The King and his Embroiderer,” in Colin Jones, Juliet Carey and Emily Richardson, ed., *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures': Drawing Satire in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2012): 179-190 and 261-282. The complete book is preserved in the Rothschild Collection at Waddesdon Manor.

³⁰ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, “Les Saint-Aubin,” in *L'art du XVIIIe siècle vol. II: Greuze, Les Saint-Aubin, Gravelot*, Cahin (Paris: G. Charpentier, Éditeur, 1882): 105-167. Charles-Germain is the last of the Saint-Aubin brothers discussed.

³¹ Goncourt, “Les Saint Aubin,” 161. “Mais ce Charles-Germain a eu, lui aussi, son jour d'inspiration et son heure de génie, comme pour être digne de ses frères. Le dessinateur technique de l'Art du Brodeur a fait son ESSAY DE PAPILLONNERIES HUMAINES ; et c'est par là qu'il mérite de rester.”

³² *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures': Drawing Satire in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, edited by Colin Jones, Juliet Carey and Emily Richardson (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2012) is the most extensive text to date on the *Livre de caricatures*. For the Goncourt brothers on Boucher in the *Livre de caricatures* on, see de Goncourt, “Les Saint-Aubin,” 181.

language to parody courtly Rococo (or in Daumier's case courtly Rococo revivals), Daumier's *Idylles parlementaires* continues in this eighteenth-century political caricature tradition, repeating particular verbal-visual puns, commenting on contemporary artwork, and, despite their mass printing, appealing to a similar audience.

Led by British historian Colin Jones, Saint-Aubin's *Livre de caricatures* has recently undergone extensive visual and historical analyses that further elucidate the matter of humor, political satire, and caricature in the eighteenth-century more generally. The scholars' research has revealed the 391 watercolor, ink, and graphite drawings to be full of politically, religiously, and socially transgressive images: Madame de Pompadour is depicted as both a monkey and a fish (playing off her family name, Poisson);³³ Jansenists are roasted on spits at the same time as are supper chickens;³⁴ the philosophical apostate and Jesuit Jean-Baptiste-Louis Gresset, depicted as a monkey dressed as a cleric, dances on his books as they begin to burn;³⁵ and the recently deceased dauphin, the father of the future Louis XVI, is depicted as a bloated fish.³⁶ In addition to contemporary political issues, Saint-Aubin also spoofs the Rococo artistic, fashion, and decorative culture in which he lived and in which he played an active role as royal embroiderer. For instance, a satyr judges Boucher's 1756 painting of the marquise in "La vérité surmonte l'autorité" (Figure 4-5); in "L'avés vous reconu?, 1769," a street dealer in the new art market looks for signatures on paintings with a magnifying glass but fails to heed the obvious

³³ See "C'est bien indécent pour la femme d'un notaire," 1745-1775, watercolor, ink and graphite, illustrated in Colin Jones, *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures,'* 181, fig. 7.2.

³⁴ See "Phénomène janséniste," ca. 1740-1777, watercolors, ink, and graphite, in Colin Jones, *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures,'* 129, fig. 5.5.

³⁵ See "L'homme du jour n'est pas celui du lendemain," 1758-1775, watercolor, ink, and graphite, illustrated in Colin Jones, *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures,'* 129, fig. 5.6.

³⁶ See "Oraison funèbre du dauphin," 1765-1766, watercolor, ink, and graphite, illustrated in Colin Jones, *The Saint Aubin 'Livre de caricatures,'* 145, fig. 5.13.

destruction of the gallery, which is full of mice and a burning stove;³⁷ the absurd size of fashionable dress is pushed to its limit in “Moyen de parvenir” (Figure 4-6); and in “Il vaut mieux dire une bêtise que de se taire” (Figure 4-7), an elaborate empty cartouche is framed by putti.

Despite their undermining of elite political and cultural figures and customs, Jones claims that the work should not be seen as anti-Rococo, but in fact is “embedded in the culture of the *ancien régime*.”³⁸ According to Jones they exemplify Diderot’s definition of caricature, a “libertinage of the imagination,”³⁹ due to the way in which humor is created through a combination of text and image, a focus on the crude and obscene body, and cerebral “inside jokes.” Resolutely kept private on pain of imprisonment, Saint-Aubin “drew, painted, and joked for a small band of soulmate contemporaries” who would enjoy untangling the visual and verbal puns and allusions.⁴⁰ Additionally, James H. Johnson, who also worked on the *Livre de caricatures* project at Waddeston Manner, points out that despite the “barbed contemporary comment or thinly veiled [political] references,” the *Livre de caricature* “is good-humored rather

³⁷ See “L’avez vous reconnu? 1769,” 1769-1774, watercolor, ink, and graphite. Illustrated in Colin Jones, *The Saint-Aubin ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 297, 13.7

³⁸ Colin Jones, “French Crossings: II. Laughing over Boundaries,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (2011): 1-38. Julian Swann agrees with this assessment in her essay “Politics and Religion (117-150), when she says: “The *Livre de caricatures* can be integrated into this broad cultural stream and that is perhaps the key to understanding it. Ultimately, Charles-Germain and his friends were products of the *ancien régime* and they help us to understand a political culture that was rarely differential and, in private at least, was constantly questioning the actions of those in authority. Such attitudes do not necessarily have to be seen as subversive or even as contributing directly to the outbreak of Revolution in 1789 but they do give us insight into why the French population was able to make the leap from the comparatively restricted political world of the *ancien régime* to the public politics of the new with such elan.” (150)

³⁹ Jones, “French Crossings: II. Laughing over Boundaries,” 13. Also see Werner Hofmann, “Ambiguity in Daumier (and elsewhere),” *Art Journal*, vol. 43 nr 3 (1983): 361-364, for Daumier in relation to the eighteenth-century (and earlier) tradition of political caricature as ambiguous (and thus also potentially subversive) through the combination of word, image, and interpretation.

⁴⁰ Colin Jones and Juliet Carey, “Introduction,” in *The Saint-Aubin ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 2

than angry, more lampoon and spoof than scorn or contempt, more adaptive than insurrectional.”⁴¹

Framing the *Idylles Parlementaires*: Structure, Humor, Audience

The tradition of Rococo subversion and caricature (particularly as seen in Saint-Aubin) is an especially appropriate “frame” for understanding the *Idylles parlementaires*. This is literally so in the case of the tenth plate in the series, which depicts Berryer inhaling the aromas of a lily garden (Figure 4-8), and on whose frame Daumier inscribes his initials. This privileging is not incidental, and was picked up by scholars such as Adhémar who discerningly (but incompletely) remarked that the *Idylles parlementaires*’ “comedy is underscored by the ornate frame.” Understanding the history and use of the Rococo frame, further elucidates Daumier’s style and “framing” of these “revivalist” images and his own Rococo.

