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Dissertation Director:
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This dissertation repositions the place of four Romantic artists within the current discussion of Modern sculpture. Today, Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux has displaced Auguste Rodin’s paramount place as the first Modern sculptor. The dynamism, suppleness, truthful movements, appropriate gestures, and accuracy of Carpeaux’s sculptures are considered the epitome of Modernist sculpture. This analysis argues that the portrait-busts and sculpted caricatures of Jean-Pierre Dantan (called Dantan-Jeune), Pierre-Jean David (called David d’Angers), Auguste Préault, and Honoré Daumier exemplified audacious artistic changes made thirty years before Carpeaux. These four artists showed a distinct rejection of formal portraiture and the values of artistic decorum by creating an unprecedented avant-garde style of sculpture. They left purposely their sculpted portraits and caricatures with irregular surfaces, distorted facial features, exaggerated mops of hair, and used colorings, emphasized physiognomic and physiologic characteristics to overthrow Academic traditions of realistic and idealized beautification of sitters. They showed innovation through their use of the two "pseudo sciences", physiognomy and phrenology – the latter considered at the cutting edge of progress – resulting in sculpted
portraits, which Salon art critics ridiculed as ugly, caricatural or grotesque. They also exemplified modernism by reversing the traditional making and purpose of sculpture. They subverted artistic expectations by making two-dimensional lithographs and albums based on their three-dimensional portraits and caricatures that were sold to a wide public. The serialization of their works in small-scale further democratized the art of sculpture. These examples show artistic and commercial innovations in the mass-market popularization of sculpted portraiture, which had been shunned by the public because of its repetitive and elitist nature. These four sculptors shattered artistic, political, social, and commercial expectations in the 1830s. Their sculpted portraits and caricatures attest to their modernity, which not only precede Carpeaux’s but skip over his generation in a manner that points the way to French Expressionist sculpture of the late nineteenth century. In fact, these four sculptors far exceed Carpeaux’s modernism by showing a rare audacity and creativity that goes well beyond the expressivity of his oeuvre. David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, Daumier, and Préault anticipated many of the innovations of Carpeaux, acting as generators rather than simply “forefathers".
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Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Portrait de Jean-Léon Gérôme*, 1872
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The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles,
Ref: 88. SA. 8
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David d'Angers, *Buste de Goëthe*, 1831
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Fig. Introduction. 5
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Dantan-Jeune, Bust of *Monsieur de Sleigo*, 1837
Plaster
Musée Carnavalet, Paris
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Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of *Xavier Denon*, 1847
Plaster
Collection of the Musée des Beaux-arts de Valenciennes, France
Ref. S. 90.57
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Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *La Danse*, 1869
Stone
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Auguste Rodin, *Honoré de Balzac*, 1898
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Département de sculpture, Musée d'Orsay, Paris
Ref: D.O. 1986-2
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Auguste Préault, *Tuerie, fragment épisodique d’un grand bas-relief*, 1834
Bronze
Musée de Chartres, France
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Honoré Daumier, Series of *Les Célébrités du Juste-milieu*, 1832-35
(cast in 1927-37 after the Musée d'Orsay series),
Painted unbaked clay, terracotta and plaster
Zimmerli Art Museum, New Brunswick, New Jersey
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Ref. S. 47
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2.24 Horace Vernet, *Self-Portrait*, 1832
Oil on canvas
Collection of the Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio
Ref. 1977. 171.
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2.31 Auguste Préault, *Portrait of a Man*, ca.1830
Bronze
Collection of the Palais des Beaux-arts de Lille, France

2.32 Auguste Préault, Posthumous medallion of *Eugène Delacroix*, 1864
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Collection des sculptures, Musée du Louvre, Paris
Ref. 1564

2.33 Auguste Préault, *Eugène Delacroix*, 1864
Ink on paper
Département des Arts Graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris
RF 29751
Chapter three

3.1 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Portrait de Jean-Léon Gérôme*, 1872
Marble
The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles,
Ref: 88. SA. 8

3.2 David d’Angers, *Buste de Goëthe*, 1831
Plaster
Collection des sculptures, Musée d'Orsay, Paris

3.3 Johann Gottfried Schadow, *Bust of Goethe*, 1822-1823
Marble
Collection of the Alte National Gallerie, Berlin
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INTRODUCTION

Early nineteenth-century sculpture is often defined in distinct terms of either Neoclassicism or Romanticism; however, this thesis focuses on the fluidity of the two seemingly conflicting terms. Sculpted portraiture is not easily categorized; distinct groups of either formal portraiture or caricatural works pose problems in classification. The multifaceted nature of sculpture during the July Monarchy is shown by sculpted portraiture, which was often caught between an Academic stylization represented by models depicted in the nude with herm busts and idealized features, and a Romantic approach, which included the perception of movement, modern clothing, colors, new materials, and exaggerated features that bordered on caricature (when not depicting actual caricatures).

The sculpted portraiture of Pierre-Jean David, (called David d’Angers; 1788-1856), Auguste Préault (1809-1879), Jean-Pierre Dantan (called Dantan-Jeune; 1800-1869), and Honoré Daumier (1808-1879) exemplify the audacious artistic changes in sculpture made prior to and during the July Monarchy which, I am arguing, often included a combination of Academic and Romantic features. Sculpted portraits that differed from the expected norm were regularly reviewed as lacking in taste, showing artistic incompetence, or simply madness on the part of sculptors whose portraits were compared to caricatural grimaces, and ugly depictions. When possible, conservatives censored non-conventional sculptors by rejecting their works from exhibiting at the Salon, which was the only viable venue to publicize one’s name. Romantic sculptors
were also subjected to negative press coverage from conservative art critics who voiced their disapproval by ridiculing the portraits that were chosen for exhibition. Yet, the sculpted portraits or caricatures that these four artists produced reveal a high level of Modernity in their artistic choices. When commissioned, sculptors had to work in a conservative style; yet when making portraits that were tokens of friendship, their work contained the dynamism and expressivity that was comparable to the sculpted portraits made later in the century. They varied their methods depending on the sitter and patron, and on their protection or rejection by art critics. They also used different materials according to the commission, which was typically in plaster to resemble the purity of marble, or bronze when financially possible. However, the high cost of bronze remained prohibitive for sculptors working without commissions.

An essential component of this thesis is based on the interest that David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, Préault, and Daumier all shared for the pseudo-sciences of physiognomy and phrenology. These four sculptors re-evaluated the theories of physiognomy first established during the seventeenth century by Academician Charles Lebrun (1619-1691). They exaggerated facial features, which resulted in sculpted portraits and caricatures that broke from Academic sculpture by emphasizing ugliness, grimaces, and grotesque depictions. Their works were also based on phrenology, which was promoted as a useful tool for sculptors who wanted to extrapolate the inner nature of their sitters. Phrenology often resulted in distorted portraits that bordered on caricature because adherents to the pseudo-science exaggerated facial characteristics to convey their sitters' individualism.

David d’Angers and Préault showed innovation through their use of phrenology and physiognomy. They accentuated the characteristics of their sitters, sometimes to the
of gross exaggeration. David d'Angers regularly emphasized foreheads and skulls, and was often ridiculed for being an overt follower of phrenology, a "pseudo-science" that was nonetheless considered to be the cutting edge of progress. His abuse of phrenology is exemplified in his 1830 Portrait of Chateaubriand (1758-1848; fig. Introduction. 1), which depicts the writer with an extraordinarily large, distorted forehead. Préault also broke artistic boundaries by showing extreme facial features that often were condemned as ugly grimaces by the majority of art critics. Nonetheless, Préault's expressionist methods allowed him to enliven the physiognomies of his sitters. This could have resulted in frozen-like facial distortions, but his dynamic handling of high reliefs and deep grooves resulted in an interplay of dark shadows and vibrant highlights. This progressive method is exemplified in the individualized physiognomies of his 1834 relief Tuerie (Massacre; fig. Introduction. 2).

Dantan-Jeune and Préault also showed their Modernism by reversing the traditional making and purpose of sculpture. Typically, artists began by making sketches on paper, which they developed onto three-dimensional materials. Instead, Daumier subverted artistic rules and used his sculpted busts to make two-dimensional lithographs. Dantan-Jeune also showed his modernism by making lithographic albums based on his most popular three-dimensional caricatures. These examples show artistic and commercial innovations in the mass-market popularization of the art of sculpture, which had been shunned by the public because of its repetitive and elitist nature.

Of the first generation of Romantic sculptors, David d’Angers is essential to this thesis because of his central role in opening new venues for younger Romantic artists, including Dantan-Jeune, Daumier and Préault. Although these four sculptors appear to
have had different artistic methods, audiences, and even views on portraiture, there are many critical intersections in their personal and artistic lives. Most important, perhaps, is their shared interest in medical discoveries, related to contemporary innovations in the study of anatomy. Their portraits shaped the aesthetics of Romantic portraiture and testify to the shifts in audience and patronage during the July Monarchy. Portraits by David d’Angers will here studied in relation to the formal portrait busts, statuettes, and sculpted caricatures by Dantan-Jeune, medallions and reliefs by Préault; and Daumier’s *The Celebrities of the Juste-Milieu*, a series of thirty-six caricatural busts. The selection is anchored in the artistic, scientific, and socio-political interconnections among the works, as well as their collective participation in a reshaping of the notion of portraiture.

This dissertation uses a model of “hybridity” in which the romantic coexists with the academic, a notion that was already noted by art critics. During the 1830s, a genre hybride was a negative reference, as it was used to criticize the works of artists who remained neutre in their approach to portraiture.¹ This artistic method needs to be considered vis-à-vis Louis-Philippe’s new Constitutional Monarchy, which was based on political neutrality, a goal that was to be reached through the ideals of a Juste-Milieu (Middle of the Road) government. To liberal Salon critics, a work of art defined in terms of stylistic hybridity betrayed a lack of artistic conviction, which in turn resonated as a lack of political engagement.

Recently, L. Cassandra Hamrick and Suzanne Nash have studied the concept of “hybridity” and emphasized the complex links between l’idéal antique of Neoclassicists

and *le beau moderne* favored by Romantic artists.\(^2\) However, their research focuses on the connections between literature and sculpture. Instead, I am using the term “hybridity” to analyze the artistic formation and incongruities of four artists who embodied a kind of modernist art that would open new artistic venues for future generations. The *Juste-Milieu* wanted artistic neutrality to represent the stability that they hoped to achieve by pleasing all political sides. Painters were the first to combine academic and romantic styles in an *eclectic* style. To date, this term has been applied only to the sculpture of the Second Empire (1852-1870) when Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux’s (1827-1875) works shocked the bourgeoisie with dynamism, naturalism, and overt sensuality.

This thesis intends to reposition the place of four Romantic sculptors within the current discussion of Modern sculpture. Anne Middleton Wagner’s analysis of Carpeaux as the quintessential originator of Modernist sculpture has not been yet challenged. She argues that Carpeaux has displaced Auguste Rodin’s (1840-1917) paramount place as the first Modern sculptor.\(^3\) According to Wagner, the dynamism, suppleness, truthful movements, appropriate gestures, and accuracy of Carpeaux’s sculptures embody the epitome of Modernist sculpture. In her telling, Carpeaux was a modern sculptor who shattered public expectations of decorum in monumental sculpture; however, I argue that Carpeaux’s sculpted portraiture does not make him, as Wagner asserts, the first Modernist sculptor. The artists who will be discussed in this thesis used many modernist

---


3 “Carpeaux, in other words, created a body of work perfectly suited to contemporary life, and in so doing resuscitated the art of sculpture in France, returned to a more vital tradition. The judgment is...important, because it argues for the modernity of Carpeaux’s art from both a formal and (tentatively) social point of view, well before the same argument is made to give Rodin’s work the extraordinary place it holds in intellectual circles of the 1880s and 1890s.” Anne Middleton Wagner. *Jean Baptiste Carpeaux. Sculptor of the Second Empire.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1986, 5.
characteristics in their sculptures years prior to Carpeaux’s inclusion of similar details in his art. For example, Carpeaux's 1872 *Portrait de Jean-Léon Gérôme* exudes vitality and individualism through the subject’s energetic pose, flowing hair, thick mustache, intense gaze, and neck turned to the side (fig. Introduction. 3). The bust shows tool marks and an uneven shape at the base of the neck, giving an unfinished quality and also implying that it is a fragment removed or broken from a full-length statue. Carpeaux's portrait of *Gérôme* has such liveliness that a reviewer nicknamed the bust "le décapité parlant" (the talking beheaded).4 Forty years earlier, at the Salon of 1831, David d'Angers exhibited a *Buste en marbre de Goëthe*, which could have been rightfully called "le décapité pensant" (the thinking beheaded; fig. Introduction. 4). The bust of *Goëthe* shows an inner depth of character, an audacious modeling, exaggerated features, evidence of tool marks, and a broken chunk of marble at the base, which exemplifies the progressive style of David d'Angers.

This example, and the aforementioned sculpted portraits and caricatures of Dantan-Jeune, Préault and Daumier, attest to their modernity, which not only precede Carpeaux's but skip over his generation in a manner that points the way to Expressionist sculpture of the late nineteenth century. In fact, these four sculptors far exceeded Carpeaux’s modernism by showing a rare audacity and creativity that goes well beyond the expressivity of his oeuvre. The four sculptors shattered artistic, political, social, and commercial expectations of the art of sculpture in the 1830s. These examples, as well as others that will be elaborated upon, form the basis of my argument that Carpeaux’s primacy as the forerunner of Modern sculpture is incorrect. Instead, I believe that David

---

d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, Daumier, and Préault anticipated many of the innovations of Carpeaux, acting as generators rather than simply “forefathers”.

David d’Angers’ statue of the Grand Condé (fig. introduction.5) embodies early Romantic sculpture *par excellence*. But what is Romantic sculpture and how to define it? In her foreword to Luc Benoist’s *La Sculpture Romantique*, Isabelle L.J. Lemaistre notes that Romantic sculpture is “difficult to characterize” because of the different currents that sculptors followed, according to the commission, the patron, and the subject. She paraphrases Benoist who stated, “A Romantic work is anything that is not Academic.”

Although quite vague, this definition is nonetheless helpful because we know that Academic sculpture followed Neo-Classical principles of elevation, propriety, decorum, symmetry, smooth surfaces, calm physiognomies, balance, clean finish, immobility, timelessness, heroism, morality, virtue, good taste and, of course, beauty. Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer provides the most fitting definition of Romanticism, as

---

5 In his study on David d’Angers, De Caso rightfully notes: “The Grand Condé is an audacious study of movement; nothing comparable can be found in the sculpture of the period...The costume of the Grand Condé, as much as its unusual expressive power, defined it as “Romantic” and led to its success and popularity over the years”. Jacques de Caso. *David d’Angers. Sculptural Communication in the Age of Romanticism*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988, 50.

she encapsulates Charles Baudelaire’s (1821-1867) question, “What is Romanticism?” by succinctly responding, “Romanticism barked to the future, to modernity, and progress.”

At its core, Romantic sculptors wanted artistic freedom. Romantic sculpture is a hodgepodge of styles that borrowed from Renaissance, Baroque, Rococo, Medieval and, shockingly, Neo-Classical precedents. Romantic sculpture emphasized dynamism, exaggeration, fluidity, painterly methods, coloring, sharp edges, and encompassed sketchy and unfinished surfaces, expressivity, realism, individualism, the excessive use of physiognomy and phrenology, contemporary, rather than historical subjects, modern costumes, instability, deformation, both the small-scale and the monumental, seriality, the dark shade of bronze, the fragment, new modes of displays, and a decisive penchant for ugliness, the grotesque, and caricature. Romantic sculpture does not always include all of these characteristics, yet it often combines many.

David d’Angers planted the seeds for freedom of expression in younger sculptors. He was also a firm believer that sculpture ought to contribute both a social and moral purpose as a means to bring well-being and happiness to humanity. His financial security allowed him to undertake a lifelong quest to create a series of sculpted portraits which he divided between a Pantheon of Great Men made in a Neo-Classical tradition, a Gallery of Contemporaries based on realistic features and modern costumes, and a series of medallions made with Romantic expressivity and a lack of finish. Even though David d’Angers made a clear distinction between his gargantuan production of busts, portrait-busts, and medallions, many pieces combine elements that generate a hybridity of style that is essential to what is considered modern sculpture. He included contemporary

---

costumes on herm busts, made colossal busts as fragments, and exaggerated facial features to the point of distortion. This versatility and combination of styles was often misunderstood – and consequently rejected – by conservative and liberal art critics alike. But they are testimonies to the Modernism of Romantic sculpture. Art critics denigrated David d’Angers’ “absurd” style and compared his busts to “hydrocephalic” sufferers. Paradoxically, David d’Angers was a stern proponent for the depiction of Beauty. Ugliness was not worth portraying because it was “the worst mistake of creation”.

The concepts of Beauty and Ugliness are rather difficult to analyze because of their subjective nature. Professors at the École des Beaux-Arts were virtually incapable of teaching the concept of Ideal Beauty because it was supposedly based on a natural appreciation that only few students could grasp. The concept of Beauty and Ugliness was – and still is – dependent on the bon goût (good taste) or mauvais goût (bad taste) of an artist. At best, sculptors who often came from lower social classes learned to appreciate beauty by studying from ancient sculptures that had been judged by connoisseurs as beautiful. The depiction of ugliness was understood to be visible in physical discordance and deformities, physiognomic exaggerations, asymmetrical forms and a lack of balance. It also reflected all moral failures that were not appropriate for immortalization.
Consequently, sculptors who portrayed ugliness were perceived as artistically deficient because they propagated bad taste among the public.

Just as with beauty and ugliness, good taste and bad taste were also subjective. I believe that Voltaire's (1694-1778) reluctance to write about beauty best reflects this delicate concept. Voltaire wrote, “Ask a toad what beauty is, the to kalon? He will answer you that it is his toad wife with two great round eyes issuing from her little head, a wide, flat mouth, a yellow belly, a brown back. Interrogate a Guinea negro, for him beauty is a black oily skin, deep-set eyes, a flat nose. Interrogate the devil; he will tell you that beauty is a pair of horns, four claws and a tail.”¹¹ The relative nature of beauty and ugliness is exemplified in the sculpted portraits that these four artists made, which vary from conventionally accepted beautiful forms to grotesquely-deformed shapes. Dantan-Jeune, Préault, and Daumier followed Hugo's Romantic credo, "Le beau, c'est le laid" (Ugliness is Beauty). David d'Angers professed refusal of Hugo's concept, yet made portraits that were deemed ugly by critics. This contradiction is essential to my argument as it often results in portraits that include various styles and, thus, were examples of "hybridity".

David d'Angers loathed Dantan-Jeune. Although both were academically trained, Dantan-Jeune devalued the noble purpose of sculpture. He specialized in formal portraiture, and also profited from a new type of sculpted portraiture that he created: caricatural busts and statuettes of contemporary celebrities. In contrast to David d’Angers’ *Pantheon of Great Men*, Dantan-Jeune made a *Pantheon a Contrario*, focusing on the ugly and grotesque side of humanity rather than its idealization. Dantan-Jeune sculpted caricatures at a prodigious speed, resulting in an apparent freedom of expression.

and spontaneity that most contemporaries admired. His wit and exceptional talent as a caricaturist eclipsed his position as a serious portraitist. At the Salon, Dantan-Jeune showed formal busts that were regularly compared to his series of caricatures. His formal busts were often ridiculed for being funnier than his caricatures. At times, this criticism was well founded. Those busts show a combination of academic, realist, idealist, and Romantic elements that result in a hybrid style which, unlike that of David d’Angers, he failed to master. But Dantan-Jeune also made a series of serious portrait busts which reveal his artistic originality. For instance, he added eyeglasses or monocles directly on sculpted busts. Dantan-Jeune's 1837 formal bust of Monsieur de Sleigo exemplifies the use of accessories included by the sculptor, which appears to have been unprecedented in formal portraiture. In contrast, Carpeaux's 1847 bust of Xavier Denon (figs. introduction. 6 and 7) represents the young sitter with a contemporary costume and realistic features. It pales in comparison to Dantan-Jeune's realistic and modernist approach.

This thesis also addresses the problem of the commercialization of sculpture. Of the four sculptors, Dantan-Jeune offers a prime example of the diffusion of small-scale sculpture for financial gain. His entrepreneurship was criticized as devaluing art when in fact his purpose was to diminish the elitist notion that sculpture was reserved for the upper class. Nonetheless, Dantan-Jeune’s commercial enterprise flourished. His sculpted caricatures and statuettes were sold to an ever-increasing bourgeois public in fashionable Parisian shops and were also available directly in his atelier. The serialization of Dantan-Jeune’s works exemplifies time of radical change in the production, viewing, display, and reception of small-scale sculptures. Technological inventions facilitating mechanical reduction of large art works, and the treatment of plaster to make reproductions resemble
bronze or terracotta, lowered the cost of production. Sculpture became accessible to a much larger clientele than ever before. Carpeaux is known for serializing his most popular sculptures in small-scale statuettes, which were sold successfully to a large clientele. Before becoming the best known sculptor of the Second Empire and producing his sculptures in series through his thriving atelier, Carpeaux sold his statuettes to the elegant Susse store, the very place that Dantan-Jeune had chosen for the commercialization of his production twenty years earlier. Carpeaux was criticized for selling his sculptures in series, yet Dantan-Jeune had already experienced the backlash.