The Rococo frame evolved from the Baroque cartouche and was a fundamental element of Rococo interior design and print.⁴² Seemingly innocuous, the ornamental frame, however, was seen as an *agent provocateur*, appropriating attention from the central image while simultaneously suggesting, but rejecting, specific relational meanings.⁴³ This was particularly true of Rococo ornamental print, in which form was confused and dissolved: the frame was not actually a frame, merely a continuation of the printed image, creating a back and forth between the structurally distinct (frame vs. image) and the physically inseparable (printed as one). This

⁴¹ James H. Johnson, “Musical Culture,” in *The Saint-Aubin ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 229.

⁴² See Kimball, *The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style*.

⁴³ Scott, *The Rococo Interior*, 124.

confusion—is the frame part of the image? should it be read as such?—played with reality and intention, challenging the primacy of the central image and destabilizing meaning.⁴⁴

Both Saint-Aubin and Daumier “frame” their critiques within this context of shifting meaning. As we saw earlier with Saint-Aubin’s drawing “Il vaut mieux dire une bêtise que de se taire,” the frame becomes a feature of caricature for this very reason of disrupting intention. Presented in the center of the image, rather than functioning on the border as it should, Saint-Aubin’s text below translates as “it is better to say something silly than to say nothing at all.” The “silliness” of the lighthearted drawing is in the focus on the frame, which placed in the center and empty “says nothing,” it does not perform its framing function. Yet the ridiculousness of the text with the image clearly suggests the contrary. It ironically recalls the actual proverb “say nothing unless your words are better than silence.”⁴⁵ Here Saint-Aubin is suggesting that independently such ostentatious ornament has nothing to say, while simultaneously using it to say something, demonstrating ornament’s insignificant significance.⁴⁶

In his musings on eighteenth-century frames, Karsten Harries elaborates on the visual function of the frame, which is supposed to present the image as an aesthetic object, set apart for contemplation.⁴⁷ A frame should prevent confusion between the viewer’s space and the space of the image: “The frame therefore raises at these borders an aesthetic barrier that protects the

⁴⁴ Scott, 249. For a very recent account of an artist working in this Rococo decorative tradition of irony, wit, and visual games, see Jean-François Bédard, *Decorative Games: Ornament, Rhetoric, and Noble Culture in the Work of Gilles-Marie Oppenord (1672-1742)* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011).

⁴⁵ James H. Johnson, “Musical Culture,” in Colin Jones, ed., *The Saint-Aubin ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 230.

⁴⁶ Scott also discusses the elusive and adaptable meaning of ornament in print: “It is almost as if artistic license was smuggled into print on the premise that the unregulated use of etchings and engravings precluded the implementation of traditional rules of *convenance* and decorum. Moreover, the fluid nature of rococo syntax, which by dividing, dissolving, and almost destroying form argued the inherent adaptability of its models to any purpose, itself” (249) and “Pattern, advertisement, commodity, riddle, critique; printed rococo played all these roles, often enough simultaneously” (241).

⁴⁷ Karsten Harries, *The Broken Frame, Three Lectures* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989): 68.

artificial world created by the painter from the reality beyond and thus protects our collusion with the artist's fiction."⁴⁸ In the case of Daumier's frames, the emphasis on the border thus mitigates the impact of the internal caricature by humorously designating it as "fiction." Yet it does so ironically. Like Scott's argument of Rococo ornamental frames, according to Fiske Kimball, during the Rococo "frame, field, and filling became indeed inextricably interwoven."⁴⁹ Likewise, though the *Idylles parlementaires* frames "re-present" the political caricature as painting, here on the same printed plane, like Rococo printed ornament, it revels in the play between the elements and is able to say something serious despite itself.⁵⁰

Within Daumier's frames, this mingling of light hearted visual play and more serious political subversion continues. Returning to the image of Berryer in the Lily garden, below the framed image, the text reads:

Behold, Berryer, famous horticulturist,
Seen here in his early morning round.
At the Elysée, he cultivates a flower,
But is it a lily, is it an imperial?
(Quatrain from poetic attacks: volume in press).⁵¹

The end of the text is particularly ironic, within the context of the time and of the figure depicted. Berryer was an active opponent of the press, particularly of caricature. According to Robert Goldstein, in his book on censorship of political caricature, images were often restricted more than were words:

⁴⁸ Harries, *The Broken Frame, Three Lectures*, 68.

⁴⁹ Kimball, *The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style*, 161.

⁵⁰ Harries, *The Broken Frame*, 74.

⁵¹ Voyez Berryer, célèbre horticulteur,
Fessant ici sa ronde matinale.
A l'Elysée, il cultive une fleur
Mais est-ce un Lys, est-ce une impériale?
(Quatrain tiré des coups de boutoir poétiques. - volume sous presse.)

The authorities were especially sensitive to pictures due to the general belief that drawings had a much greater impact and were far more widely accessible than the printed word. Caricatures were viewed as even more dangerous than the print press partly because they were perceived as simply being a more powerful means of communication... Drawings were viewed as having such a strong impact because they were perceived as speaking directly to the senses and emotions. Therefore, it was argued, illustrations had an immediate impact which amounted to incitement to action, whereas the printed word was seen as speaking more to the intellect, with its effect dampened and delayed by the thoughtful consideration and time needed to process its message.⁵²

The press was feared and censorship enforced by both the Monarchy and the Republic (as well as the intermittent Empires). Although censorship was abolished during the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth-century with Article 11 of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, it was almost immediately reintroduced. A censor for caricatures in Paris was appointed in July 1789 and was reaffirmed at the height of the Revolution in April 1794.⁵³

Censorship remained a contentious issue throughout the nineteenth-century, and therefore any volumes of “poetic attacks” which Daumier’s *Quatrain* refers to were unlikely to be in press. However, “sous presse” might refer to an “underground” press, wittily playing on words, but also more seriously referencing a subversive way in which poetic attacks could still be printed despite Berryer’s censorship laws. But then again, owing to the anxiety that press images induced, a poetic (linguistic) attack might be published sooner than a visual one (which of course this lithograph actually accomplishes due to the brief lift in censorship).

Within the frame, the scene of Berryer in the garden continues the Rococo compositional motifs with mythologized figures (the winged Berryer), flying cupids, and corpulent amounts of flesh. It also continues the tradition of Saint-Aubin’s subtle jokes, drawing on similar strategies and visual puns, and using similar elements of a Rococo idiom. For instance, behind Berryer

⁵² Goldstein, *Censorship of Political Caricature*, 2.

⁵³ Melot, “Caricature and the Revolution,” 25.

prominently sits a jug. Based on the Quatrain inscribed below which indicates that “Berryer, the famous horticulturist is on his early morning rounds, cultivating flowers,” it is presumably a watering jug, which Berryer neglects as he neglects his stated duties (both politically at the Elysée and horticulturally in the garden). On another level though, a jug, or *cruche*, was a person of limited intelligence, a visual barb which John Rogister—another *Livre de caricature* scholar—points out Saint-Aubin repeatedly employed, including in what is considered the finest of his political sketches about the Paris *parlementaires* (Figure 4-9).⁵⁴ Above the hand-written title “Hebien! Touttes les cruches ne sont pas la” (Well! All the jugs are not here), jugs turn toward each other and converse, as a jug at the left prostrates himself and spills coins across the floor and up the stairs in the direction of the presiding large jug adorned with vest and wig. According to Rogister, the jugs represent the *assemblée des chambres*, and with all of their attributes (which include “the first president with the beak of a parrot, the spectacle denoting pedantry, the trumpet for the loudmouth, the flowers and garlands for the flowery orator...”)⁵⁵ the tableau presents the *parlementaires* as corrupt and idiotic (“jug-headed”).

Likewise, Daumier’s verbal play on flowers in the quatrain—“is it a lily? is it an imperial?” (est-ce un Lys, est-ce une impériale?)—is reminiscent of Saint-Aubin’s floral satire in which he combined the name of flowers with patrons in mocking manners such as in his *Recueil de plantes*, a private book of 250 botanical studies. For instance, Melissa Hyde shows the verbal-visual associations employed by Saint-Aubin in comparing Madame de Pompadour to a flower. Saint-Aubin’s illustration of the “belle de jour” with reference to Madame de Pompadour suggests her as “a passing ‘beauty of the day’ as much as it refers to the pretty

⁵⁴ John Rogister, “Decoding the ‘Livre de caricatures,’” in Jones, *Saint Aubin’s ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 64.

⁵⁵ Rogister, “Decoding the ‘Livre de caricatures,’” 64-65.

bouquet pictured above.”⁵⁶ Daumier’s caricature works on this same level of visual-verbal-contextual puns. Here, Berryer cultivating a lys, a lily, could be innocuous, a flower to be grown in any garden. However, that fact that he has time to spend leisurely cultivating flowers, suggests inefficiency and ineffectiveness in his political duties. On another level, Daumier suggests that perhaps the flower he cultivates is an “impériale.” This verbal pun refers to the fleur-de-lys, which of course was an emblem of the monarchy, implying that Berryer is trying to nurture a relationship to the new rising Empire. Phrased in a question though as to what/who Berryer develops in his garden, indicates that perhaps there are other flowers/politicians that Berryer “cultivates,” insinuating him as a flip-flop. Finally, his inattentiveness to any cultivation as he forgets his pail behind him, suggests he is not very good at either (political or floral cultivation).

Unlike Saint-Aubin whose book was privately kept for a small group of friends, most of Daumier’s caricatures reached the entire public circulation of *Le Charivari*. However, like Saint-Aubin’s *Livre de caricatures*, the *Idylles parlementaires* are full of inside jokes about contemporary art, jesting that would have been especially evident to his like-minded friends and followers in the art community, and not necessarily to the greater public. Significantly however, while Saint-Aubin spoofs Watteau’s *fête galantes* or Boucher’s portraits of the King’s mistress, despite the Rococo “loves of the gods” theme, Daumier does not take stabs at specific eighteenth-century Rococo works. Rather he mocks paintings and sculptures of the nineteenth-

⁵⁶ Melissa Hyde, “Needling: Embroidery and Satire in the Hands of Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin,” in *Seeing Satire*, eds. Elisabeth Mansfield and Kelly Malone, *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation). In press, to be published in 2013; ms p. XX. The subject of flowers and satire is also taken up by Katie Scott in “Saint-Aubin’s jokes and their relation to...” in *The Saint-Aubin ‘Livre de caricatures,’* 349-403. Along the lines of her work in ornament and subversion, Scott suggests that Saint-Aubin used flowers in a similar manner of inversion: “By puffing up these humble ornaments [flowers], by moving them from the periphery to a central focus, Saint-Aubin exploited comic reversal to establish a floriferous framework for fun” (380). This is similar to his use of the frame in “Il vaut mieux dire une bêtise que de se taire.”

century done in mythologized Rococo-revivalist style, each with diverse political, social, or artistic resonance.⁵⁷

For instance, in “Le secret confié au dieu faune” (Figure 4-10) Thiers impishly stands on his tiptoes on the base of a herm in order to whisper into the ear of the bust of Molé: “I pretend to like the young Republic with a discrete and tender passion: but I claim, far from being platonic, to one day violate his Constitution!”⁵⁸ On one level, the Pygmalion-like visual relationship between Thiers and Molé reinforces a political and homoerotic rhetorical pun (“to violate his constitution”). Yet Daumier also takes another stab at art and politics: the Thiers/Molé group is a copy of Francois Jouffroy’s *Premier secret confié à Venus* (Figure 4-11), exhibited at the 1839 Salon and bought by Louis-Philippe as purchase for the relief of living artists’ fund. Even though the marble mythological group recalls Rococo rather than Revolutionary themes, the sculpture is fashionable in a revivalist style, and was used as a means to associate Louis-Philippe with French court culture, rather than with the political/aesthetic ideals of the Rococo in which Daumier invested himself. For insiders who would recognize this sculpture and piece together its significance within the lithograph, Daumier’s image becomes a joke on the “depraved” sexual and artistic proclivities of political leaders as they try to regain monarchical power and use stereotypically Rococo revival courtly imagery to fashion themselves within that context.

⁵⁷ This is an area for future research. In addition to the ones to be discussed throughout the rest of the chapter, several of Daumier’s other lithographs clearly reference specific works of art (such as Daumier’s “Le Sommeil d’Endymion,” an unpublished lithograph from *Idylles Parlementaires*, now at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC). However, more work is needed to elucidate all of the connections between Daumier’s lithographs and contemporary painting and sculpture.