In 1869, Carpeaux shocked the public with the indecency of the monumental high relief *La Danse* for the Palais Garnier. The naturalism of the bacchantes dancing in the nude around the *Génie de la danse* was compared to low-class prostitutes and to drunken cancan dancers. Wagner compares the public's scandalized reception of *La Danse* to that of Rodin's *Balzac* of 1898 (figs. introduction. 8 and 9). She emphasizes that Rodin was part of the committee, which allowed him to show his statue at the Salon. In contrast, Carpeaux's *La Danse* was a fait accompli when it was unveiled and instantaneously became public property. Wagner acknowledges that Préault's 1834 *Tuerie* is one of "the most controversial sculptures of the mid-nineteenth century", yet *Tuerie* merits only ten lines in her lengthy study on Carpeaux (fig. introduction. 10). I am arguing that Préault's relief *Tuerie* is more controversial than both Carpeaux's and Rodin's sculptures because it exemplifies the sculptor's subversive stance – both formally and in its reception – against the despotic power of an artistic establishment that wanted to maintain the status quo. One ought to remember that Préault made the relief in time for

---

the Salon of 1834, thirty-five years before Carpeaux's *La Danse*, and sixty-four years before Rodin's *Balzac*.

Wagner states that *La Danse* is difficult to capture from a close-up view because of its irregularity, chaotic composition, asymmetry, and lack of sequence. Préault sculpted his fragment *Tuerie* with far more incoherence than Carpeaux's relief. Unlike Carpeaux's, Préault's relief is equally indecipherable from close-up as it is from afar. The audacity of his depiction of extreme expressions of pain, terror, hatred, complacency, and horror supersedes Carpeaux's expressions of joyful bliss and *joie de vivre*. Préault did not have the protection of Louis Napoleon. He was not part of an official committee to hang his own works. In fact, the Jury of the Salon regularly rejected his works because they were so controversial. Préault's *Tuerie* was only accepted "to be exhibited at the Salon like a thief hung at the gallows."¹³ The adversity against Préault from conservative members of the Institute who set out to destroy his reputation and artistic boldness is, I believe, more representative of a modern stance based on freedom of expression than was any adversity against Carpeaux or Rodin.

This thesis also addresses the artistic tension between the representation of beauty and ugliness that exploded under the tools of Romantic sculptors. In *On Ugliness*, Umberto Eco writes that Victor Hugo’s (1802-1885) "Preface" to *Cromwell* is a "eulogy of ugliness".¹⁴ Hugo's "Preface" opened new aesthetic doors for the depiction of ugliness and the grotesque in the arts. However, Eco also writes that the “redemption of ugliness” took place in Romantic literature and the arts. The depiction of ugliness became

acceptable to the artistic establishment when representing a so-called *laideur intéressante* (an interesting ugliness), which sculptors portrayed for worthy and illustrious sitters. It was also admissible in caricature as long as it remained within the range of amusement.

As the leader of *L’École du laid* (The School of Ugliness), Préault was criticized for the "ugly grimaces of an infinite kind" represented in his portraits rejected by the Jury of the Salon.\(^\text{15}\) Clearly, the "redemption of ugliness" did not affect all artists equally.

Préault was considered to lack basic artistic knowledge because of his method of handling the clay as if he were painting with loose and sweeping brushstrokes. He accentuated sharp and thick contrasts, which resulted in high reliefs that resembled thick impasto. Daumier went even further than Préault – who likely taught him the rudiments of sculpture – by painting directly on the clay of sculpted busts that he made of *Les Célébrités du Juste-milieu* (fig. introduction.11). In 1832, Charles Philipon (1800-1861), publisher of the newspapers *La Caricature* and *Le Charivari*, hired Daumier to produce the series of caricatural busts of key figures in Louis-Philippe’s government. Daumier likely made more busts than the thirty-six that are known today. The series of political figures is the sheer embodiment of the grotesque and the ugly side of human nature. Daumier’s sculpted busts are representative of vile, immoral, and bestial characteristics, which lower man to animalistic behaviors instead of elevating him toward virtue.

Philipon’s commission is unique in the history of sculpted portraiture because it shows a complete change in the purpose of sculpted portraiture: three-dimensional busts made for the sole purpose of being translated into two-dimensional forms. This novelty raises questions about the mutability and fluidity of artistic forms – and consequently
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hybridity – which was of primordial importance to Romantic artists. The small busts were used as drawing aids for Philipon’s employees and by Daumier himself, who referred to the busts to create multiple, damaging lithographs for Philipon’s two newspapers. Philipon was allowed to publish the lithographs of politicians, yet the bust series remained unknown to the public until 1878, when ten of them were exhibited in a retrospective on Daumier. The drastic difference in dates exemplifies an important theme of this thesis, which is based on the fact that a paper caricature was not considered as damaging as a sculpted caricature. The latter has connotations of durability and permanence. In contrast, paper is a fragile medium and, thus, does not appear to have the lasting impact of a three-dimensional work.

An essential component of this thesis is based on the interest that David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, Préault, and Daumier shared for the pseudo-sciences of physiognomy and phrenology. David d’Angers used phrenology and physiognomy to accentuate the character of his sitters, sometimes to the point of gross exaggeration. Dantan-Jeune showed a deep understanding of the sciences, the application of which is visible in his formal and caricatural busts. Daumier satirized the two pseudo-sciences in his busts series and in lithographs to ridicule the idiosyncrasies of the social classes of the July Monarchy. Similarly, Préault exaggerated physical characteristics based on physiognomy and phrenology, sometimes to the point of grotesque exaggerations. The use – and abuse – of physiognomy and phrenology was contrary to the understanding of Ideal Beauty in classical portraiture, which had been standardized to edify the virtues of the sitter. Contradictions occurred in the sculpted portraiture of the four artists, with neo-Classical, Romantic, realist, naturalist, and expressionist elements appearing often within the same
bust. Sculpted portraiture often resulted in a style of artistic “hybridity” which paralleled the political and societal ambivalences of the early years of the July Monarchy caused by social unrest, the reinstatement of censorship, and the revival of conservatism among the Jury of the Salon.

In *The Sculptural Imagination*, Alex Potts analyses new modes of display for sculpture and its impact on the audience. A viewer can either interact with autonomy or subjection, depending on the placement of a three-dimensional object. This active or passive experience is directly linked to the conditions set out by the artist who chooses where, when and how to place his sculpture on view. Potts successfully argues that a different reading of a sculpture occurs when seeing it from afar rather than close-up. In the latter, the audience has a direct contact with the object, and experiences the interaction on a tactile level instead of just a visual one. Potts starts his discussion with the stage-like setting and use of candlelight that Antonio Canova (1757-1822) used to enhance the viewing experience of his patrons. He then skips a century and jumps to Rodin's methods of display, thereby omitting the innovations of the four sculptors I am discussing. In this analysis, I address the problem of antiquated modes of display that sculptors wanted to replace in order to make them more fitting for the modernism of their sculptures.

David d'Angers and Dantan-Jeune moved their audiences from the Salon to their own ateliers. Dantan-Jeune also generated a new way of looking at sculpture by locating caricatures and statuettes that the general public gawked at through the windows of the Susse store with its enticing bright lights from regal chandeliers. The public also had
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the possibility of entering, viewing, and holding the statuettes, creating an actual tactile interaction between the viewer and potential buyer.

This new mode of display and reception contrasted with the dimly lit galleries of the Louvre, where sculptures were exhibited during the Salon. Sunlight from large windows cast unattractive shadows on the rows of sculptures displayed in the galleries where the public rarely ventured. In contrast, Préault controlled his audience by showing reliefs that were hung on the walls and, thus, required a physical passivity because the viewer had to remain immobile in front of his works. As an ostracized artist, Préault lacked the power to choose where to place his sculptures at the Salon. This imposed placement is, I believe, relevant to my analysis since art critics refused to discuss works that were poorly placed.

The portraits-busts and medallions that I include in my analysis are but a small section of the large body of work that David d'Angers and Dantan-Jeune produced. They were both prolific sculptors who made hundreds of sculptures throughout their long careers. Préault's oeuvre is much smaller because of his lack of patronage, which resulted in the destruction of his sculptures for lack of space. Consequently, I analyze objects from descriptions or lithographs of them that have been lost or destroyed. I have included these because of the importance of their reception, which led to Préault's rejection in subsequent Salons.

The selection of works that I discuss is only comprised of male sitters because of the accepted notion of decorum vis-à-vis women. This discretion was a show of respect toward women who were supposed to be beautiful. A notable example occurred with soprano Marie-Félicité Malibran (18080-1836). The popular singer wrote to Dantan: “M.F. Malibran a prié Monsieur Dantan de vouloir bien lui faire sa charge en plâtre afin que la masse vulgaire pût rire à ses dépens.” (M.F. Malibran begs Mr. Dantan to make

Sculptors regularly beautified
women, a practice which goes beyond the scope of my thesis. In fact, my analysis is largely based on the evolving concept of ugliness as a vehicle for these sculptors to realize a modernity for which they have not been credited.

I believe that I have chosen to analyze a range of sculpted portraits and reliefs that show the versatility of the four artists in their use of "hybridity", with distinct styles often included within a single sculpture. This thesis is, then, written to demonstrate that the defiance with which the four artists approached the art of sculpture is of paramount interest. David d'Angers, Préault, Daumier, and Dantan-Jeune are more than the predecessors of Carpeaux and Rodin. They embody Modernity \textit{par excellence}.

---

CHAPTER 1: Academism versus Romanticism

A. Differences between caricatures in two and three-dimensions

In the 1806 edition of the *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*, Aubin-Louis Millin notes that making caricatures is a useful tool for students. He gives the definition of caricature as follow:

Term of painting or drawing by which one understands a portrait in which the features are so exaggerated and the natural flaws so accentuated that the person represented is turned to ridicule. Nonetheless, caricatures must always keep a close resemblance to the original... In the art of drawing, caricatures must be distinguished by the strong impression that they produce on the imagination that is stricken by the extraordinary idea and by the lively and unexpected response that they produce.¹⁸

Two points in Millin’s description need to be addressed. He does not include the art of sculpture even though he gives examples of Ancient sculpted caricatures in his text. This omission asserts that in the early 1800’s, sculpted caricatures were not produced or, at least, were atypical of traditional atelier exercises. In 1838, students at the Beaux-Arts School still used Millin’s Dictionary as a reference. The definition remained the same. Despite the large number of sculpted caricatures that Dantan-Jeune produced and their enormous popularity, caricature was still considered a two-dimensional art form. Millin also describes the reaction that the caricature must provoke on the viewer. A caricature has to have an immediate impact that shocks the imagination of the viewer. It is achieved through its liveliness, unnaturalness, and surprising quality. Consequently, a (drawn) caricature is a sketch made impulsively, quickly, with facial exaggerations, but only essential ones. Consequently, the art of caricature shares characteristics with Romantic sculpture. Although not actual caricatures, Romantic portraits busts were regularly compared to them because they were quickly made, their physiognomies and expressions were exaggerated, and they lacked a smooth finishing touch. Of course, this new sculptural method was deemed unworthy of the noble art of sculpture. Yet, the sketch-like portraits had an immediate effect of shock or bemusement on the Salon audience that did not understand such audacious innovations.

At one point or another, Préault, David d’Angers, and Dantan-Jeune faced harsh criticism and ridicule because their formal portraits were compared to caricatures. This reception of incomprehension and uneasiness shows the great steps that they took away from traditional portraiture. When comparing their works to caricatures, art critics failed to acknowledge an essential point which separates a caricature from a portrait:
Caricatures are meant to ridicule a sitter, either physically or morally, and need the participation of the audience to laugh at the person depicted. In contrast, the formal portraits by these three sculptors were not made with the intention to render their subjects laughable. Instead, they thrived to introduce portraits through artistic and scientific innovations. The misguided public followed reviews of art critics they trusted in their knowledge and opinion on art. By comparing portraits to caricatures and other demeaning terms, art critics shaped public opinion against artists and their works.

David d’Angers despised caricatures. He compared them to “the mud of society” and caricaturists to “the leprosy of the arts”, even though he likely made them while studying under Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) before winning the Prix de Rome in 1811. Jean-Henri Cless made an ink drawing, Un atelier d’artiste en 1804 (also called L’Atelier de Jacques-Louis David; Jacques- Louis David’s Studio), which shows the importance he applied to the study of the nude, both from live models and Classical sculpture. Former pupil Etienne Jean Delécluze (1781-1863; fig. 1.1) describes David’s atelier in similar terms to Cless’ drawing.

The drawing and the description differ on one fundamental point. Cless’ represents bare walls, except for David’s 1778 Academic nude painting Hector. Students’ hats and overcoats, a palette, and two postings are placed under a wooden plank.


which holds paintings. David’s atelier appears as a space solely dedicated to learning from live models and Antique casts. In contrast, Delécluze notes that the atelier was filled with rows of caricatures that students made on a regular basis. He writes:

There were no ornamentations unless one would like to call as such, large spots of color spread under the long wood plank and a multitude of caricatures, some of them quite old, that covered the walls. David considered these jokes from his students to be quite important; in fact, when a new student’s physiognomy demanded to be caricatured, one never missed the opportunity to make it on the side of the wall closest to the model, so when David came to criticize the work of his students, he was able to see it. In general, he would say: It is a good one; or It is a bad one. In the first case, he asked the name of the student who made it; in the second, he laughed sarcastically, which provoked a massive howl resulting in the washing out of the caricature.21

Cless’ tribute to Louis David’s is a fallacy made to perpetuate Louis David’s reputation as the reformer of Rococo decadence and his role in moralizing and ennobling French art. Even though during the Convention Louis David was commissioned to make propaganda caricatures against the English government. Those were made in multiple copies and widely distributed. One of them, Gouvernement Anglois (The English Government; fig. 1.2) has a simple scatological narrative that would have been easily understood by the masses. It represents the head of King Georges III stuck on the Devil’s

21 “Du reste, nul ornement, à moins que l’on veuille donner ce nom à de grandes taches de couleurs étalées au dessous de la planche courante, et à une foule de caricatures, dont quelques unes assez anciennes, couvraient les murailles. David attachait quelque importance à ces lazzis de ses élèves; aussi, lorsque les traits d’un nouvel élève prêtaient à la charge, ne manquait-on pas de s’exercer à la faire sur le coté du mur près duquel se détachait le modèle, en sorte que quand David venait corriger ses élèves, il pût la voir. Ordinairement il disait: Elle est bonne; ou Elle est mauvaise. Dans le premier cas, il demandait le nom de l’auteur; dans le second, il riait ironiquement, ce qui produisait un chœur de huées sourdes, à la suite desquelles ordinairement la caricature était effacée.” M.E. J. Delécluze. Louis David, son école et son temps. Paris: Didier, Libraire-Éditeur, 1855, 46-47.
buttocks, from where lightning bolts are thrown at the English people.\textsuperscript{22} Cless’ drawing is an idealized fabrication made for a public unaware of Louis David’s past. Delécluze wrote his memoirs thirty years after the painter’s death, when his aura was no longer relevant to artists working in the mid-1850s.

The rows of caricatures that covered the walls of Louis David’s atelier show that seemingly benign jokes were, in fact, an important exercise that taught students to extract the most salient features of a person’s physiognomy. Louis David’s emphasis on making caricatures was not a new teaching method and it was not an art form that generations of great artists rejected.\textsuperscript{23} In France, they were called \textit{portraits-charges} or \textit{charges} after the Italian Renaissance artist Annibale Carracci (1560-1609), who made them regularly in his atelier and directly in the streets of Bologna. Carracci believed that Nature played tricks on men by giving them deformities or odd shapes. In turn, men enjoyed playing jokes on others by making caricatures. He writes: “It (Nature) distorts a subject by creating a big nose, a large mouth, a lump or any other deformity; it shows that it takes pleasure or makes fun of the concerned subject, by laughing and recreating itself in such deformity or such disproportion…When the artist imitates these kinds of subjects, not only as they are,

\begin{footnotesize}

\end{footnotesize}
but when without altering the resemblance, he increases contradictions and flaws, it bears the name of loaded portraits.”\textsuperscript{24}

Despite his veneration for Louis David, David d’Angers clearly stated his stand on caricature and portraiture:

There are two ways to increase the strength of the human face. The first is to exaggerate its flaws: caricature is then born, which the Greeks repudiated so forcefully. The second is based on the accentuation of significant forms of the moral grandeur of the subject. In this case, it is appropriate to soften the flaws; it does not mean that the shape is changed but that it is an interpretation of nature. It is always within the same range, but the parts that correspond to the most distinguished features of the face are enhanced while the defective ones are veiled through the skillful hand of the sculptor.\textsuperscript{25}

Caricature was a disservice to the purpose of sculpture because it emphasized men’s weaknesses and vices. David d’Angers even rejects the notion that Ancient Greeks made sculpted caricatures. His steadfast stand against caricature and caricaturists appears to have been directly aimed at Dantan-Jeune who popularized caricatures in the medium of sculpture. Paradoxically, David d’Angers read Charles Philipon’s (1800-1861) satirical


\textsuperscript{25} “Il y a deux moyens d’accroître la puissance du visage humain. Le premier consiste à outrer les défauts : alors naît la caricature, que les Grecs répudiaient avec tant d’énergie. Le second repose sur l’accentuation des formes significatives de la grandeur morale du sujet. Il convient dans ce cas d’adoucir les défauts ; la forme n’est pas changée pour cela mais il y a interprétation de la nature. C’est toujours la même gamme, mais les notes qui correspondent aux traits distingués de la face sont données avec force, tandis que les points defectueux sont voilés par le doigté du statuaire.” Henry Jouin. David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains. Vol. II. Paris: E. Plon et Cie, Imprimeurs-Editeurs, 1878, 85.
newspapers *Le Charivari* and *La Caricature*. He even made a medallion of the publisher in 1834, which asserts that he was not adverse to caricatures, as long as they were made in a *temporary* medium. The sculptor portrays *Charles Philipon* in a profile view to include in his *Galerie des Contemporains* (fig. 1.3).  

It is made with a precision of contour which follows *Philipon’s* well defined forehead and gently curved eyebrow on eyes left blank, even though he faces straight forward. *Philipon* has a long nose with flaring nostrils and a caved-in thin mouth which accentuates his pronounced chin. *Philipon* has a faint smile from curved upward lips and has smooth cheeks. David d’Angers includes a full set of hair with thick curls that fall in waves above his ear and on his neck. The sculptor includes wispy hair on the back of the neck and adds an Adam’s apple which results in a realistic depiction of *Philipon*.

The end of censorship led to a surge of printed press, and new lithographic techniques allowed multiple copies to be made rapidly and cheaply. *Philipon* was the most successful entrepreneur in the diffusion of printed caricatures and formal portraits in his newspapers *La Caricature* and *Le Charivari*. His publishing house also sold single lithographs and albums of portraits of historical and contemporary subjects. He reproduced works on view at the Salon and others that the Jury rejected. One of them is a
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26 *Philipon’s* full signature is carved behind his head and under the neck, David d’Angers has included the date “1834” next to his name. For a bronze example of the *Portrait médaillon de Charles Philipon*, see Collection Maison de Balzac, Paris. Ref: BAL 01-0014. Although they worked in very different mediums, the friendship between the two appears to have been lasting. In 1839, La Maison Aubert started a new series on contemporary figures and David d’Angers was included in the first book in which Huart wrote, “David n’est non seulement un grand et habile artiste; c’est de plus un homme éminemment intelligent et d’un caractère aussi loyal que ferme.” (David is not just a great and skillful artist; he is also an extremely intelligent man with a character as loyal as strong.) In an ironic twist, Dantan-Jeune was also featured and was represented on the cover of the book. Charles Philipon and Louis Huart. *Galerie de la presse, de la littérature, et des beaux-arts*. Vol.1. Paris: Au Bureau de la publication et Chez Aubert, 1839, np. For an illustration of *Philipon’s* medallion, see Joseph G. Reinis. *The Portrait Medallions of David D'Angers: A Complete Catalogue of David’s Contemporary and Retrospective Portraits in Bronze*. New York: Polymath Press, 1999, 360-361.
lithograph of Préault’s sculpture in the round, *Parias* (Pariahs; fig. 1.4), which the Jury rejected for the Salon of 1834. Auguste Bouquet lithographed the group sculpture that Philipon published in 1835. On the top right, Bouquet writes, “to my friend Préault” and signs his name underneath. On the lower part of the lithography, Philipon includes the title of the sculpture and adds underneath, “Group rejected by the Salon of 1834”. Other liberal newspapers also reproduced lithographs of Préault’s sculpture with similar captions. The *Journal des Artistes* published Célestin Nanteuil’s lithograph of *Parias* and added on its lower part, “! Rejected by the Jury…!” 27 These examples typify the power of the press in diffusing illustrations of works that the Jury rejected.