⁵⁸ LE SECRET CONFIE AU DIEU FAUNE:
Je feins d’aimer la jeune République
D’une discrète et tendre passion:
Mais je prétends, loin d’être platonique,
Violer un jour sa Constitution!

Similarly, the composition of “Flore et Zéphir (de la Meurthe)” (Figure 4-12) is taken from Pierre-Paul Prud’hon’s *Young Zephyr Balancing above Water* (Figure 4-13).⁵⁹ The painting, which became immensely popular after its exhibition at the Salon of 1814, was reproduced for sale in all forms and media, including enamel miniatures. In Daumier’s version, as Flora looks on and sees Henri Georges Boulay de la Meurthe (1797-1858) delicately dipping his toe in the water, she exclaims “Ah! Truly he is beautiful, I must have him at any price,”⁶⁰ implying that politicians, like art, can be bought (or paid off) in any form.

As the quote by Adhémar at the beginning of this chapter indicated, the *Idylles parlementaires* are “Rubensian.” Certainly, de la Meurthe’s paunchiness in lithographs like “L’Ivresse de Noé” (Figure 4-14) recalls Rubens’s Silenuses, from which we know Daumier was inspired. But “in Rubensian style” also implies issues previously elaborated. Rubens’s influence on the Rococo (and in turn on certain elements of Rococo revivals) was stylistic, in its affirmation of loose brushwork and coloristic effects, as delighting the viewer. Rubens’s stylistic influence was also political, as Rococo and Rococo revivalist artists not only imitated his visual effects but utilized them for similar political reverberations. Working for alternative audiences, in non-Academic genres and styles, these artists and their works subtly and subversively stood against traditional artistic and governmental institutions; in the proper sense of Rubens’s *Imitatione*, they also did so as befitting their own contemporary moment.

⁵⁹ For Prud’hon as a Rococo revival artist, see Carol Duncan, “The Persistence and Re-emergence of the Rococo in French Romantic Painting,” (PhD Diss, Columbia University, 1969): 31-33.

⁶⁰ FLORE ET ZÉPHIR (DE LA MEURTHE.)

Légalement il se balance,

Du pied à peine effleurant l'eau:

Flore qui l'admire en silence

Se dit: Ah! crédié qu'il est beau!

(Traduit d'Anacréon par Ratapoil, Colonel de Gendarmerie en retraite, membre de la société des belles lettres de Châlons sur Marne et de la société du Dix Décembre de Paris.)

Similarly, for Daumier in his *Idylles parlementaires*, this Rubensian connection is clearly seen in the way he picks up on the spirit of a Rococo print and caricature tradition and transforms specific paintings/sculptures within the present revived political and artistic context. But, despite the critical stance of the *Idylles parlementaires*, like Saint-Aubin's caricatures, they are also "good-humored lampoon and spoof." Adhémar observed the pride and enjoyment Daumier must have taken in drawing these lithographs, as Daumier also clearly implicates himself as a Rococo-revivalist not far from the ones he mocks, based on his own involvement with Rococo art in these lithographs, and in his paintings. Yet through his particular continued engagement with the Rococo, in print as in painting, Daumier still implies a change in "Rococo-revival" politics, then being associated with institutional, monarchical, anti-Republican claims. Implementing Rococo styles associated with freedom—references to Rubens, loose brushwork, ornament, caricature—Daumier sides with and fights for political liberty through artistic means.

APPENDIX
FIGURES

- 1-1 Honoré Daumier, *La République*, 1848, oil on canvas, 29.7 x 23.6 in. (73 x 60 cm). Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7020_926.jpg
- 1-2 Honoré Daumier, *Les fugitifs*, 1849-52, oil on panel, 6.3 x 12.2 in. (16 x 31 cm). Private collection on permanent loan to the National Gallery, London. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7027_749.jpg
- 1-3 Honoré Daumier, *Un wagon de troisième classe*, 1860-65, oil on canvas, 25.7 x 35.5 in. (65.4 x 90.2 cm). Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7165_17.jpg
- 1-4 Honoré Daumier, *Le baiser*, 1845-48, oil on panel, 14.5 x 11.2 in. (37 x 28.5 cm). Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7006_926.jpg
- 1-5 Honoré Daumier, *Au bord de l'eau*, 1850, oil on panel, 12.99 x 9.4 in. (33 x 24 cm). Musée d'Art moderne, Troyes (France). Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7011_790.jpg
- 1-6 Honoré Daumier, *Don Quichotte sur un cheval blanc*, 1870-73, oil on canvas, 15.7 x 12.2 in. (40 x 31 cm). Private Collection, Zurich. Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7238_1022.jpg
- 1-7 Honoré Daumier, *Scène de comédie*, 1870-75, oil on panel, 9.4 x 12.5 in. (23.8 x 31.8 cm). Armand Hammer Daumier and Contemporaries Collection, Los Angeles. Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7237_1020.jpg
- 1-8 Honoré Daumier, *La leçon de lecture*, 1855-60, oil on panel, 16.5 x 14.9 in. (41.9 x 37.8 cm). Armand Hammer Daumier and Contemporaries Collection, Los Angeles. Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7102_1020.jpg
- 1-9 Honoré Daumier, *L'amateur d'estampes*, 1860, oil on panel, 9.5 x 10.2 in. (24.1 x 26 cm). Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7136_544.jpg
- 1-10 Honoré Daumier, *La blanchisseuse*, 1863, oil on wood, 19.3 x 13.2 in. (49 x 33.5 cm). Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7160_926.jpg
- 1-11 Honoré Daumier, *Le baiser*, 1850, brown chalk drawing on yellowish paper, 11.8 x 9.8 in. (30 x 24.9 cm). Collection of drawings, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.culture.gouv.fr/Wave/image/joconde/0154/m503501_d0017286-000_p.jpg