The captions clearly condemn the selection members, who were known to try to suppress Préault’s popularity among young artists and to destroy his only means of direct publicity, which was to exhibit at the Salon. The publication of his sculptures allowed the public to see – albeit in two-dimension – his works, the only recourse that he had to promote his name.

This new type of publicity shows a radical change in the printed press, which did not publish works rejected for the Salon until the reinstatement of the freedom of the press in 1830. It also attests to a drastic evolution in the way artists were promoted who, without the printed press, would have remained unknown or made a lesser impact on the arts. The renown of Préault and his battle against the artistic establishment that has reached us today is, in great part, because of the help of the printed press.

Daumier did not exhibit paintings at the Salon until 1848 and consequently did not have the problems that Préault faced on a regular basis. Daumier was known as a

27 “Parias. Groupe refusé par le jury de 1834.” These lithographs are the only visual references of Préault’s sculpture, which whereabouts is unknown. Philipon published the lithograph in *Le Charivari* (4 May 1835): 4; “! Refusé par le jury…!” *Journal des artistes*. (5 July 1834): 5.
lithographic caricaturist who worked for Philipon’s publishing house. The series of sculpted busts of *Les Célébrités du Juste Milieu* was unknown to the public until his first retrospective in 1878 (fig. 1.5).\(^{28}\) In contrast, their two-dimensional counterparts were regularly published between 1832 and 1835. Even though they represented politicians, the lithographs of the caricatural busts were not perceived as threatening. Philipon regularly brought his lithographs to the censorship office, where they regularly received a stamp of approval for publication. Daumier showed a natural ability for three-dimension works even though he made them as drawing aids for his two-dimensional production. In fact, Daumier appears to have cared little for his sculpted busts of the *Célébrités*. When he was done with the series of lithographs, he sold the sculpted busts to Philipon who, unlike Daumier, saw them as worthy objects to be kept.

Daumier also used his ca. 1850 statuette of *Ratapoil* as an aid to make a series of two-dimensional caricatures (fig. 1.6). The statuette confirms Daumier’s masterful handling and his ease in working with a medium other than a lithographic pen or a paintbrush. Made to criticize the Second Republic (1848-52), *Ratapoil* is a stereotype of the secret police force that intimidated citizens to vote for Louis-Napoleon’s reelection campaign. With his worn out top hat, his pointed beard and slanted demeanor, *Ratapoil*
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\(^{28}\) Daumier’s 1878 retrospective took place at the Gallery Durand-Ruel in Paris where his paintings, lithographs and drawings were exhibited with *Ratapoil*, *the Emigrants* and ten caricatures from the *Celebrities of the Juste-Milieu*. A reviewer noted: “Une autre exposition, qui a été aussi un étonnement et une leçon pour la génération nouvelle, est celle qu’un groupe d’artistes et d’amateurs organisèrent de l’œuvre d’Honoré Daumier, le puissant caricaturiste…On trouvait aussi à cette exposition de petits bustes en terre cuite pétris par le doigt nerveux de Daumier, avec une verve d’observation réaliste et une intensité d’expression comique qui dépasse tout ce qu’on peut imaginer.” (A group of artists and enthusiasts of the oeuvre of Honoré Daumier, the mighty caricaturist, has organized an exhibit, which is a surprise and a lesson for the new generation…in it, one could also find small terracotta busts kneaded by Daumier’s vigorous hand, with a verve of realistic observation and an intensity of comical expressiveness that exceeds everything that one can imagine.) Quoted in Jean Cherpin. *Daumier et la sculpture*. Paris: Éditions de la revue moderne, 1979, 119.
appears equally malicious and self-assured. With enormous baton in one hand and legs firmly planted on the ground, he is a menacing presence who also exhibits buffoon-like qualities. Ratapoil is a tour de force in expressivity, liveliness, and contrasting lines that break free in all directions. But Ratapoil retains its wholeness and legibility from all angles because Daumier uses a spiraling form which provides enormous dynamism.

The readers of Le Charivari were familiar with Ratapoil who was portrayed alternatively as a sinister brute, a buffoon, a hypocrite, and a seedy veteran (fig. 1.7). Yet, only close friends of Daumier knew of its existence. He even hid the subversive statuette after Louis-Napoleon’s Coup d’état in 1852. Ratapoil was “hidden with a jealous care…wrapped in linens, or straw, Ratapoil was unceasingly moved by Madame Daumier who could never find a safe enough place…”29 Clearly, Daumier knew that his statuette was exceptional and he wanted to preserve it. At the same time, his need to hide Ratapoil reveals the power of three-dimensional caricatures versus the seemingly inconsequential effect of caricatures in two-dimension. This problem of effect, however, is principally due to the subjects that Daumier sculpted. They had political messages and their implications were too subversive to be shown publicly.

In contrast, Dantan-Jeune could show his sculpted caricatures because they did not represent politicians. He produced single prints and albums of his caricatures and formal busts to reach a greater market because they were cheaper than his sculpted

caricatures and portraits of celebrities that were sought after by the public. Sculpted portraiture and caricature were, thus, widely distributed in two-dimensional forms.

The bourgeoisie of the July Monarchy was made of a group of *nouveaux riches* who wanted validation and recognition. Never before were so many portrait busts made of a social group that had no other reason to be *immortalized* than for the fact that they could afford the cost of portrait. Caricature, we have seen, is a portrait that exaggerates the most salient features and is made with the final intent of ridicule. Yet, a shift occurred in the art of caricature with the help of Dantan-Jeune. His sculpted caricatures of contemporary celebrities had an unforeseen appeal to the public. Instead of having connotations of ridicule, the model whom he caricatured was perceived as being famous and successful. Indeed, a young actor contacted Dantan-Jeune to tell him that his caricatures had “increased the popularity of many in society” and asked him to make his caricature as a “service” so the public would grow fond of him.\(^\text{30}\)

This stunning example shows the power and popularity of Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures on the public. Just as it used to be a mark of distinction to have a formal portrait bust, now it was an honor to be caricatured by Dantan-Jeune. It was also a marketing ploy to promote oneself. When Dantan-Jeune published his lithographs, he was very selective in his choice of which sitters to include in his albums. He appears to have based his selection on their popularity, and chose well known sitters would be easily recognized. As a result, the public responded with enthusiasm to the production of

lithographs and purchased them, perhaps hoping that one day they would also be worthy to be caricatured.

B. Dantan-Jeune and the depiction of deformity in sculpted and paper caricatures

Carpeaux made multiple caricatures on paper. He also made a plaster caricature, Portrait charge de Cherzère, chef de gare de Drouai (Caricature of Cherzère, Chief of the Train Station in Drouai; fig. 1.8). Made around 1860, the sculpted caricature is a traditional depiction based on exaggerating the size of the head, which is large as the torso and upper-part of Cherzère legs. The full-length statuette is made of a thick and unrefined stump. It depicts Cherzère with an enormous aquiline nose, mutton-chop side burns, and almond-shaped eyes which Carpeaux has deeply carved. Cherzère holds his balding head up, giving a sense of his self-sufficiency. Perhaps Cherzère had just been promoted, and Carpeaux accentuates the man’s pride by showing his hands holding the sides of an overcoat that is too small to cover his enormous stomach, which is covered by a vest that is ready to burst. The seams of the vest hardly hold the buttons in place. Yet he appears unfazed by his weight, which he carries on two short and thick legs. Carpeaux has kept a chunk of plaster behind the legs as if to hold the caricature in a stable position. This technique is unnecessary as the caricature is already a thick chunk of plaster. Carpeaux's caricature of Cherzère does not have the refinement that Dantan-Jeune already showed in his first sculpted caricature.

31Carpeaux's sculpted caricature is held in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-arts de Valenciennes. Ref. S. 90.57.
Dantan-Jeune received an academic training and studied in the atelier of François-Joseph Gilbert Bosio (1769-1845), one of the most successful sculptors in Paris. He rented a space at La Childebert, a dilapidated house which had been divided into small studios since the 1790s. Young art students enjoyed practical jokes and spent time making caricatures of one another when taking breaks from their more serious works. In 1826 or 1827, Dantan-Jeune sculpted his first caricature, history and portrait painter Louis-Joseph-César Ducornet (1806-1856; fig. 1.9) who was born without arms. Ducornet was able to paint with his feet and held the palette with one toe and his paintbrush with his other foot. Despite Ducornet’s physical defect, he was a talented artist who, instead of hiding his deformity, stressed his uncommon gift by signing his canvases, “Ducornet, né sans bras” (Ducornet, born without arms). Clearly Ducornet felt pride in his artistic abilities and turned a congenital defect, then considered a monstrosity, into a distinctive physical characteristic worthy of respect and wonderment. In fact, Ducornet’s
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32 Louis-Léopold Boilly (1761-1845) and Louis-Philibert Debucourt (1755-1832) were early occupants and, starting in the 1820’s, artists Paul Delaroche (1797-1856), Alfred and Antoine Johannot (1800-1837; called Tony 1803-1852), Eugène et Achille Devéria (1808-1865; 1800-1857) patronized the studios’ space. Les Jeunes France, a group of Romantic youth including novel writer and art critic Théophile Gautier (1811-1872), sculptor Jean Bernard (1808-1866, called Jehan du Seigneur), and poet Petrus Borel (1809-1859) also frequented La Childebert, as well as other groups such as Les Bouzingots. They differed from Les Jeunes France with their style of dressing and behavior but both despised the bourgeois, which they nicknamed l’épicié. Alexandre Privat d’Anglemont. Paris anecdote. Paris: chez P. Jeannet Libraire, 1854, 172 and 188.

33 Prosper Viro. Charges et Bustes de Dantan Jeune: esquisse biographique. Paris: librairie Nouvelle, 1863, 85-86. In the front of the base, Dantan-Jeune wrote in ink, “Ducornet sans bras artiste peintre D.Je” (Ducornet without arms artist painter D. Je) and on the side added, “1ere charge faite par moi” (First caricature that I have made); on the back of the base, he carved his name and dated the caricature to 1826. The exact dating of the caricature and the fact that he made it his first essay remains doubtful. It is generally believed that Dantan-Jeune created the statuette between 1826 and 1827, and that it was “une des toutes premières” (one of the first) that he produced. Philippe Sorel notes, “En 1826 ou 1827 Dantan modèle sa première charge connue, celle de Ducornet.” (In 1826 or 1827, Dantan modeled his first known caricature, that of Ducornet). Philippe Sorel. Dantan-Jeune: caricatures et portraits de la société romantique. Paris: Maison de Balzac, Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1989, 27.
deformity was such that his condition and artistic abilities were described in *Histoire des Monstres* (History of Monsters). The author writes:

Who does know the story of Louis Ducornet, born in Lille in 1806? He was born without arms...Ducornet painted with the big toe in hole of the palette, which he posed on his left heel; he held his brush between the big and the small toe of his right foot; when he needed to prepare his canvas, he held the brush in his teeth: the diligent work that he set for himself resulted in emaciated legs that appeared somewhat deformed; but the foot, used to hold the brush, was not part of the deformity: it looked as delicate as the foot of a woman...could we not see an objection against nature’s irony that played a game to sequester the soul of an artist into the body of a monster? 34

Dantan-Jeune made a full-length caricature of Ducornet in which the model’s lack of arms is hardly noticeable. In fact, Dantan-Jeune represents Ducornet in a stocky statuette in which he wears a single cape cloak that disguises his infirmity to completely give the impression that he is standing on two legs. Although Dantan-Jeune depicts the four-toe feet, they do not stand out. They blend in as if Ducornet's toes were normally formed. Dantan-Jeune represents Ducornet with the collar of his shirt opened wide and attached by a single button which lay on his breast. Unless the viewer had previous knowledge of Ducornet's congenital deformity, he would likely miss the fact that he did

not have upper limbs. Dantan-Jeune’s caricature is a friendly prank in which Ducornet is laughing cheerfully and shows a set of front teeth partially covered with bulging gums; above his thick nose, his eyes are shut due to his contagious hilarity. From the side, Ducornet’s physical deformity becomes more apparent. It is clear that Ducornet lacks his upper limbs and his deformed back forms a hump that accentuates uneven shoulders. They protrude from the back of the cloak and grossly distort Ducornet’s silhouette.

Dantan-Jeune chose an easy prey for a first try at sculpting a caricature. He depicts Ducornet as a good-natured tease instead of emphasizing the gross deformity of a colleague who appears to have had the respect of his peers. However, two years later, Dantan-Jeune made a second caricature of Ducornet (fig.1.10). The drawing on paper represents Ducornet in the action of painting. Although caricatural, the contour drawing is a much more realistic depiction of Ducornet’s distorted body. Dantan-Jeune shows the painter, in profile, completely engrossed in his work. He sits in an armchair set on a platform which allows him to reach various parts of the large canvas. Ducornet is

---

35 The drawing is held in the Collection of the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lille, France. Box 52, 41-4. Ref 44. Ducornet was able to work with the help of his father who also carried him on his back to protect his feet. A witness wrote: “La nature n’a cependant pas réduit Ducornet à lui-même; elle a commit au soin de cet être physique inachevé l’être complémentaire le plus enclin à s’adapter, si l’on peut s’exprimer de cette façon, à cet organisme particulier. Le père de Ducornet remplit auprès de son fils cette fonction bien respectable et bien digne d’éloges; c’est ce compagnon inséparable, attentif, qui transporte sur ses épaules le peintre, soigneux de ne pas fatiguer des pieds si bien utilisés à la culture des beaux-arts; c’est constamment lui qui s’adjoinit à tous les actes que Ducornet ne peut pas accomplir avec ses seuls moyens; c’est lui qui monte Ducornet sur son échafaudage, l’en descend, l’habille, en un mot, le complète.” (Nature has not left Ducornet to fend for himself; It has entrusted a complementary being most inclined to adapt to this unfinished life form, if one can say, to this particular organism. Ducornet’s father fills this worthy function, which his laudable; He is the inseparable and mindful companion who carries the painter on his shoulders, cautious to protect the feet that are so well utilized to the culture of the Beaux-Arts. He is, at all times, the one who takes in charge everything that Ducornet is unable to accomplish on his own; He is the one who lifts Ducornet on his scaffolding, lowers him, dresses him, in one word, he completes him.) J.B. Delestre, “Ducornet.”. *Dictionnaire de la conversation et de la lecture: inventaire raisonné des notions générales les plus indispensables à tous.* Second édition. Vol.8. Paris: Aux comptoirs de la direction, 1854, 116.
hunched over a tilted canvas, likely placed in this way to ease its access. He paints with a brush placed between his toes and holds the palette with his other foot. Unlike the sculpted caricature, Dantan-Jeune does not hide that Ducornet is incapable of walking. His caricatural drawing is akin to Ducornet’s *Self-Portrait* in which the painter looks directly at the viewer (fig. 1.11). Ducornet emphasizes his own physical deformity by showing his feet, which hold three thin brushes and a palette filled with neatly laid-out colors. His feet are wrapped in white cloth up to the middle and appear as wondrous tools able to perform as adequately as hands. In both two-dimensional depictions, Dantan-Jeune and Ducornet acknowledge the painter’s disability.

The contradiction that results between Dantan-Jeune’s two caricatures – one a sculpture, one a drawing – underscores an essential perception that was prevalent prior to, and during, the July Monarchy. A contemporary remarked:

> Caricature has remarkably soared these past years. For a long time, it was only a simple sketch, a crazy idea thrown rapidly on a piece of paper; and now, it is made in relief. Caricature has become a monument, a bust or a statuette. It is Dantan who has had the idea and exploits it... One day, we will find some of the caricatures of this maker of figures just as we have found antique ones; we will talk a long time over them and they will be subjects of learned thesis for the academy of the inscriptions of time.37

A sculpted caricature was an artistic liability because of its durability. A two-dimensional caricature was perceived as less threatening to the person who was caricatured. Paper, Paper, Paper,

36 Ducornet’s *Autoportrait* is held in the collection of the Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille, France. Ref. P 884.

37 “La charge a prit un essor remarquable dans ces dernières années...Elle se contenta long-temps [sic] d'être un simple croquis, une idée folle jetée en courant sur le papier; la voilà affectant le relief. Elle s'est fait monument, buste ou statuette. C'est Dantan qui a eu cette idée et l'exploite...Un jour on retrouvera quelques unes de ses charges de ce figuriste comme on en a trouvé d'antiques; on disserterà long-temps là dessus, et ce sera matière à de savans [sic] mémoires pour l'académie des Inscriptions du temps.” “Paris moderne. Dantan,” *Nouveau tableau de Paris au XIXème siècle*, 1834, 327-330.
after all, is a fragile medium that is not supposed to withstand the test of time. However, a caricature made in a durable material retains the association of permanence; thus, ridicule can be associated with the sitter for a much longer period. In fact, Dantan-Jeune’s drawing was a quick study, which he never developed into a sculpted caricature. Instead of emphasizing Ducornet’s actual birth defect, Dantan-Jeune opted for tactful discretion which was likely a testament to their friendship and the artist’s admiration for Ducornet, who had battled great adversities to pursue a career.

At the death of Ducornet, Henri Bruneel wrote a eulogy and recalled:

We shall never forget the impression we received upon entering his painting room. There, extended upon an easel, stood a huge canvass… and across the whole extent of the canvass ran with incredible agility, like a fly upon a wall, the stunted trunk of a man, surmounted by a noble head, with expansive brow and eye of fire… we saw then that he was deprived of arms; that he had no thighs; that his short legs were closely united to the trunk; and that his feet were wanting of a toe each… Then the apparition, gliding down the whole length of the scaffolding to the ground, advanced or rather rolled toward us and, with a bound, established itself on the sofa at our side.38

Bruneel’s description is accompanied by an illustration of a full-length statuette of Ducornet (fig. 1.12). Dantan-Jeune’s caricatural statuette veiled Ducornet’s deformity when seen frontally. Similar to Dantan-Jeune’s caricature, the illustration represents Ducornet in a frontal view and in a standing position. He wears a buttoned cape cloak with a collar opened wide on his chest. In contrast to Dantan-Jeune’s caricature, which only veils Ducornet’s deformity and portrays him with a wide grin, the lithograph shows Ducornet with enhanced facial features and with a solemn expression. Ducornet appears dignified, with his head slightly tilted upward, as if he were looking to a higher realm for

inspiration. Ducornet stands on a pedestal where a palette and paintbrushes are sculpted in low relief. His body and neck are elongated, resulting in a better-proportioned body which does not suggest his deformity. When looking at the illustration without reading the accompanying text, one would be unable to tell that Ducornet could not walk or stand up because of his distorted legs. The disjunction between the illustration and Bruneel’s text are enlightening when compared to Dantan-Jeune’s two caricatures of Ducornet. A drawing has more impact than a text. However, a sculpture has a greater impact than a text or an illustration because of its connotation of durability.