- 1-12 Honoré Daumier, *Le troubadour*, 1868-73, oil on canvas, 32.9 x 22.4 in. (83.6 x 56.8 cm). Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio. Accessed 9 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7186_56.jpg
- 1-13 Honoré Daumier, *La soupe*, 1862, pencil, pen, ink and watercolor on paper, 11.8 x 19.5 in. (30 x 49.5 cm). Musée du Louvre, département des Arts graphique, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.culture.gouv.fr/Wave/image/joconde/0192/m503501_d0019485-000_p.jpg
- 2-1 Peter Paul Rubens, *La Kermesse*, 1638, oil on panel 58.7 x 102.8 in. (149 x 261 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://uploads5.wikipaintings.org/images/peter-paul-rubens/the-kermesse-1638.jpg!Blog.jpg>
- 2-2 Honoré Daumier, Copy of Rubens' *La Kermesse*, 1848, oil on canvas. Destroyed in a fire in 1950. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR8055_586.jpg
- 2-3 Honoré Daumier, "Les Paysagistes: Le premier copie la nature, le second copie le premier," from the series *Les Artistes*, published in *Le Charivari* on 12 May 1865, lithograph, 7.8 x 9.1 in. (19.8 x 23.2 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR3439_16.jpg
- 2-4 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Felicity of the Regency*, 1622-25, oil on canvas, 155 x 116 in. (394 x 295 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/a/a5/Peter_Paul_Rubens_040.jpg/474px-Peter_Paul_Rubens_040.jpg
- 2-5 Honoré Daumier, *Le Meunier, Son Fils, et l'âne*, 1848-1849, oil on panel, 15.6 x 12.9 in. (39.5 x 32.8 cm). Private Collection, Switzerland. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7023_578.jpg
- 2-6 Peter Paul Rubens, *Family of Lot Departing from Sodom*, 1613-1615, oil on canvas. 86 3/4 x 96 in. (220.3 x 243.8 cm). The John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota. Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://www.peterpaulrubens.org/87566/The-Departure-of-Lot-and-his-Family-from-Sodom-large.jpg>
- 2-7 Honoré Daumier, *Deux nymphes poursuivies par des satyres*, 1850, oil on canvas 50.9 x 38.2 in. (129.3 x 97 cm). Museum of Fine Art, Montreal. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7032_73.jpg
- 2-8 Honoré Daumier, *L'ivresse de Silène*, 1848-1850, charcoal, brown chalk, sepia wash and gouache on paper, 16.9 x 24 in. (43 x 61 cm). Musée des Beaux-Arts et de la Dentelle, Calais. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.valenciennes.fr/uploads/RTEmagicC_Calais.jpg.jpg

- 2-9 Peter Paul Rubens, *Drunken Silenus*, 1616-1617, oil on panel 84.25 x 83.47 in. (214 x 212 cm). Alte Pinakothek, Munich. Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://www.peterpaulrubens.org/101284/The-Drunken-Silenus-1616-17-large.jpg>
- 3-1 Honoré Daumier, *L'atelier*, ca. 1870, oil on canvas, 16 x 12.5 in (40.6 x 31.8 cm). J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7225_844.jpg
- 3-2 Jean Honoré Fragonard, *The New Model*, ca. 1770, oil on canvas, 19.7 x 24.8 in. (50 x 63 cm). Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://musee-jacquemart-andre.com/en/collections/new-model>
- 3-3 Jean Honoré Fragonard, *Inspiration*, 1769, oil on canvas, 31.5 x 25.2 in. (80 x 64 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/58/Fragonard%2C_Inspiration.jpg
- 3-4 Honoré Daumier, *Pierrot jouant de la mandoline*, ca. 1873, oil on panel, 13.8 x 10.6 in. (35 x 27 cm). Oskar Reinhart Collection, Winterthur, Switzerland. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7240_567.jpg
- 3-5 Honoré Daumier, *Le peintre*, ca. 1865, oil on panel, 11.4 x 7.5 in. (29 x 19 cm). National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7192_556.jpg
- 3-6 Honoré Daumier, *Un loge au théâtre*, 1865-70, oil on canvas, 20.4 x 13.8 in. (26.5 x 35 cm). Kunsthalle, Hamburg. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7188_807.jpg
- 3-7 Honoré Daumier, *Galerie de tableaux*, oil on canvas, ca. 1860-70, oil on canvas, 15.7 x 12.8 in. (40 x 32.5 cm). Present Location Unknown. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7133_586.jpg
- 3-8 Honoré Daumier, *L'amateur d'estampes*, 1860-65, oil on panel, 16.1 x 13.2 in. (41 x 33.5 cm). Musée des Beaux-Arts de la Ville de Paris, Petit Palais, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7137_533.jpg
- 3-9 Honoré Daumier, *Le liseur*, 1860-65, oil on panel, 13.5 x 10 in. (34.3 x 25.4 cm). Des Moines Art Center, Iowa. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR7157_107.jpg
- 4-1 Honoré Daumier, "Empire, Orléanisme et Légimité," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on November 4, 1850, lithography, 10.75 x 7.99 in. (27.3 x 20.3 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2060_773.jpg
- 4-2 Honoré Daumier, "Cupidon," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on November 8, 1850, lithography, 10.75 x 7.99 in. (27.3 x 20.3 cm). Accessed 10 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2061_1.jpg

- 4-3 Honoré Daumier, "Nymphes des alentours," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on October 3, 1850, lithography, 10.75 x 7.99 in. (27.3 x 20.3 cm). Accessed 10 October 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2054_55.jpg
- 4-4 Antoine Watteau, *L'enseigne de Gersaint*, 1720, oil on canvas, 64 x 121 in. (163 x 308 cm). Charlottenburg Palace, Berlin. Accessed 10 October 2012. <http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/9/94/Gersaint.jpg/800px-Gersaint.jpg>
- 4-5 Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, "La vérité surmonte l'autorité," from *Livre de caricatures tant bonnes que mauvais*, 1757, watercolor, ink, and graphite, 7.4 x 5.2 in. (18.7 x 13.2 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://collection.waddesdon.org.uk/images/large/collection/books/675.303.jpg>
- 4-6 Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, "Moyen de parvenir," from *Livre de caricatures tant bonnes que mauvaises*, ca. 1740-1775, watercolor, ink, and graphite, 7.4 x 5.2 in. (18.7 x 13.2 cm). Accessed 16 August, 2012. <http://collection.waddesdon.org.uk/images/large/collection/books/675.102.jpg>
- 4-7 Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, "Il vaut mieux dire une bêtise que de se taire," from *Livre de caricatures tant bonnes que mauvaises*, c. 1740-1775, watercolor, ink, and graphite, 7.4 x 5.2 in. (18.7 x 13.2 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://collection.waddesdon.org.uk/images/large/collection/books/675.279.jpg>
- 4-8 Honoré Daumier, "Voyez Berryer..." from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on November, 6, 1850, lithography, 10.63 x 7.99 in. (27 x 20.3 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2059_1.jpg
- 4-9 Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin, "Hebien! Toutes les cruches ne sont pas la," from *Livre de caricatures tant bonnes que mauvaises*, 1763-1775, watercolor, ink, and graphite, 7.4 x 5.2 in. (18.7 x 13.2 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. <http://collection.waddesdon.org.uk/images/large/collection/books/675.357.jpg>
- 4-10 Honoré Daumier, "Le secret confié au dieu faune," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on February 24, 1851, lithography, 10.16 x 8.27 in. (25.8 x 21.0 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2065_773.jpg
- 4-11 François Jouffroy, *Premier secret confié à Vénus*, 1839, marble, 65.4 x 22.4 x 17.3 in. (166 x 57 x 44 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012. http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/f/f1/Secret_Jouffroy_Louvre_LP1919.jpg/268px-Secret_Jouffroy_Louvre_LP1919.jpg
- 4-12 Honoré Daumier, "Flore et Zéphyr (de la Meurthe)," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, printed in *Le Charivari* on September 21, 1850, lithography, 10.94 x 8.19 in. (27.8 x 20.8 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012. http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2053_773.jpg