C. David d’Angers, the expression of passions and Academic portraiture

Since the seventeenth century, portraiture was considered a low genre unworthy of Academicians. Portraiture was a minor art form. Writer André Félibien (1619-1695) explains:

Just as the figure of man is the most perfect work that God made, it is certain that the one who imitates God’s creation by painting human figures, is the best of them all...However, a painter who only makes portraits has not reached the high perfection of Art and ought not to believe that he will receive the highest esteem of the most learned...In effect, those who endeavor to make a portrait do not employ in this occasion, their most intellectual effort and fail to use the knowledge necessary for the composition of a Great Painting. 39

39 “Et comme la figure de l’homme est le plus parfait ouvrage de Dieu sur la terre, il est certain aussi que celui qui se rend l’imitateur de Dieu en peignant des figures humaines, est beaucoup plus excellent que tous les autres...Néanmoins un Peintre qui ne fait que des portraits, n’a pas encore atteint cette haute perfection de l’Art , & et ne peut prétendre à l’honneur que
The human figure was the noblest form to represent because it was the creation of God, who made man to His image. However, portraiture was only a mechanical act that artisans and not artists could make. It did not require creativity but only the ability to reproduce the traits of a sitter. In 1759, Count de Caylus (1692-1765) offered the Royal Academy the implementation of an annual fund for winner of the best representation of “a particular study of the heads and principally of the expression of passions”. The Prix Caylus or Prix pour l’étude des têtes et de l’expression des Passions (Prize for the study of heads and the expression of passions) would be based on a life model, which could be represented in a drawing, a painting, a low relief, or a sculpture in the round. The primary reason behind the Prix Caylus was to revive interest on the part of students in depicting the human passions as defined by art theorist and First Painter to King Louis XIV, Charles Le Brun (1619–1690). Le Brun’s theories on physiognomy are based on the correlation between man’s nature and the external marks that are left by his internal passions, which leave characteristics that are visible on the human face and body. He
believed that facial features were external imprints of men’s internal passions and based his research on men’s intense emotional states. Those were visible in the shape of the eyes, the mouth, and the forehead. The mouth reflected the passions of the heart because it was closer to the heart. Le Brun also theorized that the most legible expression of passions was imprinted in the shape and movements of the eyebrows because they were closest to the soul and, as a result, directly expressed its condition. According to Lebrun:

It is in the expression of pathetic passions that eyebrows react most violently; all movements are composed by a combination of multiple causes; they take a piercing form and character during extreme physical pain and in sharp pains in the body and the mind…Despondency or elevation are the two principal movements of the eyebrow, nonetheless while observing that there are two types of elevation; one embodies pleasure, such as joy, and the other the dejection of the heart or of sadness. 42

In 1811, the Prix Caylus was still active. David d’Angers competed for the expression of La Douleur (Suffering; fig. 1.13). His bust was unanimously chosen. The subject of “la douleur morale” (moral grief) had been offered the previous year, but “la douleur” was more expansive. 43 It can be interpreted as a moral or physical pain, or the

---

43 “…Après avoir examiné attentivement les têtes dessinées peintes ou modelées dans ce concours on a mis aux voix la question de savoir s’il y a lieu de donner le prix. Le résultat du scrutin a été unanime pour l’affirmative. (illisible) les voix se trouvent réunies sur la tête marquée de la lettre G. L’auteur est Mr. David (Pierre-Jean) d’Angers âgé de 22 ans sculpteur Elève de Mr. Roland.”

expression of both. David d’Angers could choose from an array of expressions reflective of sorrow, anguish, and agony because there was no guideline to depict either a moral or physical pain. The sculptor combined all of these possibilities in one bust, which represents a young hero with a stretched and tilted neck that allows his head to turn toward heavens. David d’Angers has left the eyes without pupils in the manner of the Ancient Classical statues with eyes blank as if staring into eternity, a treatment usually reserved for Gods, heroes, and athletes. He gives his expressive head the style of an idealized portrait, which is accentuated by the Neo-Classical herm base. David d’Angers suggests that his sitter is a wounded hero who suffers greatly but has not yet surrendered to death. Although he renders the eyes blank, he instills a sense of life in the hero’s deeply ridged furrows between his eyebrows, and accentuates his suffering with the stretched and contorted neck. David d’Angers has shown restraint when dealing with the mouth of his model, which is opened only slightly, a reminder that a statue is not to show excessive emotions. David d’Angers includes a Grecian ribbon that athletes received with a laurel wreath after succeeding in athletic games: the ribbon separates carefully shaped curls which trail down his neck. The ribbon was regularly used in Ancient portraiture and shows that David d’Angers emulated Academic prototypes in order to put the odds in his favor. By emphasizing the supremacy of Greco-Roman sculpture and using a Neo-Classical bust, David d’Angers achieved success.

David d’Angers directly followed the archetype of Lebrun’s description of “tristesse” (sorrow), one of six “primitive” or simple passions, to complete his bust.

(...After having examined with utter care the drawn, painted, and modeled heads in this competition we posed the question as to know if there was ground to award the prize. The result of the poll has been unanimously positive. (illegible) the votes are all for the head marked with the letter G. The author is M. David (Pierre-Jean) d’Angers, 22 years old, sculptor and pupil of M. Roland.) Archives Nationales. AJ 52.5. Séance du 26 Janvier, 1811 et 7 Février, 1811.
Suffering. According to Lebrun, “Eyebrows are less exalted near the cheeks than in the center of the forehead…the nostrils pulling down and the mouth slightly open; the head casually propped on the shoulder.” David d’Angers extracted elements from Lebrun’s description by rendering visible the reaction to pain through the eyebrows that rise alongside the nose. In physiognomy, the neck is as important as the eyebrows for conveying expressions. David d’Angers concentrates on the outstretched neck twisted to one side, as if the hero has difficulty holding his head up, due to physical and mental agony. In fact, David d’Angers combines two expressions, including the conventional iconography of the mixed passions of “douleur corporelle et d’esprit” (physical and moral suffering) with Lebrun’s description of “tristesse”. David d’Angers approached the contest of the Prix Caylus in a conventional manner for a traditional exercise offered at the École des Beaux-Arts. This decision and the mastery of execution resulted in David d’Angers success, a contest that allowed him to compete for the most important prize, the Grand Prix de Rome.

### D. David d’Angers and the differentiation between portrait-busts and busts

Carpeaux made distinct types of portrait busts. These included sitters fully dressed or in the nude. He favored the curved busts à la française for portraits in contemporary costumes. This type of bust had been regularly used in the eighteenth century by Rococo

---

sculptors Augustin Pajou (1714-1785), Jean-Antoine Houdon (1741-1828), and by David d'Angers' master Roland, in a style which loosely followed the tradition of Baroque sculptor Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680). Eighteenth century portraitists depicted their sitters with contemporary costumes and often with powdered wigs. Such portraits were in vogue among the aristocracy and the high bourgeoisie who commissioned sculptors to represent them in carefree poses. As a result, a plethora of busts à la française were produced which typically represented male sitters with their heads turned sideways and looking away from the viewer. They were also made with deeply carved pupils in order to enliven the portrait, a technique favored by Carpeaux. Sitters wore loosely held overcoats and their wide collar shirts were opened onto their chests. When depicting sitters in the nude, Carpeaux also borrowed from Ancient precedents that the aforementioned French sculptors also used.

Carpeaux thus borrowed a conventional artistic style when making portrait busts. He often combined highly individualized facial expressions for sitters that he represented in the nude, a technique regularly used by Houdon, including in his 1793 portrait bust of Buffon (fig. 1.14). Houdon portrays Buffon in a naturalist manner. He successfully combines Buffon's head to the torso by sculpting his neck with muscles that continue

---


down to his upper torso. Unlike Houdon, Carpeaux's portrait busts based on this conventional style result, at times, in incongruous depictions. In 1862, he sculpted a portrait bust of banker Ernest André, representing him in a naturalistic pose, his head turned to the side and a collar beard framing his lower jaw (fig. 1.15). Carpeaux deeply carved in the eyes which give André a semblance of life, and has shown heavy bags and deep age lines. Yet, André’s nude torso does not include signs of aging and his neck is made with a smooth and even finish which contradicts the detailed facial features. André’s portrait bust begs to be covered by a costume.

Carpeaux's busts of fully dressed sitters are also based on Baroque and Rococo portraiture; the sculptor, however, shows a facility of handling, resulting in lively portraits which are made from the choice of an instantaneous pose that he has captured. His 1868 bust of Charles Garnier portrays the architect in a vivacious pose, emphasized by his head turned to the side and the multiple folds of his costume (fig. 1.16). Carpeaux adds liveliness by sculpting the hair of Garnier in thick waves which result in an uneven contour, which he replicates in the base by cutting under the upper arms and sculpting parts of the costume that fall loosely on the sides. Nonetheless, Carpeaux's portrait of Garnier is made in a Rococo style similar to Roland, exemplified in his 1797 portrait bust of Augustin Pajou (fig. 1.17). Roland represents his master with naturalistic features and also imbues dynamism by cutting the arms and the costume in uneven contours. Despite the naturalism and liveliness that Carpeaux expressed in his portrait busts, he nonetheless looked back at eighteenth century portraiture instead of creating a

---

47 Houdon's marble bust is held in the Collection des Sculptures, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Ref: RF. 379; Carpeaux's bust, in marble, is held in the collection of the Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Ref. RF. 1062.
48 Carpeaux's bronze bust is held in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-arts de Valenciennes. Ref. 91.82.
new style of sculpted busts. Carpeaux rarely used herm busts for his portraits busts. However, he used the Neo-Classical base in his 1872-73 bust of *Napoléon III* (fig. 1.18).\(^49\) Although the deposed Emperor was dying, Carpeaux represents him with naturalistic features that do not project any indication of his illness. *Napoléon III* looks to the side, with deeply carved eyes that gives him a lively – albeit removed – presence. The herm bust gives him a sternness and solemnity and attests that Carpeaux reserved this type of base for exceptional sitters. Consequently, as a trained Academic sculptor, Carpeaux selected different bust styles depending on the commission and the worth of the sitter.

David d’Angers was also well versed in the difference of busts according to the same principles as Carpeaux. However, David d’Angers had more freedom that Carpeaux because he was less dependent on official patronage when making sculpted portraits. The majority of his sculptures fall within the category of portrait busts but even he made a clear distinction between his *portraits bustes* and his *bustes*. He reserved busts for eminent sitters, as Ancient busts were made of notable sitters who deserved emulation and reverence. Neo-Classical herm busts represented heroic models in the nude or with a folded garment that partially covered a shoulder. Based on the idea that symmetry visually embodies the immutable, they represent idealized features and eyes without pupils that convey a sentiment of timelessness and eternity. In contrast, David d’Angers believed that a portrait remained at a lower position in the hierarchy of representation, as

---

\(^{49}\) Carpeaux started the bust in 1872 and travelled to London to finish the bust at the request of Napoleon III’s son because the ex-Emperor was dying. Carpeaux’ marble bust is held in the Collection of the Heim Gallery, London. He also represented *Marquis Léon de la Borde* in a herm bust. Collection of the Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Ref. RF. 929. For information on the commission that Carpeaux finished in London, see Alison McQueen. “Carpeaux’s vision for Napoleon III: mourning the death of an emperor.” *Apollo*. (November 1, 2003)
it required only the realistic depiction of the sitter; its primary goal was to achieve as much resemblance as possible. \footnote{For an analysis on the evolution of portraiture, see Guilhem Sherf. Sculpted Portraits, 1770-1830: “Real Presences.” Citizen and Kings: Portraits in the Age of Revolution. 1760-1830. London: Royal Academy of the Arts, 2007. Sheft raises the question of selection of appropriate choice of bust for a sitter during the transitional period of Rococo and Neo-Classical portraiture. The sculptor faced a choice between Idealization or likeness. The decision ultimately depended on the status of the sitter and his selection of a sculptor who either specialized in “immortalizing” his sitters or gave them a “likeness” that gave the appearance of a lifelike portrait.}

David d’Angers combined elements from Idealism and Realism in portrait-busts that he made based on his own judgment of the level of patriotic virtue of the sitter. The combination of these two distinct styles result in a hybrid portraiture that include beautification through the removal of physiognomic flaws and realistic features that are not necessarily considered beautiful, but are important to convey the character of the sitter. David d'Angers would reach this symbiosis in the early 1830s.

At the École des Beaux-Arts, professors taught theoretical concepts of Beauté, which they emphasized over concepts of Laideur. Students were dissuaded from representing physical flaws that could be perceived as ugly. Instead, they were encouraged to depict ideals of Beauty in order to enhance the artistic value of portraiture. Millin explains under “buste”:

> Ancient artists often gave, without eliminating the resemblance, an ideal beauty to portraits, which they produced as a result of their desire to combine beauty and resemblance. Consequently, they were able to give a heavenly presence to the human form…The same reason led them to reject mere representation of physical flaws as they could have disfigured the sitters that they portrayed; for such reason, modern artists ought to emulate such rules, because resemblance can be achieved without having to include a model’s every imperfection. \footnote{“Les anciens artistes donnoient souvent aussi, sans nuire à la ressemblance, une beauté idéale aux portraits qu’ils exécutoient, ils se faisoient une loi d’unir la beauté à la ressemblance, et de donner ainsi quelque chose de divin à la forme humaine…La même raison encore les engageoit à ne point imiter dans leurs portraits les défauts qui auraient pu défigurer le personnage qu’ils représentoient, et en cela encore les artistes modernes les devroient prendre pour modèles, parce que la ressemblance peut être obtenue sans s’attacher trop minutieusement à tous ces}
The École des Beaux-Arts professed two types of beauty, which included a *Beauté Idéale* and a *Beauté Académique*. The concepts differs in two ways: Ideal Beauty is based on elements of imagination and creation, and the generalization of physiognomic features into a simplification of forms that only keep the most beautiful features of a model. In order to succeed in the abstract pursuit of Ideal Beauty, the student ought to first excel in the lower stage of Academic Beauty. This was an easier task to achieve, as it involved the concrete representation of one specific model. In order to differ from the level of being an artisan who mechanically reproduced nature, the student slowly grew toward mastery by learning to enhance the model’s best physical features, thereby conveying the sitter’s internal beauty while preserving elements that remained recognizable. The concept of *Beauté Idéale* is a much harder concept to teach than *Beauté Académique*, as the former is based on an Idea that emerges in the imagination of the artist who succeeds in composing a general image formed out of multiple examples chosen from nature. Consequently, the artist is able to reach a higher realm that brings him and the viewers closer to God. Artists believed that the depiction of an Ideal of perfection was a Universal Beauty understandable by exceptional minds who had a refined sensibility.

Quatremère de Quincy also published an analysis on the concept of a *style ideal*. His definition supports Millin's, which he further develops. He defines the difference between "vulgar" portraits, which are only based on resemblance to that of an "ideal style". The latter elevates the subject through the sensibility and imagination of an artist. He writes:

---

When defined in its grammatical authority, the ideal type is the product of the imagination or the interior vision instead of being from the external vision and the positive imitation of the model. It is a combination born out of the idea of the artist or of the faculty to compose an image made of elements other than the model offers. In its moral authority, the ideal type is a style that aims to surpass the common style, which is the portrait and the model...

As a young student, David d’Angers showed a deep understanding of the concept of Idealized Beauty when creating the bust *Suffering*. The bust is embedded in Ancient Greek precedents exemplified in Lysippus’ (ca. 370-300 B.C.) fragment bust of *The Dying Alexander*, which represents the Greek Conqueror in a moment of moral and physical suffering (fig. 1.19). The pose of *Suffering* closely resembles Lysippus’ bust;

---

52 “Défini dans son acceptation grammaticale, le style idéal est un style produit pas l’imagination ou la vue intérieure, au lieu de l’être par la vue extérieure et l’imitation positive d’un modèle. C’est une combinaison née de l’idée de l’artiste ou de la faculté qu’il a de composer une image d’élémens [sic], autres que ceux d’un modèle donné. Dans son acceptation morale, le style idéal est un style qui prétend s’élever au dessus du style vulgaire qui est celui du portrait, du modèle...” Antoine-Chrysostôme Quatremère de Quincy. *Sur l’idéal dans les arts du dessin*. S.n. 1805, 34.

53 *The Dying Alexander* entered the collection of the Uffizi Gallery in the later part of the seventeenth century. It was believed to be a fragment of a statue that the Ancient Greek sculptor Lysippus created for Alexander the Great. According to Plutarch, Lysippus was the only contemporary sculptor allowed to represent the likeness of Alexander because he was “the sole patent for making all of his statues; because he alone expressed in brass the vigor of his mind, and in his lineaments represented the luster of his virtues; while others strove to imitate the turning of his neck and softness and brightness of his eyes, failed to observe the manliness and lion-like fierceness of his countenance.” Plutarch. *Plutarch’s Lives*. Vol. I. Translated by William Watson Goodwin. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1874, 495. During the seventeenth century, the identity of the bust was disputed. It led to a lack of interest in the reproduction of the bust, which had been included in collections throughout Europe, yet by the eighteenth century, it was again reproduced as a Classical bust. Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny. *The Taste for the Antique: The Lure for Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981, 134-135. In Classical sculpture, portraits were simply imitation of nature and lacked the nobility infused through canons of Beauty. Roman writer Gaius Plinius Secondus (called Pliny the Elder, 23-79) described the artistic changes that occurred in the portraiture during the 4th century B.C.A. Greek artist Lysistratus (active ca. 370-315 B.C.), brother of Lyssipus, was the first sculptor to represent lifelike features in sculpted portraiture. Lysistratus invented the process of applying plaster onto a model’s face in order to get a realistic image of the physiognomy. Lysistratus poured wax onto the hardened plaster mask, which resulted in the creation of the faithfull likeness of the model. Prior to Lysistratus’ new style of realistic portraiture, artists only “thought on how to make their portraits as handsome as possible.” Pliny
however, David d’Angers has made a notable change. He includes a herm bust instead of the curved base of *The Dying Alexander*. David d’Angers likely chose a Neo-Classical base to please Academic judges who emphasized the predominance of Neo-Classical busts over all others.

Students were encouraged to compare busts of a same model made by different sculptors. This comparative technique helped them identify elements that embodied Ideal Beauty. They were also expected to copy from antique sculptures to refine their sensibility and learn from Ancient masterpieces. David d’Angers’ success depended on his interpretation of an expression that he was able to formulate in a depiction based on a *Beauté Idéale*. This early mastery over the simpler depiction of a *Beauté Académique* likely depended on his knowledge of anatomy. David d’Angers was privy to direct observation and participation in human dissections in Parisian hospitals where lectures were given to medical students and artists alike. Art students regularly assisted in anatomical dissections to study the intricate functioning of the human body, considered essential in the painting and sculpting of anatomically correct figures. Dissections were also necessary to understand the intricacies of facial expressions and their relationship to muscles and nerves, as well as bones under the flesh and skin. In the bust *Suffering*, David d’Angers represents a vein that starts at the base of the neck and continues to its top. He also shows the extension of the muscle flexed from the tension of the stretched neck. The knowledge of anatomy was essential to render expressions and the sculptor excelled in their portrayal.

---

David d’Angers followed conventions in order to succeed and carefully followed the treatise on sculpture of art theorist Toussaint Bernard Eméric David (1755-1839). In 1805, Eméric David wrote a detailed study book that became a reference for Beaux-Arts’ students specializing in sculpture. Eméric-David emphasized the importance of studying anatomy in order to understand the complex functioning of the human body. He explains:

The sculptor does not learn sufficiently anatomy in books: One needs to dissect with his own hands...Start with an iron discipline. Rip the veil that covers the elastic interiors. Study the shape of muscles, their position, their interlacing, and especially their joints. Remove the first layer of muscles by lifting their extremities; study the shape of those underneath; remove them as well; go on, go on, go to the skeleton; Sculptors, your figure is there. 54

David d’Angers befriended professor of anatomy Doctor Pierre-Augustin Béclard (1785-1825), a fellow native from Angers, who took the younger man to hospitals, where he dissected cadavers on a regular basis. 55 He was able to complement his artistic studies


55 Similar to David d’Angers, Béclard had a humble upbringing. He moved to Paris to pursue his medical studies and by 1808, studied anatomy and physiology at the Hotel Dieu where dissections were regularly performed. Béclard was promoted to chief surgeon at the Hospital de la Charité and in 1818 became Professor of anatomy and physiology at the École de Médecine de Paris. Raige-Delorme. “Notice nécrologique.” Archives générales de Médecine. 3rd year. Vol VII. January 1825. Paris: Béchet jeune, libraire de l’Académie Royale de Médecine, 1825, 450-460. Since the Revolution, the use of unclaimed corpses for the use of dissections to teach anatomy was a common practice. By the end of the eighteenth century, Paris was the largest capital in Europe. It had more than six thousand indigent and ill patients who were housed in public hospitals. Their bodies as well as those of criminals were regularly used for teaching purposes. For more information, see Dora B. Weiner and Michael J. Sauter. “The City of Paris and the Rise of Clinical Medicine.” Orisis. 2nd serie. Vol. 18. (Science and the City). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003, 25.
with hands-on experience, which resulted in his ability to draw accurate sketches made directly from the human body while learning about the functions of the muscular system.

David d’Angers’ stunning debut with *Suffering* was clearly aimed to please the panel of conservative judges; it greatly differs from a bust made one year before winning the *Prix Caylus*. The 1810 bust *Lieutenant Poupard* represents a childhood friend who, in 1808, enrolled in the military *École Polytechnique* in Paris (fig.1. 20). David d’Angers’ bust of *Poupard* shows that he was well versed in diverse types of portraiture, and already adapted his style according to the model, the patron, the commission, and his expected audience. Unlike the expressive head of *Suffering*, David d’Angers portrays *Poupard* in a naturalistic style that contrasts with other busts made for Academicians and an elitist public. In fact, the three different busts show David d’Angers’ hybrid style clearly divided in three very different busts. These examples predict his later portraits which would combine elements of different styles within the same bust, resulting in a sculpture *mixe* and *hybride*.

In contrast with the Neo-Classical herm bust and idealized features of *Suffering*, David d’Angers selected a curve-shaped bust *à la française* and followed the style of his master when sculpting *Lieutenant Poupard*. In 1796, Roland represented painter *Denis-Sébastien Leroy* (d.1832; fig. 1.21), in a typical Rococo aesthetic, which David d’Angers incorporates in his portrait of *Poupard*. Roland sculpted *Leroy* with life-like features and a slightly opened mouth as if he were ready to speak. The naturalism of the pose and the

---

56 Poupart’s last name is usually erroneously spelled “Poupard.” Henri Jouin donated the bust in 1877 to the Musée David (today Gallerie David d’Angers), which also refers to the bust as “Poupard.” Jouin purchased the plaster bust in 1872 from a photographer who explained its provenance and the sitter’s identity. Little is known of the life of Poupart. He dispatched in Anvers and died in 1819 from the plague in Corsica. Henri Auguste Jouin. *David d’Angers et ses relations littéraires: correspondance du maître*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1890, XVI-XVII.
contemporary costume that he wears are typical of portrait busts of the period, which fell out of favor with the emergence of Neo-Classicism. Roland sculpted Rococo style portraits before turning to Neo-Classical busts, even though he varied his style depending on the commission. This duality shows a seemingly contradictory artistic method, but it was a common practice for sculptors, who depended on both public and private commissions to make a living. David d’Angers’ hybridity follows Roland’s example. However, David d’Angers takes portraiture one step further, by blending different styles within one bust, unlike Roland who separated his production in two distinct styles.

David d’Angers’ bust of Lieutenant Poupart is a naturalistic portrait based on a Beauté Académique as opposed to a Beauté Idéale. Poupart’s family commissioned David d’Angers to make the bust after the young man left his hometown for Paris. David d’Angers represents Lieutenant Poupart in full regalia, which include the Napoleonic uniform of the École Polytechnique. The sculptor has taken great care in realistically representing the military uniform. He carves eagles on each button and depicts the specific style of epaulettes that Poupart wore. The sitter is an attractive young man who appears at ease in his uniform despite the tightly worn collar that frames his round chin and youthful features. David d’Angers accentuates his naturalism by carving deep half-moon shaped pupils, a technique which allows light to reflect on the iris, giving the appearance of light colored eyes. He also accentuates Poupart’s lifelike features by carving individual hairs to delineate the shape of the eyebrows. David d’Angers represents Poupart with a mass of hair worn fashionably short with loose curls that come
forward on his temples. However, the portrait bust of Poupart does not reflect the admission file at the École Polytechnique. It indicates that Charles Poupart had red hair and blue eyes, a high forehead and a fat nose, a medium size mouth and a round chin on an oval shaped face. Perhaps to counterbalance uneven facial features, David d’Angers accentuated the size and fullness of his mouth, which minimizes the size of Poupart’s nose.

David d’Angers has applied Millin’s precepts on Lieutenant Poupart’s portrait bust by omitting an essential physiognomic flaw. Poupart’s admission file notes that he was “Marked by smallpox”. Smallpox scars were rarely shown in sculpted portraiture because of its association to the disfiguring disease that left ugly marks on a subject’s physiognomy. David d’Angers has clearly taken artistic license to enhance the features of his childhood friend. He does not depict the smallpox marks; instead, he represents Poupart with a perfectly smooth skin. In following Millin’s precepts of rejecting the representation of disfiguring flaws, David d’Angers has deliberately enhanced Poupart’s facial features by eliminating scarring marks considered unworthy of sculpted portraiture.

Even though David d’Angers appears to have made a realistic and lively portrait, it is not a truthful likeness of the sitter. The bust of Poupart is a combination of styles borrowed

---


58 Bibliothèque Centrale École Polytechnique. See record # 142. Concours de 1808: "Charles-Henri Poupart, matriculation No : 2112. Signalement: cheveux et sourcils: roux; front: haut; nez: gros; yeux: bleus; bouche: moyenne; menton: rond; visage: ovale; taille d’un mètre 67 centim. Marques apparentes: marqué de petite vérole. Charles-Henri Poupart, matriculation number 2112. Description: hair and eyebrows: red; forehead: high; nose: large; eyes: blue; mouth: average; chin: round; face: oval; height of one meter 67 centimeters. Apparent marks: marked by smallpox).” As an example to the frequency of the illness, the student that follows Poupart in the admission form is also described as “Marqué de petite vérole” (The student, André Simon, was born in the North Eastern part of France, unlike Poupart who came from the North West. For information on Poupart wearing a wig, see Georges Chesneau. Les œuvres de David d’Angers: sculpteur d’histoire et mémorialiste. Angers: Imprimerie Centrale, 1934, 154.
from Rococo portraiture and a *Beauté Académique.* The portrait bust of his friend is an early example of David d’Angers’ method of selection of physiognomic elements that he considered worthy – or not – of sculpted portraiture.

E. Sculpted portraiture and the representation of Ugliness as worthy subject

Carpeaux stirred away from the representation of ugliness in his portrait busts of contemporary sitters. The only example that shows a model with ugly features is a small terracotta sketch that Carpeaux sculpted prior to his sojourn at the Villa Medici when he won the *Prix de Rome* in 1854. The bust is believed to be a portrait of French Chancellor *Henri-François d'Aguesseau* (1668-1751; fig. 1.22). Carpeaux portrays *d'Aguesseau* with a seventeenth century regal costume, and a skull cap on top of long curled hair that cascade on his shoulders. His head is lowered and he looks to the side with a chilling gaze, accentuated by inquisitive eyebrows that are raised. Even though the nose is partially damaged, it appears flat and the nostrils are pressed against his face. A closely cut mustache falls to the sides of caved in cheeks and his thin and tightly-shut lips curve downward. Carpeaux left the bust of *d'Aguesseau* as a study and never produced a finished version. This example is telling of Carpeaux's artistic preference for attractive

59 Anne Pingeot has cautiously identified the bust, which is held in the Collection of the Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Ref. RF. 9878.
subjects – especially when portraying female sitters – and his rejection of ugliness as an unworthy artistic subject.

The notion of ugliness was as difficult to explain as Beauty, and its definition evolved throughout the centuries. From its first edition in 1694 until the nineteenth century, the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française* defined *Laideur* as, “Deformity, a remarkable flaw in proportions, in forms, or in colors that constitute the natural beauty of the species.” The concept of physical ugliness was, then, synonymous to deformity, to an obvious lack of proportions, and any other abnormal traits which differed from men’s expectations. On a figurative level, ugliness or deformity equated to vice and lack of morals. For the next two centuries, the definition remained the same but, in 1835, it included a novel element, which expended the concept of ugliness. The dictionary states, “There are types of ugliness that are not displeasing.” This addition shows the enormous shift that occurred between the beginning of the century and the July Revolution period. Academicians had to acknowledge that, indeed, it was possible to find a *laideur agréable* in literature and the arts. This significant addition shows that the

Institute, which housed the most inflexible stronghold and championed artistic status quo had to evolve with contemporary taste.

Hugo’s Romantic manifesto opened new artistic paths even though the concept of Laideur had been analyzed centuries before his call for its depiction in the visual arts. Yet Academicians rejected this modernist concept for sculpture because of its didactic and moralistic role. Depictions of virtuous subjects were at the core of official portraiture and sculptors trailed behind Romantic painters because of their economic dependence on governmental commissions. Since the turn of the century, Academic sculptors were expected to make portraits of notable sitters in an Academic style. The art of sculpture was a slow process, which often involved the need for additional workers to carve marble and make copies of statues. Sculptors required larger working spaces than painters and needed a main ground atelier due to the heaviness of the material. Monumental commissions and the storage of cumbersome materials were also prohibitive. Sculptors were required to purchase expensive materials and were unable to exhibit their works in marble or bronze unless public or private patrons covered the costs. Typically, statues and portraits exhibited at the Salons were in terracotta or in plaster until the State purchased them and covered the costs for larger models to be made in marble or bronze. The majority of sculptors lived in poverty and depended on public or private commissions. Consequently, they made portrait busts for sitters wanting to be beautified, a prospect that was hardly suited for the depiction of ugliness and the grotesque. Hugo’s appeal was a notion antithetical to sculpture until the early Salons of the July Monarchy.
Paradoxically, Quatremère de Quincy published in 1805 his theory on the *style ideal* in which he states that Ugliness can be Beautiful. Each age of man has its own beauty although youth embodies perfection. He explains:

In a sense, one can say a beautiful young man or a beautiful old man: in this case, ugliness will have its own beauty, especially in the work of art. A satyr can have his own ideal as much as a Venus: it signifies that one can find a manner to express every type of characters and of nature, which are only based on vulgar imitation and another manner, which is based on an ideal imitation. One can create an ugly just as one can create an ideal beauty. One can create a hideous ideal.63

Great artists were, then, able to create an ideal ugliness just as they could create an ideal beauty. However, Quatremère de Quincy's notion of an Ideal ugliness differed from the depiction of truthful ugliness, which only copied natural flaws. An artist who portrayed faithfully an ugly subject was inferior because he did not enhance nature, which was considered imperfect. Neo-Classical sculptors followed Quatremère de Quincy's Neo-Platonist concept in order to promote the elevation of French art. Ideal Beauty remained the fundamental notion and the depiction of *real* ugliness – especially in sculpture – was rejected.

A notable exception to the representation of ugliness is visible in multiple busts of *Honoré Gabriel Riquetti, Comte de Mirabeau* (1749-1791; fig. 1.23 and 1.24). A contemporary writes: "He counted among his advantages his robust style, his large figure,
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63 "Dans ce sens, on dit un beau jeune homme, comme on dit un beau vieillard : dans ce sens, la laideur même aurait sa beauté, surtout comme ouvrage de l’art. Un satyre peut avoir son idéal comme une vénus : ce qui signifie qu’il peut y avoir une manière d’exprimer tous les genres de caractère et de nature, qui tienne à l’imitation vulgaire, et une autre manière qui tienne à l’imitation idéale. On peut faire un laid comme on peut faire un beau idéal. On peut faire de l’horrible idéal." Antoine-Chrysostôme Quatremère de Quincy. *Sur l’idéal dans les arts du dessin.* S.n. 1805, 22.
his features strongly covered by marks of smallpox. He would say, One does not understand all the strength of my ugliness, and he believed this ugliness to be beautiful.\textsuperscript{64} Originally from an aristocratic family, Mirabeau turned against the Crown and became one of the most eloquent orators of the French Revolution. Mirabeau was notoriously ugly because of an unnaturally large head and a bout of smallpox during childhood that had left long, deep grooves on the lower two-thirds of his face. After his illness, Mirabeau’s father wrote to his uncle: "your nephew is as ugly as if he were Satan’s".\textsuperscript{65} Mirabeau developed multiple moles on his cheeks, forehead, and eyes. Although his mouth was small, his large nose protruded prominently under a set of eyes that drooped outward. Despite these physical flaws, Mirabeau believed that his ugliness was an advantage to his political and amorous success because he appeared non-threatening to potential rivals.

After Mirabeau’s sudden death in 1791, Houdon made a mortuary mask that he used to make a commemorative bust for the Société des Amis de la Constitution (Society

\textsuperscript{64} "Il comptait parmi ses avantages son air robuste, sa grosseur, des traits fortement marqués et criblés de petite vérole. On ne connaît pas, disait-il, toute la puissance de ma laideur, et cette laideur, il la croyait très belle." M. Abbé Espagnac asked Houdon to model the mask of Mirabeau on his death bed and offered a sum of fifty Louis toward the commemorative bust. The Friends of the Committee agreed to have Houdon model the bust, which he completed and delivered to the committee. However, Houdon’s bust was returned soon after because of his ties to the Royal Academy during the Ancient Regime. The Committee wanted to have an open competition that would allow all artists to participate on the grounds of equality of the newly formed Republic. Other sculptors responded to the open competition, which emphasized the need for a life-size bust. Sculptor Claude-André Deseine (1740-1823) won the competition for having made a bust done from life. Deseine’s bust of Mirabeau was also exhibited at the Salon of 1791. Émile Delerot. Notice sur J. A. Houdon de l’Institut. Imprimerie de Montalant-Bougleux, 1856, 138-139.

\textsuperscript{65} "ton neveu est laid comme celui de Satan.” Mirabeau was three years old when he contracted smallpox. His mother aggravated the lesions by adding medicine, which left deep scars on his face. Honoré-Gabriel de Riqueti Mirabeau, et al., Mémoires biographiques, littéraires et politiques de Mirabeau. Vol. 1. Bruxelles: Louis Hauman & Compe, Libraire, 1834, 238.
Houdon represents Mirabeau with a similar costume but makes a much squarer herm bust, which follows the Neo-Classical style. In 1775, Houdon had already sculpted a portrait of Christophe Gluck in which he also represented with smallpox marks. Quatremère de Quincy wrote: “C’est par le nombre et la finesse de ses détails qu’il imprimait à ses portraits une vive ressemblance. Il lui arriva même quelquefois d’outrer les procédés de cette méthode, comme on le vit dans le portrait de Gluck, dont les effets d’une maladie très-con nue avaient singulièrement couturé son visage. Le sculpteur prit à tâche de reproduire fidèlement ces petits accidents de l’épiderme.” (It is through the number and the delicacy of his details that he incorporated to his portraits a vivid resemblance. It even happened that he went too far in his method, visible in his portrait of Gluck, who had singularly long marks on his face caused by a very well known disease. The sculptor endeavored to reproduce with faithfulness these little accidents of the epidermis.) Quatremère de Quincy. “Sculpteurs français, Houdon.” L’Artiste: Revue de Paris. Series V. Vol.II. Paris: Ferdinand Sartorius, Éditeur, 1849, 71. For information on Houdon, see Anne L. Poulet. Houdon. Sculptor of the Enlightenment. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
In 1833, David d'Angers received the prestigious commission for the *Fronton du Panthéon* (Pediment Relief of the Pantheon, fig. 1.26). After multiple false starts and problems with the Administration, the Pediment was unveiled in 1837. David d’Angers divided the pediment in two distinct parts which he separates with allegorical statues. On the left side, he represents historical figures, some of whom he chose based on their Republican stand during the French Revolution. He has placed *Mirabeau* (fig. 1.27) in the front row, nearest to the allegory of Glory. He portrays the orator in a high relief profile in which he accentuates his large nose, his deep set and slanted eyes, his double chin and thick features. David d'Angers also includes the powered wig that *Mirabeau* wore. Given the height and distance between the Pediment and the viewer, David d’Angers could have represented the disfiguring marks on Mirabeau’s face, which would have been hardly visible. He chose to exclude them. This treatment is typical of the sculptor, who did not want to portray ugliness. He wrote: "Human ugliness is the false key of the admirable concert of nature. What is the purpose of an art that continuously shows us the ugly, which is the biggest error of creation?"68

This statement is significant because David d'Angers had contempt for the dissolute life that Mirabeau led before becoming a Revolutionary legend. Even then, the

---


sculptor doubted Mirabeau’s political convictions. He believed that Mirabeau's motives were personal instead of truly political. In fact, he criticized Hugo's *Éloge à Mirabeau* because it expressed an overt enthusiasm for the orator who lacked morals. Hugo's 1834 publication indicates the writer’s fascination and admiration for the *strength* of Mirabeau’s ugliness. He writes:

> How, in ten years, has this family demon become the god of the nation?... When he arrived as a Deputy from Aix to the General Estates, he did not arouse the jealousy of anyone. Unknown and infamous, the men of renown did not bother with him; ugly and poorly built, the good looking lords pitied him. His nobility disappeared under his black costume, his physiognomy under his smallpox. Who would have thought of envying this kind of adventurer, regularly jailed, with a deformed face and body, and on top of it financially bankrupt... 69

Hugo celebrates Mirabeau's ugliness as a powerful weapon that misguided his future enemies. The orator's perceived insignificance resulted from a misguided interpretation that was based only on external appearance. Political opponents failed to see his inner strength, which erupted when he talked to crowds. Then, Mirabeau's ugliness became irrelevant. It disappeared under the power of his speech and he appeared as an untamed animal. Mirabeau embodied Hugo's motto *le laid, c'est le beau* (Ugliness is beauty), which was an irreconcilable concept to David d’Angers.

---

69 “Comment, en dix ans, ce démon d'une famille est-il devenu le dieu de la nation?...lorsqu'il arriva comme député d'Aix aux États-Généraux, il n'excitait la jalousie de personne. Obscur et malfamé, les bonnes renommées s'en inquiétaient peu; laid et mal bâti, les seigneurs de belle mine en avaient pitié. Sa noblesse disparaissait sous l'habit noir, sa physionomie sous la petite vérole. Qui donc eût songé à être jaloux de cette espèce d'aventurier, repris de justice, difforme de corps et de visage, ruiné d'ailleurs...” Victor Hugo. *Étude sur Mirabeau*. Paris: Adolphe Guyot, 1834, 17-18.
F. David d’Angers and the Fall of Neo-Classical portraiture

Students were encouraged to compare busts of the same model made by different sculptors as a way to identify various elements that resulted in an idealized Beauty. They were also taught to copy from antique sculptures to refine their sensibility by learning from masterpieces. This Academic method prepared them to compete for the coveted Grand Prix de Rome, where winners studied for five years under State funding. David d’Angers won the Prix de Rome in 1811, which was supposed to help him receive official commissions and public recognition once he returned to Paris. Without this prestigious award, sculptors were unlikely to further their career. The majority could not afford the costs necessary for large working spaces and expensive materials. Bronze and marble statues or busts were rarely made without the funding of the State.

The nearly impossible task of teaching a formula for Ideal Beauty resulted in a compromise. Students were taught a rather simple but tedious method:

70 David d’Angers arrived in Paris in 1807, ten years after the Treaty of Talentino, which resulted in the shipment of cartloads of priceless artworks that were removed from Italy as spoils of war. Masterpieces were visible until the Restoration at the Musée Napoléon (Musée du Louvre). David d’Angers was able to study from the Apollo Belvedere, Hercules Commodus, Antineous, the Dying Gladiator and Laocoön and his Sons, masterpieces which were exhibited in the Imperial Galleries. For a detailed list, see M. Capefigue. L’Europe pendant la Révolution Française. Vol. V. Bruxelles : Société Belge de Librairie, Hauman & Cie, 1843, 154-159.
“Place a live model next to beautiful antique statues with which he shares similar age and proportions...Carefully measure them in one or the other of these poses...Repeat this process as many times as possible and on a wide number of beautiful models...You will discover by yourself, just as the Greeks knew how to do, the type of beauty.”

Due to lack of mastery of the students, they were encouraged to observe and copy Classical works while also incorporating realistic characteristics. This solution was designed to revitalize and modernize sculpture because depictions of Ideal Beauty were no longer relevant to contemporary sculpted portraiture. David d’Angers learned this technique from Roland and Louis David. He perfected the harmonious emphasis of contours and learned to remove superfluous details in order to purity and clarify lines. He combined Greco-Roman elements of Ideal Beauty with direct observation of facial characteristics in order to infuse a lifelike expression to his portrait busts. Yet, while in Italy, he wanted to refine his taste and continued to study from the Antique sculpture. He also worked from live models to learn how to extract their inner nature.

At the Villa Medici, sculptors experienced greater hardships than painters because of the cost of marble and the time required to carve a bust or a statue. David d’Angers only produced two marble busts that he was allowed to sell because they were made during his free time. One of them is a marble bust of

---

71 “Placez un modèle vivant à coté des belles figures antiques, avec lesquelles il aura le plus de rapports par son âge et par ses proportions...Mesurez-le avec soin dans l’une ou l’autre de ces positions... Répétez cette opération autant de fois que vous le pourrez, sur un grand nombre de beaux modèles... Vous découvrirez par-là vous-mêmes, ainsi que les Grecs avoient su le faire, le type de la beauté.” Toussaint Bernard Eméric David. Recherches sur l’art statuaire, considéré chez les anciens et chez les modernes, ou mémoire sur cette question proposée par l’Institut National d France. Paris: Chez la veuve Nyon ainé, Libraire, 1805, 198.
mythological hero Ulysses, which d’Angers wanted to sell to cover expenses for a trip to Greece which would further his study of Classical sculpture. David d’Angers was unable to find a private patron, and sent his bust to the Salon where he hoped to generate interest. He wrote to a friend:

I realized that by sending it to Paris, it will be exhibited at the Salon and that perhaps, I will be able to sell it or to borrow money against it so I can start a marble statue, which I want to sculpt…Apollo after having killed Hyacinth cries for him and crowns his lyre with the flower that has just grown from his friend….If I had the good fortune to succeed with this statue, it would then be exhibited at the second Salon that will take place in two years.72

David d’Angers shipped Tête d’Ulysse (Head of Ulysses; fig.1.28) to Paris for exhibition at the Salon of 1816. The marble bust is an early example of his works based on Neo-Classical models. He originally called the bust le modèle à barbe (The Bearded Model) but changed its title to Tête d’Ulysse to elevate its artistic value and to assure that it would be shown at the Salon. David d’Angers’ model was an Italian peasant whom he met in the streets of Rome. He wrote to Roland: “…when I find a model with a handsome face, I study it and try to compare it to beautiful antiques of the same characteristics…I have made a bust of a bearded model who had a superb face…”73

72 “j’ai réfléchi qu’en l’envoyant à Paris, il sera exposé au Salon, que je trouverai peut-être à le vendre ou à emprunter de l’argent dessus, pour faire commencer de suite une figure en marbre dont je veux faire le modèle…Apollon, après avoir tué Hyacinthe, le pleure et couronne sa lyre de la fleur qui vient de naître de son ami…Si j’avais le bonheur de réussir cette figure, elle serait exposée au second Salon qui aura lieu dans deux ans” Pierre-Jean David d’ Angers and Robert David d’Angers. Lettres de P.J. David d’Angers à son ami le peintre Louis Dupré. Paris : Etienne Charavay, 1891, 6.
73 “…quand je trouve une belle tête dans la nature, j’en fais une étude et je tâche de la comparer avec les belles choses antiques du même caractère…J’ai fais une figure d’après un modèle à barbe qui avait une tête superbe..” Henry Jouin. “David d’Angers : nouvelles lettres du maître et de ses contemporains.” Nouvelles archives de l’art Français : Revue de l’art français ancien et moderne. 3rd
In the fashion of Greco-Roman statues of heroes and Gods who stare eternally beyond the worldly realm, David d’Angers has carved eyes without pupils. He also represents Ulysses in the nude, with strong shoulder blades and a thick beard carefully carved in smooth curls. His hair reaches his shoulders and the sculptor has added the semi-oval cap that the hero wore when at sea. His physiognomy is void of individual characteristics. He is an idealized Grecian hero whose name is carved in Greek letters on the base of the large chunk of marble. Ulysses has been set in stone for eternity. The herm bust includes all the artistic trappings that would have satisfied the audience d’Angers wanted to please: Academicians and officials. It has the rigidity and stability of Greco-Roman precedents. It is made in the purity of a veinless white marble and is polished to a smooth surface.