- 4-13 Pierre-Paul Prud'hon, *Young Zephyr Balancing above Water*, oil on canvas, 38.4 x 50.4 in. (97.5 x 128 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris. Accessed 16 August 2012.
<http://uploads7.wikipaintings.org/images/pierre-paul-prud-hon/young-zephyr-balancing-above-water.jpg!Blog.jpg>
- 4-14 Honoré Daumier, "L'Ivresse de Noé," from the series *Idylles parlementaires*, 1851, lithography, 11.38 x 8.19 in. (28.9 x 20.8 cm). Accessed 16 August 2012.
http://www.daumier-register.org/img/DR2076_35.jpg

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adhémar, Jean. "Daumier et le sentiment de la solitude," *Aesculape*, January 12, 1958.
- . *Honoré Daumier*. Paris: Éditions Pierre Tisné, 1954.
- . "Daumier, peintre officiel." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français* (1941-44): 76-77.
- . "Sur la date des tableaux de Daumier." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français* (1935): 145-160.
- . "Peut-on dater les peintures de Daumier?" *Gazette des beaux-arts*, no. 68 (1934): 1-6.
- Alexandre, Arsène. *Honoré Daumier, l'homme et l'oeuvre*. Paris: H. Laurens, 1888.
- Alpers, Svetlana. *The Making of Rubens*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Anonymous. "Les amateurs de tableaux par Daumier." *Le Journal Illustré*, August 13, 1865.
- Arnauld, Thomas. "Estampes satiriques: relatives à l'art et aux artistes français pendant les XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles." *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, vol 1, no. 3 (1859): 342-361, and vol. 1 no. 4 (1859): 101-113.
- Ballas, G. "Daumier, Corot, Papety et Delacroix, inspirateurs de Cézanne." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français* (1974): 193-197.
- Barr, Alfred H. *Corot-Daumier*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1930.
- Bédard, Jean-François. *Decorative Games: Ornament, Rhetoric, and Noble Culture in the Work of Gilles-Marie Oppenord (1672-1742)*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011.
- Béraldi, Henri. *Les graveurs du XIX siècle; guide de l'amateur d'estampes modernes*. Paris: L. Conquet, 1885.
- Berger, Robert W. *Public Access to Art in Paris: A Documentary History from the Middle Ages to 1800*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.
- Blum, André. *La caricature révolutionnaire (1789 à 1795)*. Paris: Jouve & cie, 1916.
- Boime, Albert. *Art in an Age of Civil Struggle, 1848-1871*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- . *The Academy and French Painting in the 19th Century*. London: Phaidon, 1986.
- . *Thomas Couture and the Eclectic Vision*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

- Borowitz, Helen O. "Three Guitars: Reflections of Italian Comedy in Watteau, Daumier and Picasso." *Cleveland Museum of Art*, vol. 71, no. 4 (April 1984): 116-129.
- Burnell, D.B. "Art and Ambiguity: the Aesthetics of Caricature Considered in Relation to Nineteenth Century Romanticism and to the work of Daumier." Thesis, University Of Chicago, 1976.
- Burty, Philippe. "Exposition des oeuvres de Daumier." *La Republique Francaise*, May 1, 1878.
- Carlin, S.L. "Daumier's 'The Fugitives': Republican Idealism and Independence of Form." *The Minneapolis Institute of Arts Bulletin* XLIV (March 1955).
- Chagnon-Burke, Veronique. "Rue Laffitte: Looking at and Buying Contemporary Art in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Paris." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, <http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/index.php/summer12/veronique-chagnon-burke-looking-at-and-buying-contemporary-art-in-mid-nineteenth-century-paris>, accessed 22 May 2012.
- Champfleury, Jules Husson. *Préface du catalogue de l'exposition des peintures et dessins de H. Daumier*. Paris: Galerie Durand-Ruel, 1878.
- Childs, Elizabeth C. "Louis Provost: collectionneur et amateur." In *Daumier: Scènes de la Vie Conjugale*, exhibition catalogue, 9-13. Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, St. Denis, France, 1988.
- Clark, T. J. *The Painting of Modern Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- *The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France, 1848-1851*. Greenwich: New York Graphic Society, 1973.
- Coffin, Sarah, ed. *Rococo: The Continuing Curve, 1730-2008*. New York, NY: Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum, 2008.
- Cowart, Georgia. "Watteau's *Pilgrimage to Cythera* and the Subversive Utopia of the Opera-Ballet." *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 83, no. 3 (Sep., 2001): 461-478.
- Crown, Patricia. "British Rococo as Social and Political Style." *American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 23, no. 3 (Spring, 1990): 269-282.
- Cuzin, Jean-Pierre and Dimitri Salmon. "Daumier et Monticelli, 'Baroques Provençaux.'" In *Fragonard: Regards/Croisés*, 135-137. Paris: Mengès, 2007.
- Dolan, Therese. "The Empress's New Clothes: Fashion and Politics in Second Empire France." *Woman's Art Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring - Summer, 1994): 22-28.
- D'Otrange Mastai, M.-L. "The Connoisseur in America: A Daumier Exhibit." *Connoisseur* 151 (Nov. 1962).