Despite following a Neo-Classical style, David d’Angers’ plan failed miserably. Instead of being exhibited at the Salon, the shipping box containing the bust of Ulysses was never opened. This blatant lack of interest shows the difficulties that artists encountered when spending years away from Paris. Winning the Grand Prix de Rome had advantages as well as drawbacks. Students who won the competition were often chosen for State commissions but they also faced the possibility of being forgotten by the art administration and the public alike.

série. Vol. IX. Tenth year. Paris: Charavay Frères, 1893, 171. Anonymous. “Avantages et désavantages de Rome considérée comme l’école des arts.” The English Literary Journal of Moscow. Number 1. Vol. 1. Moscow: A. Semen, 1823, 206-207. The first year, students were required to send a marble copy of a low relief based on an antique sculpture that was owned by the French Government. The second year, students had the choice to work on a life-size relief in plaster or a half-size statue in the round. The third year, they were required to refine the sculpture that they had worked on the previous year. During their fourth year, students were expected to send a study of a group of figures in the round and a model of the statue that they planned to complete in marble on their fifth (and last year) in Rome. Anne Pingeot et al., La Sculpture Française au XIXe siècle. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1986, 53.
In addition, during David d'Angers’ absence, Napoleon’s Empire had toppled and the Restoration was instated. A freer artistic climate was slowly replacing the propagandistic sternness of Neo-Classical art. The thick marble block of *Ulysses* was already passé.
CHAPTER 2: Situating Romantic Sculpture

A. Sculptural changes at the Salon of 1827

We are finally done with the deluge of the public exhibition. If men could be outraged by anarchy, confusion, and excesses of licentiousness, this Salon would have produced on the public a kind of indigestion. A few have revived the project that I gave to the Academy seven or eight years ago, which was to set a limitation to the right to exhibit at the Louvre. But who wants to hear about that? Is there a Minister today who could or would care to listen?74

The anarchic direction that the Salon of 1827 exemplified was condemned by the stern proponent of Neo-Classicism and Perpetual Secretary of the Institute, Antoine-Chrysostôme Quatremère de Quincy (1755-1849). At the Salon, François-Joseph Heim (1787-1865) exhibited his commemorative painting Charles X distribuant des récompenses aux artistes à la fin du salon de 1824 au Louvre (Charles X Distributing Awards at the End of the Salon of 1824 at the Louvre; fig. 2.1). Heim portrays more than one hundred attendees including Quatremère de Quincy, Carle and Horace Vernet, Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, Jean Pierre Cortot, François-Joseph Gilbert Bosio and David d’Angers among the artists and other officials present at the ceremony. Heim represents paintings and sculptures that were exhibited at the Salon of 1824 in the Grande Galerie of

the Louvre.\textsuperscript{75} Conspicuously absent from the ceremony is Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863) and, on the walls, his succè\`es à scandale, the Massacre de Scio: familles grecques attendant la mort ou l’esclavage (Massacre at Chios: Greek Families Waiting for Death or Slavery) although King Charles X purchased the painting at the contemporary Musée du Luxembourg. Baron Antoine-Jean Gros’ (1771-1835) notorious exclamation when seeing Delacroix’s painting “the Massacre of Chios is the massacre of painting”, implying that Delacroix’s painting was not worthy of commemoration in Heim’s painting.\textsuperscript{76} In fact, Delacroix’s Massacre de Scio: familles grecques attendant la mort ou l’esclavage is the embodiment of the artistic division between Classicists and Romantics that exploded at the Salon of 1824.

Heim only represents one sculpture in his painting. It is a full length statue of Charles X en costume de sacre (Charles X in his Consecration Robe) that Cortot was commissioned to make for the Paris Hôtel de Ville. Cortot’s statue is a quintessential example of the stagnancy of sculpture in the 1820s, which was deeply rooted in an Academic tradition perpetuating repetitive Ancient prototypes that bored the public.

\textsuperscript{75} For a complete list of the participants and a detailed description of the paintings shown in Heim’s commemorative painting, see Paul Lafond. “François-Joseph Heim. Premier article”. Gazette des Beaux-Arts. Paris: rue Favard, 1896, 447-454.

\textsuperscript{76} “Le Massacre de Scio, c’est le massacre de la peinture”. Gros helped Delacroix in 1822 by having the Barque de Dante sur la rivière Styx framed for the Salon. However, he believed that Delacroix lacked basis tenets of drawing and, when meeting Delacroix at the Louvre in 1824, stated, “Monsieur... il ne s’agit pas de saluer les gens, il faut encore bien dessiner et ne pas confondre la bonne peinture avec la mauvaise.” “Sir...it is not enough to greet people, one also needs to know how to draw well, and not confound good with bad painting.” Alexandre Dumas. Exposition du Boulevard des Italiens. Causerie de M. Alexandre Dumas. Eugène Delacroix, sa vie son oeuvre. Revue des cours littéraires de la France et de l'étranger. 2nd year. No 1. Issues 1-26. December, 24, 1864. Paris: Imprimerie de E. Martinet, 1864, 61-62. For an analysis of Delacroix’s painting, and high and lowbrow representations of the Greek war of independence see, Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer. French Images from the Greek War of Independence (1821-1830). Art and Politics under the Restoration. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989. The author focuses on the parallels between Greek and French political struggles as well as preexisting stereotypes of Greeks and Turks in French literature and iconography.
regardless of whether Cortot depicted a contemporary subject.77 The statue is a Neo-Classical depiction of Charles X who, although wearing a sacrament costume, appears as a timeless Greco-Roman heroic model. The sculpture is white, vertical, static, and imposing. Charles X holds the royal specter with his extended arm; yet the gesture reflects an immobile stance that even the diagonal of the object does not disrupt. The statue is placed on a tall pedestal separating it from the audience. This display forbids the viewer to see the Monarch directly, and blocks the chance to identify with him. One must look up to see Charles X. He is placed to show his superiority. He is worthy of deference through his inaccessibility.

David d’Angers was present at the awards ceremony that Heim commemorated. He showed multiple busts, most of them made in a combination of Academic and Realist features. One of the busts is a portrait of Bernard-Germain de Lacépède (1756-1825; fig.2.2), a naturalist who helped David d’Angers when he was struggling financially while preparing for the Grand Prix de Rome.78 David d’Angers represents Lacépède in a Greco-Roman herm bust and with realistic features. The aging sitter has creases in his skin which hang under his neck and on his cheeks. His large aquiline nose falls onto his

---


78 For the list of sculpture that David d’Angers showed at the Salon of 1824, see Stanislas Lami. Dictionnaire des sculpteurs de l’école française au XIXe siècle. Vol.2. D-F. Paris: Ed. Champion, 1916, 62-63. Expenses for the students were much higher than the small stipend that the State allotted. They received one hundred and fifty francs but usually needed five hundred to cover the costs of the models, who they hired on their own. Pingeot et al., La Sculpture Française au XIXe siècle. Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1986, 49.
thin mouth and, on his bolding forehead, David d’Angers includes deed wrinkles. Yet the bust retains a sense of nobility because of the serious expression of Lacépède, the stability of the base, and the direct the frontal view. His sockets are deeply carved and the upper eyelid forms a shadow on the eyes left without pupils. David d’Angers’ bust of Lacépède is an early example of his artistic hybridity, which includes a combination of different styles that he borrows from Neo-Classical portraiture and Realistic Academism. The bust of Lacépède exemplifies the majority of portrait busts that the sculptor made during his career. He combined contradictory stylistic elements that resulted in a truthful rendition of life while also being traditional sculpture. This seemingly ambivalence was in fact a shrewd maneuver at the Salon of 1824. David d’Angers’ artistic moderation was made to please Academicians and officials alike in order to receive commissions. His portrait busts conformed to contemporary taste by representing la nature vraie, based on resembling likenesses while embellishing physiognomic flaws. The depiction of la nature vraie allowed David d’Angers to evolve from the statis of Neo-Classicalism; yet it only allowed a thin margin of artistic freedom because it was based on Academic principles.

At the Salon of 1827, Heim’s commemorative painting shared the same space with Delacroix’s La Mort de Sardanapale (The Death of Sadarnapalus; fig. 2.3) and La Mort du doge Marino Faliero (The Death of Doge Marino Faliero), two paintings that focused on violent death themes. Sadarnapale represents the Assyrian King gazing over the slaughter that he has just ordered, and Marino Faliero shows the aftermath of the beheading of the Venetian traitor. In contrast to Quatremère de Quincy’s lamentations over the anarchie of the Salon, art critic Augustin Jal (1795-1873) defended Delacroix’s Sadarpale. He notes, "In fact, this work is original for the reasons that the classicists have
criticized…The faces are repulsively ugly; it is a population of the damned or scoundrels from the lowest pits…”

Sadarpale was based on the 1820 play by Lord George Gordon Byron (1788-1824). Most critics complained that even if the paintings successfully conveyed emotions through richness of colors that Academic paintings lacked, Delacroix lacked compositional skills. This new style contrasted with Academic painters’ preference for clean lines and distinct contours.

Jal recognized Delacroix’s excellence because he created a new type of painting, prominently featuring the subjects’ expressions and their passions expressed with vivid and large colorful areas. Delacroix also showed his modernism by choosing subject sources other than Classical history and mythology. Jal nonetheless warned Delacroix’s young followers to imitate his style, and wrote:

I blame the disdain that young romantics have toward drawing; this system of ugliness that they want to force on use and the monsters that they hope to make fashionable, repulse me as much as they repulse you; but I like their intention to create something different from what has been done for the past thirty years. They are trying and deserve our encouragement. One needs to disapprove of their errors, their follies, but nonetheless ought to refrain from absolute condemnation…They go through exaggeration to get to the reasonable. The public is ready to sympathize with them but there is an understandable repulsion for their love of the hideous and they will likely understand such a dangerous path.  

79 “Cet ouvrage est original justement par le défaut que les classiques y ont repris…Les têtes sont d’une laideur repoussante; c’est une population de damnés ou de scélérats du plus bas étage…” Augustin Jal. Esquisses, croquis, pochades, ou, tout ce qu’on voudra sur le Salon de 1827. Paris: Ambroise Dupont et Cie, Libraire, 1828, 112. For a study on the “decisive turn in the Romantic battle” at the Salon of 1827, see Eva-Frédérique Bouillo. Le Salon de 1827. Classique ou Romantique? Rennes: Presses Universitaires, 2009. Bouillo starts her analysis with the Salon of 1824 and the full blown battle between Academism and Romanticism which shook the artistic milieu with the Salon of 1827. However, she focuses on painters, not on sculptors.

80 “Je blâme le mépris que les jeunes romantiques semble affecter pour le dessin; ce système de laideur qu’ils veulent faire prévaloir, et les monstres qu’ils espèrent mettre à la mode ne me répugnent pas moins qu’à vous ; mais j’aime en eux l’intention de faire autre chose que ce qu’on fait depuis trente ans. Ils essaient et, méritent par-là des encouragemens [sic]. Il faut désapprouver leurs erreurs, leurs folies, mais il faut se garder en même temps de les condamner absolument…Il passent par l’exagéré pour arriver au raisonnable. Le public est tout près de
By 1827, Delacroix had been crowned *le chef de l’école nouvelle* (the leader of the new school). Jal’s warning was only addressed to painters because sculpture was considered an immutable art form, which had already achieved *perfection* that ought not to be challenged. There were multiple reasons reinforcing this deeply rooted notion. Professors at the École des Beaux Arts had unchallenged power over younger artists who were taught theories solely based on antique prototypes or on contemporary works based on Neo-Classical principles. Conservatism suffocated the creativity of sculptors who depended on the protection of their professors to have a chance at winning the coveted *Grand Prix de Rome*. At the École des Beaux-Arts, students followed rigorous theoretical courses and practical classes based on drawing from Antique plaster casts as well as from live models. To complete their training, sculptors enrolled in private ateliers where they studied from a reputed artist, typically an Academician and Professor at the Beaux-Arts. The choice of atelier was an important decision for the future of a young sculptor. Depending on the popularity and connections of their professors, students could aspire to win the *Prix de Rome*, which almost guaranteed them an official career upon their return from Italy.

In 1827, Victor-Marie Hugo (1802-1885) was crowned the Chef de l’école littéraire moderne (Leader of the modern literary school). He received this title after publishing the play *Cromwell* in which he included a Preface that became a Romantic manifesto. Hugo called for a modern literary style that had to include the comic with the tragic. He also promoted the need for new artistic depictions that reflected contemporary life.82 Hugo explained:

The modern muse…will understand that everything in creation is not humanly beautiful, that ugliness coexists with beauty, deformity with graciousness, grotesque as the reverse of the sublime, evil with good, darkness with light…Beauty has only one type; Ugliness has a thousand. Beauty, in its human connotation, is only form considered in its simplest rapport, in its absolute symmetry, in the most intimate harmony with our system. Consequently, it always gives us a complete ensemble, as restrained as we are. On the contrary, what we call ugliness is a detail from a large ensemble that we fail to grasp because it does not harmonize with man, but with creation, as a whole. That is why it always introduces new aspects however incomplete.83

---

82 Hugo wanted to end the règles de l’unité (classical unities) of time, place and action. This literary model was the norm since the seventeenth century when French tragedians based their plays on ancient Greek tragedies. The three unities necessitated the respect of time (classic plays were to be set within twenty-four hours), place (the action was to be in one setting), and action (only a single conflict or plot-line was accepted). The rules of bienséance rejected any type of fighting or death on the stage. Although considered the epitome of French classicism, writer Pierre Corneille (1606-1684) broke rules with his most play, *Le Cid* (1637). Corneille wrote the play as a tragicomedy, which the Académie Française frowned upon because of the lack of clear distinction between comedy and tragedy. He revised *Le Cid* multiple times, changing the play from a tragicomedy to a tragedy.

Hugo’s Preface revolutionized French literature. He called for a literary genre reflective of modern life and in the process shattered Classical rules that had been unchallenged for two centuries. Hugo’s forewords also resonated on young sculptors who were tired of copying beautiful Antique models. They wanted to show all of men’s facets, which included physical and moral ugliness. Hugo’s Preface was a keystone in recognizing that the search for Beauty was passé and that ugliness and the grotesque was representative of contemporary society.

In his *Salon de 1824*, Marie-Henry Beyle (called Stendhal, 1783-1842) had already noted that sculpture no longer filled the need of the contemporary public. He foresaw a change in the immutable art form by stating, “Sculpture is on the verge of a revolution”. Stendhal was right. However, due to the dependence of sculptors on official patronage, it would take another ten years to truly happen. Romantic sculpture needed a strong leader to break down the Academic fortress. Préault took that role and received the derogatory moniker *Chef de l’école de la Laideur* (Leader of the school of ugliness), a title that he proudly wore.

**B. David d’Angers’ influence on young Romantic sculptors**

Just as Carpeaux made a tremendous impact on the public when his high relief sculpture group *La Danse* was unveiled in 1869, David d’Angers’ *Grand Condé* had an

---

enormous influence on Romantic sculptors in 1827 (fig. 2.4 and 2.5). The two sculptures greatly differ in their subject and reception. Carpeaux shocked Parisians because of the public display of naturalistic nude bacchantes dancing carelessly on the façade of the Opéra Garnier. David d’Angers’ shocked the public because of the Grand Condé’s unusual liveliness; it also had a great impact on the imagination of young sculptors who interpreted David d’Angers’ statue as a new style of sculpture freed from Academic constraints. Consequently, David d’Angers’ Grand Condé had more influence on a younger generation of sculptors than Carpeaux’s La Danse, who did not have a shattering impact on sculptors of his generation.

David d’Angers was called the chef de l’école nationale mixte (Leader of the mixed national school), a title that stood cautiously between the École classique and the École romantique. However, at the Salon of 1827, the Grand Condé embodied Romantic sculpture par excellence. A contemporary recalled:

Rolland, his old master, had just passed away before completing a commission for a statue of the Grand Condé; David received the honor to make it. Who does not remember this living marble, placed at the entrance of the bridge of the Concorde by the deputies’ Chamber? Eye like a hawk, impetuous gesture; at every moment one believed that the arm of the warrior was unfolding to throw his baton of Marshal in the enemy lines. Nothing more natural than the exclamation of a commoner when looking at it: “Ma fine! It is like a thunderstorm!” The painter of the Oath of the Horatii had already observed, when the young artist from Angers frequented his atelier, that his first works were filled with passionate energy…The statue of Condé was an immense success.

87 “ Rolland, son vieux maître, venait de mourir sans avoir pu exécuter une statue du grand Condé dont il avait été chargé. David obtint cet héritage. Qui ne se rappelle ce marbre vivant, place à l’entrée du pont de la Concorde, devant la chambre des députés? Coup d’œil d’aigle, geste impétueux; à chaque instant on croyait voir le bras du guerrier se détendre pour lancer son
In 1815, David d’Angers’ master, Philippe-Laurent Roland (1746-1816) was commissioned to sculpt a colossal statue of seventeenth century French General Le Grand Condé. The statue was one of a series of twelve memorable Grands Hommes that would be placed on the Pont Louis XVI. Roland planned to show Le Grand Condé in a moment of rest, a conventional style based on Neo-Classical precepts that equated calmness with beauty. Roland passed away before completing the statue and David d’Angers received the commission. At the Salon of 1817, he showed a half-size plaster version of Le Grand Condé that was placed side by side with ten other statues of Great Men made by much older and experienced sculptors.88 David d’Angers’ statue was a bold tour de force. He chose the most emotionally charged moment in which to convey the élan of the Grand Condé’s gesture: he is about to throw his baton in the enemy lines to bâton de maréchal dans les lignes ennemies. Rien de plus naturel que l’exclamation d’une bonne femme en le regardant: “Ma fine! C’est comme l’orage! Le peintre des Horaces avait signalé dans les premiers essayes du jeune angevin, qui fréquentait son atelier, ce caractère d’énergie passionnée…Le succès de la statue fut immense.” Édouard Charton. Magasin pittoresque. Vol.13. 24th year. Paris: Aux Bureaux d’abonnement et de vente, 1856, 234. The marble statue of Le Grand Condé was originally placed on the Pont Louis XV before being moved to the Court of Honor at Versailles. Adrian Maillard. “Étude sur la vie et les ouvrages de David, d’Angers, statuaire (1).” Bulletin de la Société industrielle et agricole d’Angers et du département de Maine-et-Loire. Vol. 8-9. 8th year. Angers: Imprimerie de Ernest le Sourd, 1837, 418. The Salon of 1827 opened on November 4 and continued until early 1828, at which point the statue of Le Grand Condé was finally placed near the Invalides. It was usual for the Salons to remain open for months, which explained the importance for artists to exhibit their works. The Salon of 1824 lasted for five months, opening on August 25, 1824 and closing January 14, 1825. Henry Jouin. Lettres inédites d’artistes français du XIXe siècle. Macon: Protat frères, Imprimeurs, 1901, 118.