- Du Bois, Guy P. "Corot and Daumier." *The Arts*, no. 17 (Nov. 1930): 73-79.
- Dumas, Ann, et. al. *Inspiring Impressionism: The Impressionists and the Art of the Past*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- . *The Private Collection of Edgar Degas*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997.
- Duncan, Carol. *The Pursuit of Pleasure: The Rococo Revival in French Romantic Art*. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc, 1976.
- . "The Persistence of Rococo." PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.
- Duprat, Annie. *Histoire de France par la caricature*. Paris: Larousse, 1999.
- Duranty, Edmond. "Daumier, son point de départ, sa vie, son talent." *Beaux-Arts illustrés* no. 5, 1879.
- . "Etudes sur Daumier." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, vol. 17 (May-June, 1878): 428-443 and 528-544.
- Eitner, Lorenz. *French Paintings of the Nineteenth Century, Part I: Before Impressionism, The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Systematic Catalogue*. Washington, D.C., 2000.
- Faroult, Guillaume and Sophie Eloy, eds. *La collection La Caze: chefs-d'œuvre des peintures des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2007.
- Feydy, Jacques. "Recherches sur l'expression chez Daumier: plastique et psychologie dans les peintures de Daumier." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français* (1954): 84-91.
- François, Dominique. "Honoré Daumier: Le Rembrandt du peuple." *Jardin des Artes* (October-November 1972): 46-49.
- Fried, Michael. *Manet's Modernism, or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- . *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Gaze, Delia, ed. *Dictionary of Women Artists, vol. I*. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1997.
- Geffroy, Gustave and Pierre Georgel. "Les transformations de la peinture vers 1848, 1855, 1863." *Revue de l'Art* no. 27 (1975): 69-72.

- Georgel, Pierre and Gabriel Mandel. *Tout l'oeuvre peint de Daumier*. Flammarion, Paris 1972.
- Goldstein, Robert Justin. *Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France*. Kent, Ohio and London England: The Kent State University Press, 1989.
- de Goncourt, Jules and Edmond. *French Eighteenth Century Painters*. Translated with an introduction by Robin Ironside. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- . "L'ivresse de Silène' par Daumier." *Le Temps, Illustrateur Universel*, July 8, 1860.
- Goodman, Elise. "Rubens's *Conversatie à la Mode*: Garden of Leisure, Fashion, and Gallantry." *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 64, no. 2 (Jun., 1982): 247-259.
- Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, University of California, Los Angeles, and Bibliothèque nationale (France). *French Caricature and the French Revolution, 1789-1799*. Los Angeles: Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, Wight Art Gallery, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988.
- Guentner, Wendelin. "The Inscription of the Sketch in the 19th-Century French Journal: Michelet, Delacroix and the Goncourt Brothers." *Nineteenth-Century French Studies*, vol. 27, no. 3-4 (Spring-Summer, 1999): 276-289.
- . "The Sketch in Nineteenth-Century French Dictionaries." *Contemporary French Civilization*, vol. 23, no. 1 (1999): 95-110.
- Harries, Karsten. *The Broken Frame, Three Lectures*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Harrison, Charles, Paul Wood, and Jason Gaiger, eds. *Art in Theory 1648-1815: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- H. Daumier: Lithographer-Satirist: Selected Illustrations, 1831-1872*. Exhibition, April 1 - July 9, 1978, New Jersey State Museum, Trenton. 1978.
- Hofmann, Werner. "Ambiguity in Daumier (and elsewhere)." *Art Journal*, vol. 43, no. 3 (1983): 361-364.
- Hyde, Melissa. "Needling: Embroidery and Satire in the Hands of Charles-Germain de Saint-Aubin." In *Seeing Satire*, eds. Elisabeth Mansfield and Kelly Malone, *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation). In press, to be published in 2013; ms p. XX.
- . *Making up the Rococo: Francois Boucher and his Critics*. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute Publications Program, 2006.
- Ives, Colta, et. al. *Daumier Drawings*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.

- Johnson, Geraldine A. "Pictures Fit for a Queen: Peter Paul Rubens and the Marie de' Medici Cycle." *Art History*, vol. 16, no. 3 (September 1993): 447-469.
- Jones, Colin, Juliet Carey and Emily Richardson, eds. *The Saint-Aubin 'Livre de caricatures': Drawing Satire in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2012.
- Jones, Colin. "French Crossings: II. Laughing over Boundaries." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (2011): 1-38.
- Jullian, René. "Sur la Chronologie de Quelques Peintures de Daumier." *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de l'art français*, (1965): 223-229.
- Kahng, Eik, et al. *The Repeating Image: Multiples in French painting from David to Matisse*. Baltimore: Walters Art Museum, 2007.
- Kimball, Fiske. *The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style*. New York: Dover Publications, 1980.
- Kors, Alan, ed. *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Larkin, Oliver W. "Daumier as Painter and Draughtsman." *The Burlington Magazine* (August 1968): 466-467.
- . *Daumier: Man of his Time*. New York, Toronto, London: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Larson, James L. "Winckelmann's Essay on Imitation." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3 (Spring 1976): 390-405.
- Laughton, Bruce. "Daumier: Painter or Cartoonist?" *Queens Quarterly*, 1999.
- . *Honoré Daumier*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Le Leyzour, Philippe and Fabrice Hergott, ed. *L'apothéose du geste: L'esquisse peinte au siècle de Boucher et Fragonard*. Éditions Hazan, Paris, 2003.
- Lévy, Louis. "Daumier, le japonisme et la nouvelle peinture." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 6th ser. vol. 103 no. 1382, (March 1984): 103-110.
- Lichtenstein, Jacqueline. *The Blind Spot: An Essay on the Relations between Painting and Sculpture in the Modern Age*. Los Angeles: Published by the Getty Research Institute, 2008.
- *The Eloquence of Color: Rhetoric and Painting in the French Classical Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