88 Twelve statues representing statesmen and military figures were supposed to be exhibited, although only ten were ready in time for the Salon. Duguesclin, Colbert and Cardinal de Richelieu were among the ones exhibited. Other sculptors included Jean-Joseph Espercieux (1757-1840), Jean-Baptiste Stouf (1742-1826), and Jacques-Philippe Lesueur (1759-1830). Edmé François Antoine Marie Miel. Essai sur les beaux-arts et particulièrement sur le Salon de 1817. Paris: Pélicier & Delaunay, 1817-1818, 388. The livret included the following information, “Figure commandée par le Roi pour la décoration du pont Louis XVI, devant être exécutée dans une proportion double du modèle” “Statue commissioned by the King for the decoration of the Bridge Louis XVI, to be made in the double proportion of the model”. Pierre-Jean David d’Angers and Henry Jouin. David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains. Vol. II. Paris : E. Plon et cie, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1878, 458-459.
signal the imminent attack. The sculptor imbues dynamism with a spiraling gesture to synthesize a continuous action. This sequential feat overpowered the motionless statures of the *Great Men* placed next to it. They appeared lifeless because they were made in a Neo-Classical style that removed any suggestion of mobility. An art critic noted David d’Angers’ audacious choice to depict a moment of action instead of rest. He writes:

> The statue by David leaves a strong impression and has energy, perhaps too much; the gesture of the figure is exaggerated, even forced to the point of lacking balance. The costume and accessories are overstated and the artist seems to have taken advantage of their breadth as an excuse to not have studied anatomy, especially in the lower part of the statue. In short, one would desire more nobility in the harsh yet heroic physiognomy of the grand Condé. One sees a lot of ease in the execution but does not find enough wisdom. 89

Because of David d’Angers’ young age, the critic considered the statue’s flaws to indicate lack of mastery. Sculptors used a *ligne d’aplomb*, an artistic tool to guide them in making an equally balanced and stable statue. Yet, David d’Angers’ *Grand Condé*’s impetuous gesture and stance appear unbalanced and exaggerated. He also depicts *Le Grand Condé* in modern garb – albeit a military costume contemporary to the seventeenth century – consecrating his artistic style as progressive. The *Grand Condé*’s jacket flies in the wind, his cape falls on one shoulder, the feathers of his hat and his long...
hair twirl in all directions, his tie floats to the side, the sleeves are opened at the wrists, and one can see the tension of his toes through the boots which fall in creases on his legs.

The *Grand Condé* is an early prototype of Romantic sculpture that David d’Angers boldly used in 1817 to make an artistic statement. He needed to differentiate his statue from the others because he was in dire need of work. It was an artistic gamble that he had to take. He had just returned from Rome and needed a *tour de force* to stimulate interest in him. He gambled his reputation with the *Grand Condé* and won. Théophile Silvestre explains: “A beginner who wants to be known as soon as he starts at the Salon must throw a firecracker, which means an outrageous work. The public will look at him and from then on, the already known artist will measure his hits in the following Exhibitions”.90 *Le Grand Condé* was David d’Angers’ “firecracker”, an explosive start that allowed him to forge a reputation.

The statue is a made of a combination of diagonal and vertical lines that give a dynamic feeling of motion. One diagonal starts at the base of the statue, where David d’Angers shows the right boot partly coming out of the rectangular base. It allows the sculptor to show a steep incline which goes up to subject’s three-quarter profile before reaching his exuberant, feathered hat. A second diagonal starts in the interior of the same boot and pushes the viewer to the *Grand Condé*’s wide opened legs. The line continues to his right elbow (bent against his chest) and finally reaches the straight line of his neck. David d’Angers uses a vertical line in the center of the statue to securely ground the center to the base. This line starts inside the left boot and passes through

---

the bent elbow before leading the viewer to the profile of the *Grand Condé*. Another line is not as clearly made as the previous one. It originates outside of the boot and reaches the back of the neck. However, this line is broken by the Grand Condé’s bent leg, by both hands which hold the baton and a sword, and by his costume. The dynamism and expressiveness of the *Grand Condé* is conveyed through the use of opposite lines which break free from Neo-Classical pyramidal shape and vertical stability.

It took ten years to make the colossal marble version of the *Grand Condé*. David d’Angers had become a successful sculptor who was a member of the Institute, a Professor at the École des Beaux-Art, and had a thriving atelier where he prepared students for official contests. His colossal statue was a decisive turning point for younger sculptors who admired its unfurling gesture, its vitality, and its modern costume.

David d’Angers clearly made the *Grand Condé* with its final place in mind. From all sides, the gesture develops in space as the pedestrian walks by. The unfurling action originates with the baton that he is ready to throw. His other hand holds the sword which he will soon remove from its sheath. The *Grand Condé* was not yet placed in its final location at the opening of the 1827 Salon. Instead, the guide noted

91 David d’Angers’ principal rival, Jean-Pierre Cortot (1787-1843), held another successful atelier. Cortot’s students received the majority of Beaux-Arts awards between 1826 and 1832. After 1833, students of David d’Angers regularly won official prizes. By comparison, between 1833 and 1845, students of Cortot received ten awards and David d’Angers won twelve, including Salon medals and *Grand Prix de Rome*. Étienne-Jules Ramey (called Ramey fils, 1796-1852) and Augustin-Alexandre Dumont (1801-1884) held the third most successful atelier. For a list of students that he taught and who won prizes, see Frédéric Chappey, *Histoire de l’enseignement de la sculpture à l’École des Beaux-arts au XIXe siècle : les concours de composition et de figures modelées (1816-1863)*, thèse de doctorat, Paris-IV Sorbonne, 1992, 6 vol., inédit. Consultable à l’Institut national d’histoire de l’art, 62-63 and 70.
that it was on view near the entrance of the Deputies Chamber by the Place de la Concorde. This location allowed the public to see it outside of the galleries of the Louvre where sculptures were typically exhibited. The 1817, the Salon reviewer wrote that the series *Les Grands Hommes* needed to be seen directly on the bridge where the public would be able to judge them accurately. When shown in a row, they lost their stature and the audience could not imagine them where they should have been placed: “...in the open air, in their respective distance, in rays of bright light...”

The 1817 criticism against the bad display of sculptures was still *au courant* fifteen years later. In 1833, Théophile Gautier (1811-1872) explained:

Truthfully, it is a pity to see the indifference, I would almost disdain that we have in France for this poor sculpture. At the Louvre, it is relegated in a damp, cold, and poorly light area, where visitors, like pale shadows, wander in silence, while there is a mob in the galleries above, where we suffocate in front of beautiful golden frames and flamboyant colors that hideously hide the paintings of the Old Masters. Sculpture is nevertheless a nobler and more difficult art than painting; one can name one hundred painters for one sculptor.

The display of *Grand Condé* was a new way to look at a sculpture. In a transitional space, it allowed the public to see it before it was actually placed on the bridge. It also removed the audience from the cold and damp rooms of the

94 “En vérité, c'est pitié de voir l'indifférence, je dirai presque le dédain, que l'on a en France pour cette pauvre sculpture. Au Louvre, on la relègue dans une salle humide, froide, mal éclairée, où errent, comme de pâles ombres, quelques silencieux promeneurs, tandis qu'il y a foule dans les travées supérieures, et qu'on s'étouffe devant les beaux cadres dorés et les couleurs flamboyantes qui cachent ignoblement les tableaux des vieux maîtres. — La sculpture est pourtant un art plus élevé et plus difficile que la peinture; vous nommerez cent peintres pour un sculpteur.” Théophile Gautier. “Salon of 1833”. *La France littéraire*. Vol.6. Paris : Au Bureau de la France Littéraire, 1833, 140.
Louvre. This setting separated David d’Angers’ statue from all other sculptures shown in the galleries. The audience had to first reach the new location and experience a direct contact with the Grand Condé. This close viewing must have affected the audience in a new way: the colossal statue appeared much larger than if placed on the bridge. They saw it on directly on the floor or on a low pedestal instead of the much higher level (where it would have been seen from afar and from below). 95 Once placed on the bridge, the passerby who compared the statue to a thunderstorm summarized its power. It is also revealing of the public’s incomprehension and fearful response to a work of art like no other. Head held up high and covered with his wide rim hat, the Grand Condé appeared fearless in the advent of danger. His heroism was in complete contradiction to the frightened passerby, a parallel that can also be made with the fearlessness of young Romantic sculptors who decided to band against the Academic fortress. It comes as no surprise that the Grand Condé had an enormous effect on the younger generation of sculptors.

Romantic sculptors broke the Academic mold which had lost its relevance in the contemporary political, technological, and social changes taking place in Paris. David d’Angers and his colossal statue of the Grand Condé planted the seeds of innovation in Préault, Dantan-Jeune, and Daumier who, despite taking different routes, created

---

95 David d’Angers’ Grand Condé is an example of the “otherness”, displacement, and perception of sculpture that Alex Potts analyses. He notes the importance of new displays and the different reception that the viewer experiences as a result. The difference between seeing an object from a distance or from close up is also relevant to the Grand Condé, and so is Potts’ discussion on the autonomy of contemporary sculpture, which destabilizes the viewer who has to participate in walking around the object. As such, David d’Angers fits the model of a modern sculpture in the participation of the public. Alex Potts. *The Sculptural Imagination. Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000, 1-23.
Romantic sculpture which completely rejected outdated values. They had an acute connection to contemporary life which was quickly evolving and clashed against the torpor of the Academy. As the bourgeoisie replaced the aristocracy and became the new ruling class, they made sculpture evolve from an elitist position to one of accessibility, affordability, and popularity.

These issues are paramount to understand the struggles that the Romantic artists encountered. The July Revolution gave them the hope and the impetus to voice their desire for freedom and the need for radical changes to reflect modern times. Yet David d’Angers remained an artist torn between his Academic beginnings and his emulation for Louis David, and a Romantic impetus to make sculpture modern. His groundbreaking opening led younger sculptors to believe he would be their leader for artistic freedom. But the younger generation failed or refused to see that the Grand Condé had been made in 1816 for David d’Angers’ own advancement. He needed to be bold to enter the hermetic artistic milieu; by 1827, however, he could not take the lead of the Romantic school because of his allegiance to the Academy.

He abhorred most of his colleagues because of their pettiness and shortsightedness. But he believed in the original purpose of the Academy, which was created to share knowledge and advance French art. At the same time, he was a Republican who was surrounded by Conservatives who cared little for the plea of young artists. Even as a member of the Institute, David d’Angers continued to emulate the ideologies of the first French Republic, which was, at the end of the Restoration, equated to liberalism; Academic sculptors were linked to political Conservatism. His political ideologies fit Romantic sculptors, who were also liberals. At a time when politics and the
arts were closely linked, David d’Angers was stuck between two sides. This is revealed in his body of work. His sculpted portraiture shows a back-and-forth between Academism, Realism, Romanticism, and Expressionism, often all within one portrait bust. The hybridity of his portrait busts reflects his ambivalence: he desired to be recognized as a great artist and he desired freedom of expression. These two aspects were irreconcilable because of his position at the Academy.

C. Préault and the rejection of sculptural traditions

*Le Grand Condé* forged David d’Angers’ reputation as an innovative sculptor. He often strayed from Academic principles, yet he held one of the most successful private ateliers where he taught conventional methods to prepare his students to compete – and win – competitions at the École des Beaux-Arts. At the end of 1826, Préault entered D’Angers’ atelier and was admitted with minimal experience. Préault likely chose David d’Angers’ atelier because of the dynamism of the *Grand Condé*, which suited his impulsive and expressive style. David d’Angers embodied the contemporary school, in comparison with his artistic rivals who only promoted traditional Academism. David d’Angers was then working in a combination of techniques which varied depending on his patronage. He made Academic sculpture for official commissions. He varied the style
of his realistic portraits realistic with a tinge of idealism. It is also very likely that Préault opted for David d’Angers’ atelier because of their similar political ideologies.

But within months, Préault was dismissed from the atelier for disorderly conduct. Théophile Silvestre explains, “M. David admitted him into his atelier and had to ask him to leave with the pretext that he corrupted students with his disorderly tendencies and his instinctive horror of being instructed.”

David d’Angers’ atelier ran like an Academy. Students participated in weekly contests and the sculptor came once a week to correct their work and improve their methods. David d’Angers was then mostly absent from his atelier. Préault was opinioned, loud, and knew that he wanted to change the direction of sculpture. Préault’s temperament was not suited for discipline.

Perhaps his dismissal was orchestrated by fellow students who were studying for competitions. The majority of students also frequented the École des Beaux-Arts for additional drawing and modeling classes. In increasing numbers, these students won official competitions, including the Prix Caylus and the Grand Prix de Rome.

---


97 David d’Angers’ principal rival, Jean-Pierre Cortot (1787-1843) held another atelier where students received the majority of Beaux-Arts awards between 1826 and 1832; after 1833, students of David d’Angers regularly won official prizes; Étienne-Jules Ramey (1796-1852, called Ramey fils) and the sculptor Augustin-Alexandre Dumont (1801-1884) held the third atelier. Students of Cortot received ten awards and David d’Angers’ students won twelve prizes, including medals and Grand Prix de Rome, between 1833 and 1845. For a list of the winners affiliated with the
d'Angers emphasized the need for a strong artistic foundation that included knowledge of human anatomy. Préault rejected such basic principles and, as a result, never learned the basic tenets of conventional sculpture. Instead, he championed creativity and impulsivity over imitation and restraint, which he believed were easily taught through repetitive exercises at the École des Beaux-Arts. Préault had an atypical training due to his inability to follow directions, which were essential to succeed in the entrance examination. Between 1826 and 1830 he tried to qualify for official admission but never succeeded. In the summer of 1830, Préault placed second in the completion but stopped altogether after this last try. This radical decision already separated him from other sculptors. He was unwilling to make finished and smooth sculptures, and this was interpreted as a lack of training. In fact, he was clearly aware of the oppositional artistic stand that he was taking. He made sculptures with political themes, with physiognomic exaggerations, and with an original handling that completely turned the art of sculpture inside out. His works were packed with expressiveness and energy, and the traces of his tools and his hands became as important as the subjects. Romantic artists hailed his artistic breakthrough and his


98 By 1816, an average of twelve sculptors were admitted, compared to fifty painters who were accepted at the École. This wide difference shows the popularity of painting over sculpture, which remained standard during the nineteenth century. Frédéric Chappey. Histoire de l’enseignement de la sculpture à l’École des Beaux-arts au XIXe siècle : les concours de composition et de figures modelées (1816-1863), thèse de doctorat, Paris-IV Sorbonne, 1992, 6 vol., inédit. Consultable à l’Institut national d’histoire de l’art, 104. In 1826, Préault tried the summer and winter entrance examinations at the École des Beaux-Arts and placed eighteenth and nineteenth respectively. He also competed in 1827 on both exams while in 1828 and 1829 he only competed during the winter, placing ninth in both years. For more information, see Charles W. Millard et al., Auguste Préault: sculpteur romantique, 1809-1879. Paris: Gallimard, Réunion des Musées nationaux, 1997, 16, n.6.
courage to go against the Academy. Préault, the revolutionary artist, wanted to annihilate the Institute, which he compared to *La Loge aux Reptiles* (The Reptile Lounge).\(^9^9\)

Préault’s failure at the entrance examination is reflective of the dictatorial power of the Academy, which was tainted with rumors that Professors manipulated the outcome of competitions. In order to succeed, students had to suppress their individualism and emulate the style of their mentor who, in return, protected and defended their professional advancement. According to sculptor Louis Auvray (1810-1890), a student of David d’Angers, it was necessary to choose the atelier of a Professor at the École des Beaux-Arts, who was also a Member of the Institute, to be able to get admittance at the École.

Years after frequenting the atelier of David d’Angers, Auvray explained:

In the past, regardless of the lack of capacity of a student, he was certain to be admitted at the École if he trained under a member of the Institute’s atelier...In David d’Angers’ atelier, we not only had painters but also amateurs who did not know how to draw. Oh well! On the day of the judging for spots at the École, M. David came in the morning to take the names of the new students who were immediately accepted, talented or not, even though at the same competition we had next to us a young man who, despite his excellent drawing, was not admitted. The poor devil was not the student of a Professor of the École! \(^1^0^0\)

---


\(^1^0^0\) “Autrefois quelle qu’était l’incapacité d’un élève il était sur d’être admis à l’École s’il appartenait à l’atelier d’un membre de l’Institut...Nous avions à l’atelier de David d’Angers, non-seulement des peintres, mais aussi des amateurs qui savaient à peine dessiner. Et bien ! le jour du jugement des places à l’École, M. David venait le matin prendre les noms des nouveaux, lesquels étaient reçus d’emblée, capable et incapables, tandis qu’à ce même concours nous avions à nos côtés un jeune homme qui, malgré un excellent dessin, n’a pas été reçu: le pauvre diable n’était pas élève d’un Professeur de l’École!” Auvray used this example to confirm a passage from the brochure *Questions du jour: de l’Institut, de l’École des Beaux-Arts et des expositions*, written by Jean Raymond Hippolyte Lazerges (1817-1887) in which the history painter denounced the changes within the Academy that resulted in a lowering of standards. Lazerges discussed the method that Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) used to have his students accepted at the École des Beaux-Arts. Louis Auvray. *Revue artistique et littéraire.* Vol. 15. Ninth year. October 1 and 15, 1868. Paris: Au bureau de la revue, 1868, 157 and 160. For a list of the Professors at the École des Beaux-Arts, see Frédéric Chappey. “Les Professeurs de l’École des Beaux-arts (1794-1873).” *Romantisme.* Vol.26. No. 93. Year 1996 (95-101).
Préault refused to defer to artistic – and political – institutions. He loathed conformism, servile imitation, and the suppression of artistic impulses. This oppositional standpoint conflicted to the expected subservient relation of the pupil to the Master. However, David d’Angers believed that Préault had exceptional artistic abilities and, during the July Monarchy, regularly tried to protect Préault at Jury selections for the Salon. He also helped Préault to get commissions when the doors of the Salons were tightly shut on him. David d’Angers would later write:

All the reactions are exaggerated and almost always unjust: In 1827, when the Romantics rebelled, one saw the young artists giving themselves passionately to the cult of the ugly....Préault produced his group of the Pariah who embraces a young girl, both wallowing on the ground and presenting misery in all of its ugliness: At least there was life and a terrifying animation in this work of a young man who, if the jury had not always rejected him, would have been restored by the public to a more reasonable path, without losing the precious qualities with which nature endowed him. France would have been assured of having a new Puget...101

David d'Angers believed that Préault had been used as a pawn for the fight that liberal art critics engendered against the Salon Jury. He was right. The more positive press coverage Préault received, the tighter the doors of the Salon closed on him. This consistent rejection resulted in his hatred and disdain for the establishment. He relinquished the spotlight and had enough wit and vitality to carry the banner of the École du Laid.

After David d'Angers dismissed Préault from his atelier, d’Angers noted: “I feel the greatest repugnance for my students who emulate me; those who keep their own style

are friends of my heart.”102 This commentary clarifies his stand vis-à-vis Préault. Préault was an independent artist who decided that sculpture had been at a standstill for too long and needed to be enlivened. To reach his goal, he showed traces of his handling in the material. His rough and unfinished technique was his signature with marks that he wanted to be visible. He carved and modeled his impressions based on instinct instead of experience. Préault’s method is based on a connecting link between the artist, the material, the subject and the viewer. His apparently disorganized and impulsive style was a calculating move from an artist fully aware that he was breaking boundaries. He wanted to make an enormous impact on modern sculpture and to get recognition for his innovations. His perceived lack of taste and the ugliness of his subject matter as well as technique were his modus operandi to become the leader of the new Romantic school of sculptors.

D. Préault's hybridity between the arts of sculpture and painting

Préault is mostly known for the sculptures in the round and the reliefs that the Jury of the Salon rejected. He also created portrait medallions to commemorate friendships with sitters, many of whom are unidentified. His earliest medallions were made after leaving David d’Angers’ atelier. They date from the late 1820s. The treatment

that he uses for his early medallions upstages the medallions that Carpeaux started to make in the late 1840s. In 1849, Carpeaux made a *Portrait of an Unknown Man*, which depicts a man dressed in a contemporary costume (fig. 2. 7). The plaster medallion represents the sitter in profile. Carpeaux clearly sculpts his facial features to keep a resemblance. The sitter wears a mustache, has a double chin, a thick nose, and hair combed neatly to the side. Carpeaux uses a concave medallion to add depth and shadows around the profile, resulting in a projection between a low and high relief. The cut under the top of the costume is clean and he adds thickness to give the impression of volume to the upper body. Although damaged on the sides, the medallion forms a perfect circumference. Carpeaux’s *Portrait of an Unknown Man* shows a traditional treatment that he uses frequently. It pales in comparison to the artistic audacities of Préault.

Préault was inspired by David d’Angers’ *Galerie des Contemporains*, a series of medallions of personalities that he admired. Préault’s medallions share similarities in method and style. David d’Angers wrote: “Since I have introduced a few medallions, a large number of sculptors have started to make them. They have not understood that this type of work is for the artist only minor sketches: art must be studied in the grandiose. They are only notes from a human face.” David d’Angers is referring to the medallions that he made of “virtuous” men, which he did not exhibit at the Salons. Medals were nonetheless exhibited and, at the Salon of 1824, art critic Charles Paul Landon (1760-1826) lauded their refinement:

---

103 Carpeaux’s medallion is held in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-arts de Valenciennes. Ref. S. 71.294.

For the past twenty years, medal engraving has made remarkable progress...artists whose works improve on a daily basis one of the principal branches of the art of sculpture. We say of the art of sculpture because it is always with the same sense of surprise that we see under the same title the confusion between medal engraving and engraving intaglio, even though there is no connection between the two. The medal engraver composes the models, makes them in relief, and it is the excellence of this work that constitutes his real talent. The art of making from a model, a mold or the template of a medal is only the mechanical part of the art.¹⁰⁵

Préault’s series of medallions did not fit Landon’s description. They are made with deep grooves, crevices, lumps, accidents, contrasting lines, and other elements that differ from the appearance of a mechanical process. Préault’s fingers and tools are visible and although they were just “sketches” to David d’Angers, Préault’s medallions were made with energetic handling and show his modernism.