- Lobstein, Dominique. "Auguste-Marie Boulard (1825-1897), ami et collectionneur de Honoré Victorin Daumier (1808-1879)." *Bulletin de la Société franco-japonaise d'art et d'archéologie*, no. 18, (June 1999): 3-18.
- Loyrette, Henri, et. al. *Daumier, 1808-1879*. National Gallery of Canada, 1999.
- Mainardi, Patricia. "The 19th-Century Art Trade: Copies, Variations, Replicas." *Van Gogh Museum Journal*, (2000): 63-73.
- . *Arts and Politics of the Second Empire*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1987.
- Maison, Karl Eric. "Some Additions to Daumier's Oeuvre." *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 112 (Sept. 1970): 623-624.
- . "Daumier's Painted Replicas." *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, vol. 57 no. 1108-1109 (May-June 1961): 369-377.
- . *Honoré Daumier, Catalogue Raisonné of the Paintings, Watercolours and Drawings*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1968.
- Marcel, Henry. "Marcel Lecomte nous parle de Daumier et de ses amateurs." *Nouvelles de l'estampe*, (July-October 1979): 11-14.
- Melot, Michel. "La Caricature ou l'imitation contrariée," in *L'imitation, aliénation ou source de liberté: Rencontres de l'Ecole du Louvre* (Paris: La Documentation française, 1985): 231-240.
- . "Daumier and Art History: Aesthetic Judgement/Political Judgement." *The Oxford Art Journal*, vol. II, no. 1 (1988): 3-24.
- Muller, Jeffrey M. "Rubens's Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (June 1982): 229-247.
- Niculescu, Remus. "Georges de Bellio, l'ami des Impressionistes." *Paragone*, vol. XXI, no. 247 (Sept. 1970): 25-66.
- Noack, Dieter and Lilian. *The Daumier Register Digital Work Catalog*. <http://www.daumier-register.org/login.php?startpage>.
- Park, William. *The Idea of Rococo*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.
- Passeron, Roger. *Daumier*. New York: Rizzoli, 1981.
- Percival, Melissa. *Fragonard and the Fantasy Figure*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co, 2012.

- de Piles, Roger. *Dialogue upon Colouring*, translated by John Ozell. London: Gale Ecco Print Editions, 2010.
- . *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of above 300 of the Most Eminent Painters: Containing a Complete Treatise of Painting, Designing, and the Use of Prints*, translated by John Ozell. London: Gale Ecco Print Editions, 2010.
- Provost, Louis and Elizabeth C. Childs. *Honoré Daumier: A Thematic Guide to the Oeuvre*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1989.
- Puttfarken, Thomas. *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Reff, Theodore. "Copyists in the Louvre, 1850-1870." *The Art Bulletin* (Dec. 1964): 552-559.
- Rey, Robert. *Daumier: les grands peintres*. Paris: Cercle d'art, 1968.
- Robert-Jones, Phillippe. "Honoré Daumier, Critique d'art." *Bulletin de l'Academie Royale des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* (1975): 13-43.
- . "Daumier et l'Impressionisme." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* vol 55, (1966): 247-250.
- Roger-Marx, Claude. *L'Univers de Daumier*. Paris: H. Scrépel, 1972.
- . *Daumier Paintings*. Matthiessen éd., London 1962.
- . "Un grand peintre du mouvement Daumier." *Jardin des Arts* vol 44, (1958): 513-520.
- . *Peintres, aquarelles, dessins*. Paris, Orangerie, 1934.
- Rubensism*. A catalogue of an exhibition by the Department of Art, Brown University and the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, 1975.
- Saisselin, Rémy G. *The Enlightenment against the Baroque: Economics and Aesthetics in the Eighteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- . *Taste in Eighteenth Century France: Critical Reflections of the Origins of Aesthetics, or, an Apology for Amateurs*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1965.
- Scharff, Aaron. "Daumier, the Painter." *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 13 (1961): 356-7.
- Scott, Katie. *The Rococo Interior: Decoration and Social Spaces in Early Eighteenth-Century France*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.
- . "D'un siècle a l'autre." In *The Loves of the Gods: Mythological Painting from Watteau to David*, edited by Colin Bailey. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1992.

- Shelton, Andrew Carrington. "Ingres versus Delacroix." *Art History*, vol. 23, no. 5 (December 2000): 726-742.
- Sheriff, Mary D., ed. *Antoine Watteau: Perspectives on the Artist and the Culture of his Time*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006.
- Sheriff, Mary D. *Fragonard: Art and Eroticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Shiff, Richard. *Cézanne and the End of Impressionism: A Study of the Theory, Technique, and Critical Evaluation of Modern Art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- . "Representation, Copying, and the Technique of Originality." *New Literary History*, vol. 15, no. 2 (Winter, 1984): 333-363.
- . "The Original, the Imitation, the Copy, and the Spontaneous Classic: Theory and Painting in Nineteenth-Century France." *Yale French Studies*, no. 66 (1984): 27-54.
- Shikes, R.E. & Heller, S. "The Art of Satire: Painters as Caricaturists and Cartoonists." *Print Revue*, vol. 19 (1984): 11.
- Sidlauskas, Susan. "Resisting Narrative: The Problem of Edgar Degas's Interior." *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 75, no. 4 (Dec., 1993): 671-696.
- Silverman, Debra. *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-siècle France. Politics, Psychology and Style*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Thoré, Théophile. "Exposition de tableaux de l'école française ancienne, tirés de collections d'amateurs." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, vol. 7 (September 1860): 257-277 and vol. 8 (November 1860): 333-358.
- Tseng, Shao-Chien. "Honoré Daumier and the Institution of Art." PhD Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1998.
- . "Honoré Daumier's L'Imagination." *Journal for the History of Art* (1988): 73.
- Unruh, Allison. "Aspiring to la Vie Galante: Reincarnations of Rococo in Second Empire France." PhD Dissertation, New York University, 2008.
- Vidal, Mary. *Watteau's Painted Conversations: Art, Literature, and Talk in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Vincent, Howard Paton. *Daumier and his World*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968.

Wilker, Jenny. "Daumier's *Histoire ancienne*: French Classical Parody in the 1840s." PhD dissertation, New York University, 1996.

Wisdom, John Minor. *French Nineteenth Century Oil Sketches, David to Degas*, exh. cat. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The William Hayes Ackland Memorial Art Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978.

Wittkower, Rudolph. *Masters of the Loaded Brush: Oil Sketches from Rubens to Tiepolo*, exh. cat. New York: Columbia University, 1967.

Zorach, Rebecca. *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Elizabeth Saari Browne was born and raised in Lakeland, FL. She received her B.A. in Art History from the College of William & Mary in Williamsburg, VA, where she graduated *magna cum laude* and Phi Beta Kappa in 2009. She began to pursue her Masters of Art in Art History at the University of Florida, Gainesville, in 2010 and graduated in December 2012. At UF, Ms. Browne focused on nineteenth-century French painting and studied under Dr. Melissa Hyde and Dr. Joyce Tsai. Her other research interests include eighteenth-century French painting and caricature, print history and theory, and material aesthetics.