In contrast to the smooth finish of Landon’s description, Romantic sculptors popularized medallions as a direct rejection of Greco-Roman sculpture. They turned to Medieval, Renaissance, and contemporary sources to modernize an art form that they considered in-between sculpture and painting. Sculpture in low-relief allows a narrative that is similar to painting. A medallion is typically sculpted on one side and its obverse side lets it be placed on a wall. It is a hybrid object that is in-between painting and sculpture. The viewing of a medallion is also unambiguous. In 1846, Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) wrote the essay "Pourquoi la sculpture est ennuyeuse" (Why is sculpture

¹⁰⁵ “La gravure en médaille a fait, depuis environ vingt ans, des progrès très remarquables...les artistes dont les travaux font fleurir journellement une des principales branches de l’art statuaire. Nous disons de l’art statuaire, car c’est toujours avec une nouvelle surprise que nous voyons confondus sous le même titre la gravure en médaille et la gravure en taille douce, quoiqu’il n’y ait aucun rapport entre elles. Le graveur en médaille compose ses modèles, les exécute en relief, et c’est l’excellence de ce travail qui constitue son véritable talent. L’art de former, d’après le modèle, le moule ou la matrice de la médaille, n’est en quelque sorte que la partie mécanique de l’art...” For more information, see Charles Paul Landon. *Salon de 1824: recueil des principales productions des artistes vivants*. Vol 2. Paris: Au Bureau des Annales du Musée, 1824, 70-72.
boring) in which he complained about the difficulty to find the best viewpoint to look at a sculpture in the round. He writes:

Sculpture has several disadvantages that are the consequence of its means. Brutal and positive like nature, it is both vague and elusive because it shows too many sides. It is in vain that the sculptor tries to find a unique viewpoint; the viewer who walks around the sculpture can choose from a hundred viewpoints, except for the right one... A painting is what it is supposed to be; there is no possibility to look at it outside of the right position. Painting only has one viewpoint; it is exclusive and despotic: as such, the expressivity of the painter is much stronger. 106

Préault precedes Baudelaire's objection by fifteen years. He even goes further by showing a radical technique that he borrows from Romantic painters. Instead of carefully composing narratives, he directly approaches the clay and lets his inspiration run free. Préault sculpts his medallions and reliefs to be seen from one standpoint even when they project into space because of their thickness. They share the same viewing qualities of paintings that are to be seen from a frontal position. Unlike the Grand Condé that was designed to be seen from every direction and gave complete autonomy to the audience, Préault controls the viewer, who must remain in a static position to see his work. This power over the viewer must have suited Préault's dominant personality. The immobile

106 “La sculpture a plusieurs inconvénients qui sont la conséquence nécessaire de ses moyens. Brutale et positive comme la nature, elle est en même temps vague et insaisissable, parce qu'elle montre trop de faces à la fois. C'est en vain que le sculpteur s'efforce de se mettre à un point de vue unique; le spectateur, qui tourne autour de la figure, peut choisir cent points de vue différents, excepté le bon...Un tableau n'est que ce qu'il veut; il n'y a pas moyen de le regarder autrement que dans son jour. La peinture n'a qu'un point de vue; elle est exclusive et despotique: aussi l'expression du peintre est-elle bien plus forte.” Charles Baudelaire. “Salon de 1846. Pourquoi la sculpture est ennuyeuse.” Oeuvres complètes. Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1961, 943-944. For an analysis on Baudelaire's change of mind on sculpture between his Salon of 1846 and the exhibition of 1859, see L. Cassandra Hamrick. “Baudelaire et la sculpture ennuyeuse de son temps.” Nineteenth Century French Studies. Vol. 35. N. 1. (Fall 2006): 110-131; For a discussion on Renaissance Paragone and the perceived supremacy of painting over sculpture, see Alex Potts. The Sculptural Imagination. Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000, 24-36.
position of his audience also results in an increased energy and dynamism from his work. Consequently, his sculpture in relief has a stronger effect on the viewer, who is unable to take charge of the active process of walking around a sculpture.

Since 1829, Préault made portrait-medallions of artists as tokens of friendship. They typically represent the sitter from a left side view and include the identity in capitalized letters, either carved or on relief around the profile. Préault also signs his name cut cleanly under the sitter’s neck. One of Préault’s first known medallions is of painter Xavier Sigalon (1787-1837; fig. 2.7) whom he met in the Romantic circles they both frequented. He admired the works of Sigalon since 1824, when the painter exhibited at the Salon Locuste remettant à Narcisse le poison destiné à Britannicus (Locusta Testing a Poison Destined for Britannicus). Based on Jean Racine’s (1639-1699) seventeenth century tragedy, Sigalon depicts Locuste and Narcisse observing the effect of the deadly poison on a slave convulsing to death. Sigalon was then considered one of the most important artists of the École Nouvelle; Delacroix was its leader. Préault admired Sigalon’s painting because of its facture and the morbid theme that showed the subject gazing with cold detachment at human suffering. Despite its Classical literary source, Sigalon turns the subject into a Romantic feast of excesses. In fact, a rich banker purchased the painting sight unseen but returned it to Sigalon because it frightened his employees, guests, and family members. The painting was considered a “horror” that would have made a pregnant woman miscarry.  

Préault portrays Sigalon as a mature sitter who gazes with resolve from wide open eyes. Préault has molded a fold on the eyelid that runs parallel to the eyebrow and a curved groove reflects light to emphasize the subject’s high cheekbones. He uses his thumbs to mold bumps and crevices in Sigalon’s forehead. These create an interplay of light and shadows that enliven the profile. Préault represents his friend with a well-defined ridge on his nose and nostrils that flare. Sigalon’s full lips and round chin echo the round Adam’s apple that Préault represents on the bare neck. Sigalon is portrayed with an artist’s cap, similar to a Phrygian hat, worn high on top of his head. Underneath, short chunks of hair come forward. Well-defined ears and thick curly sideburns end at the base of his square jaw. Préault has carved “Sigalon” on the left side and “Pictor” in front of the painter’s face. He uses a tool comb to make lines and marks that resemble those of a paintbrush. This distinct characteristic only appears on the left while the opposite side is molded with more care and results in a smoother finish. Préault’s medallion of Sigalon is an early essay that already anticipates the painterly style of the later works he will soon submit to the Jury of the Salon.

wrote a dialogue between an artist and a philosopher visiting the Salon. Jal [the philosopher] states, “ ...l’esclave se débattant contre la mort qui circule dans ses veines, compriment ses entrailles et soulève sa poitrine. Voilà qui est simple et beau” “...the slave fighting against death that flows through his veins tightens his entrails and lifts his chest. What simplicity and beauty”; Jal [the artist] answers, “La tête de Narcisse n’est peut-être pas assez noble; j’y voudrais un peu plus de style...Quan à la Locuste, elle est belle comme un de ces monstres inventés par Michel-Ange ou par Byron.” “The face of Narcissus lacks nobility; I would like it to have more style...As for Locusta’s, it is as beautiful as the monsters that Michelangelo or Byron imagined...” Jal appeared torn by the painting and, after weighing its qualities and flaws, finally lauded Sigalon’s boldness of composition and his talent of execution. Augustin Jal. *L’artiste et le philosophe, Entretiens critiques sur le Salon de 1824*. Paris: Ponthieu, Libraire, 1824, 93
E. Daumier’s non-traditional training and his early lithographs

Ex-student of David d’Angers and lifelong friend of Daumier, Adolphe-Victor Geoffroy-Dechaume (1816-1892) made a posthumous medallion of Honoré Daumier that represents him in three-quarter view.\textsuperscript{108} Daumier has heavy eyelids under gently curved eyebrows that partially cover deep set eyes that gaze intensely. A turned-up nose and thin – yet well-defined – lips convey a friendly nature with a sardonic flair. Geoffroy-Dechaume portrays Daumier with unruly hair that flow away in wavy strands and with deep lines that run across his forehead. He wears his beard low under the chin and the facial hair blends in a thick sideburn. Daumier is dressed as a typical bourgeois, with a shirt held by a knot, a vest, and an overcoat that differs from the other portraits which represent Daumier with a worker’s blouse. Théodore de Banville (1823-1891) left a description of Daumier that is analogous to Geoffroy-Dechaume's portrait. De Banville wrote: "I admired the glean of kindness and strength of his face, the piercing little eyes, the nose turned up by a wind breath of the ideal, a delicate mouth, graceful, widely-

opened, in short a beautiful face of an artist so similar to the ones of the bourgeois that he painted, but soaked and enflamed in the vivid fire of the soul". On the medallion, the sculptor carved “h. Daumier” and “1879”, the year of Daumier’s death. At a later date, Henri Charles Guérard (1846-1891; fig. 2.8) reproduced the medallion in an engraving on which a hand-written aphorism states, "One must be of one’s own time", with the signature “h. Daumier”. In this statement, Daumier, like his friend Préault, asserts his modernism by rejecting antiquated artistic conservatism.

In 1879, an obituary on Préault and Daumier lamented the death of two important artists. The writer emphasized that there was no connection to be made between the two. The author stated:

Two artists have left us who were among the most powerful of this century: the sculptor Préault and the great caricaturist Daumier. It is certain that there are no parallels between them, but one can say that death removes suddenly two brave fighters of liberal causes, two valiant champions of life in art.

Clearly, the author was unaware of the friendship between the two men who shared similar artistic and political ideologies. Préault frequented private Académies where


110 “Il faut être de son temps”. The engraving is illustrated in Arsène Alexandre. Honoré Daumier, l’homme et l’oeuvre. Paris: H.Laurens, Éditeur, 1888, frontispiece. The engraving raises questions of authorship vis-à-vis Daumier’s statement. If Henri Guérard made the engraving from Geoffroy-Dechaume’s medallion after Daumier’s death, he (or Geoffroy-Dechaume) was in possession of an earlier written adage that Daumier wrote. When compared to other documents by Daumier, the writing and signature are alike, which leads to the conclusion that Daumier had already jotted down his artistic motto before losing his eyesight.

111 “Deux artistes nous ont quittés qui furent parmi les mâles et les puissants de ce siècle: le statuaire Préault et le grand caricaturiste Daumier. Il n’y a certes entre eux aucun parallèle à établir, mais on peut dire que la mort enlève d’un seul coup deux braves combattants des luttes libérales, deux vaillants champions de la vie en art.” Anonymous. “Sciences, littérature, beaux-arts: revue artistique”. Journal officiel de la République française. (16 Février 1879), 1127.
students had an artistic freedom that was lacking in private ateliers and, in 1828, he met Daumier at the *Académie Suisse*. Unlike Préal, Daumier never tried to enter the École des Beaux-Arts. Instead, he studied directly from the model in privately-owned ateliers, the *Académie Suisse* and the *Bureau des Nourrices*, which they both frequented.

At the *Académie particulière Suisse*, students worked directly from the model and with the medium that they chose. This artistic freedom resulted from the *laissez-faire* attitude of the owner, a former model. Charles Suisse, nicknamed *Le Père Suisse* was famous among artists for his uncanny ability to hold difficult poses for extended periods of time, and for having been a favorite model in the atelier of Louis David. In the mid

---

112 Daumier was from Marseilles and moved to Paris in 1816 with his mother and siblings to join his father, Jean-Baptiste Daumier (1777–1851), who was trying to make a living as a poet. Despite the support of Chevalier Alexandre Lenoir (1761–1839), who was a reputed artist, professor, and founder of the *Musée des Monuments Français*, his father failed in his endeavor. Daumier worked odd jobs in order to support his family and, after showing natural abilities for drawing, received informal training by Lenoir. Daumier studied drawing from sculpture casts and copied artworks at the Musée du Louvre. In 1791, Lenoir was given the direction of the Musée located in the old Covent des Saint-Augustins. He created a series of chronological galleries with artworks that were removed from religious spaces and looted from Royal palaces or taken from the aristocracy. His diligence resulted in the protection of a large part of the cultural patrimony, which was otherwise regularly destroyed by the masses during the Revolution. At the beginning of the Restoration, the Musée was closed to the public and the artworks returned to their previous owners, sent to the Musée du Louvre and, at its inception, to the Musée de Versailles. For a description of the museum, see letter CCLXXXVIII, Alexandre Lenoir. Ministère de l'instruction publique et des beaux-arts. *Inventaire général des richesses d’art de la France : archives du Musée des monuments français*. Vol. I. Paris : Librairie Plon, 1883, 297-304. Lenoir helped Jean-Baptiste Daumier publish the pastoral poem, *Un Matin de printemps* and *Les Veillées poétiques*, which was a commercial failure.

113 The *Académie* was located in the center of Paris, on the second floor of a squalid building on the *Île de la Cité* at the corner of the Quai des Orfèvres and the Boulevard du Palais. Suisse was reputed for his entrepreneurship. He made a small fortune, first by modeling and later on by opening his own Academy; he also was reputed for purchasing the works of students at a low prices and reselling them for considerable profit. Ernest Chesneau. *Peintres et statuaires romantiques*. Paris: Charavay Frères, Éditeurs, 1880, 295.

114 Jacques Louis David often used the services of Charles Suisse. Suisse was his model for the *Intervention of the Sabine Women*. Years later, Suisse was reputed for his acting skills and for imitating David correcting the works of his students. A student noted, “He was a born artist, and his favorite character was David the painter. When asked to do the “Charge of M. David”…Suisse would retire to his bedroom…and reappear in a complete suit of David’s clothes. He would then go round and correct the student’s work as he had often heard David correct at the Beaux-Arts, and perform other tricks, some of which were “Shocking! Shocking!” but greatly
1820s, he opened an Académie reputed for its congenial atmosphere, unlike private ateliers where new students were taken advantage by older students and learned little. Professors seldom passed by to correct their works. At the Académie Suisse, the low tuition allowed students to practice their trade but not receive criticism from professors. Criticism was useful to students who wanted to improve their work in an Academic style. The Académie Suisse stayed opened all day, and students could sketch, paint, and sculpt from live models of both genders. This method differed from private ateliers where students had to prove first that they had mastered drawing before they were allowed to paint and sculpt.

The Académie Suisse was the most renowned private atelier, closely followed by the Atelier Boudin and the Burreau des Nourrices. A description of a typical Parisian Academy gives a sense of their freedom and congeniality:

In academies, the model is presented under a completely different light. A drawing academy is the place where the would-be Raphaels, the candidates to the succession of Puget, come to draw, paint, or sculpt from life for a small fee... An important question arises every Monday about which pose the model will hold for the whole week... As soon as the pose has been decided, all the ruckus ends, one takes a place, sharpens a pencil, prepares the palette, or prepares the clay or the wax. Everyone enjoys alternatively the right to choose his


115 Three weeks out of the month, a male model posed and the remaining week, a female model was there. In the 1840s, artists including Eugène Delacroix, Richard Parks Bonington, Gigoux, Jean- Baptiste Camille Corot, and Gustave Courbet frequented the Académie, which became especially reputed in the 1860s due to the multiple artists who became famous after studying there, including Pissaro, Monet, and Cézanne. Anne Martin-Fugier. La vie d’artistes au XIXe siècle. Paris: Hachette Littérature, 2007, 56.
place; those who have gotten the last numbers are resigned to copy the back or the profile of the model.\footnote{116 “Dans les académies, le modèle se présente sous un aspect tout différent. Une académie de dessin est un lieu où les aspirants-Raphaëls, les candidats à la succession de Puget, viennent, moyennant une rétribution légère, dessiner, peindre, ou modeler d’après nature...Tous les lundis se débat une question importante: il s’agit de décider quelle sera la pose du modèle durant le cours de la semaine... Dès que la pose est arrêtée, le tumulte cesse, on s’installe, on taille les crayons, on prépare les palettes, on masse l’argile ou la cire. Chacun jouissant à tour de rôle le droit de choisir sa place, ceux qui ont les derniers numéros se résignent à copier le dos ou le profil du poseur.” The most famous models were Charles Suisse who became a miniaturist and owner of an Academy; the Italian model Cadamour considered a veteran in the trade; the Polish model Brzozomvsky, nicknamed “Le Polonais”; and Charles Alix Dubosc who had been, with Suisse, Louis David’s and his school’s favorite model. E. de la Bédollière. “Les Modèles”. Les Français peints par eux-mêmes. Vol. 2. Paris: L. Culmer, Éditeur, 1841, 5-7. For more information on the trade of models, see Susan Waller. The Invention of the Model: Artists and Models in Paris, 1830-1870. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.}

The Académie Suisse suited Préault’s boisterous nature and his need for artistic freedom to refine the unfinished sculpture that he was developing. Daumier likely observed Préault’s method and learned the rudiments of sculpture with him. Daumier was also developing the unconventional drawing style which he would soon master and use to siphon the most potent characteristics of his sitters into caricatures.

originality. He faithfully rendered portraits and scenes that were created by others. There is only one known drawing by Daumier made in the style of Belliard. Daumier’s *Portrait d’une jeune fille* (Portrait of a Young Girl; fig. 2.9) represents a seated young girl who looks at the artist with a soft – yet deep – gaze. Set in three-quarter view, Daumier aptly conveys the gentle nature of the sitter. His understanding of chiaroscuro is manifest in light crayon and chalk touches that translate into soft shading throughout her face and pulled-back hair, and on parts of her outfit. Adorned with a neatly arranged shawl tucked in her dress, the model rests her arms on her sides and holds a small book that she appears to have been reading. Daumier’s depiction of the young girl differs from Belliard’s conventional approach to portraiture in one important way. Daumier includes dark curved lines around the lace bonnet of the sitter, in the folds of her shawl and dress, and in her fingers that are clearly delineated. He also leaves the background bare, and the only shading that edges over the dress appears to be made by the artist’s fingers. Daumier’s uneven and strong contours foretell the style that he will soon develop for his work at Charles Philipon’s publishing house.

Belliard rarely worked directly from nature. Daumier likely developed his method of working from memory while apprenticing under the lithographer. In fact, with the exception of a few other drawings that he made in a conventional style, Daumier relied on his recollection of a person – or a scene – that he later translated on paper, on a lithographic stone, or in clay. Daumier’s *Portrait d’une jeune fille* embodies a realistic and conventional form of portraiture, which he quickly relinquished for the depiction of ugliness and the grotesque as worthy subjects.

---

118 Daumier drew the portrait after he dedicated it “A Jeanette” (For Jeanette), although the identity of the sitter has not been established. Daumier’s *Portrait d’une jeune fille* is held in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna. Ref. 24.125.
F. Daumier's transitional period and the development of sculptural lithography

As most artists do, Carpeaux made quickly drawn caricatures representing unknown sitters. His *croquis caricaturaux* (caricatural sketches) usually show them in profile. He uses black chalk for contours and white chalk to highlight prominent facial exaggerations. Carpeaux also used light brown paper which gives a tonality to the flesh of the sitters. The color of the paper keeps him from having to add shading throughout. In 1870, Carpeaux made a caricature of an *Unknown Man*, which exemplifies his style of drawing made on impulse (fig. 2.10).\(^{119}\) The sitter is in profile and sports a large aquiline nose. Carpeaux emphasizes the nose with white chalk to resemble the effect of light hitting directly on the top. He also uses thick and uneven dark strokes for the short and unruly hair, and lighter shades of black are blended to convey the texture of the sitter's mustache and sideburns which hang below his pointed chin. Carpeaux includes the upper part of the costume, quickly drawn with white highlights, to indicate the shirt and black lines for the jacket. Carpeaux's method is lively and expressive. Yet, in his transitional period between traditional and sculptural method of drawing, Daumier already shows a style that surpasses Carpeaux's in giving a sense of three-dimensionality to his caricatures.

\(^{119}\) Carpeaux's caricature is held in the collection of the Département des Arts graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Ref. 1189.
In 1829, Daumier produced lithographs which were published in the short-lived humoristic newspaper *La Silhouette* – partially owned by Philipon – before becoming a regular employee for Philipon’s successful endeavors, the satirical newspapers *La Caricature* and *Le Charivari*. Although already competent in the lithographic process, Daumier appeared unsure of his style in the first lithographs that he produced for the publisher. In fact, Philipon hired Daumier as a “portrait artist”. Jules-François Félix Fleury-Husson (called Champfleury; 1820-1889) explains:

Daumier was first believed to be a portrait artist and, as such, Philipon gave him the task to reproduce the features of the peers of France against whom the fight would begin. The first one to be hit was the old Lameth. He had gone through the storms of the Revolution; he had not foreseen such results. The artist’s thumb entered in his flesh as in an old baked apple: it is no longer wrinkles that furrow his face or bumps that deform; it is the ideal. The exaggeration of ugliness by a sharp pen used as a punch is reminiscent of the sketches that Delacroix drew after antique medals.  

Daumier would excel in portraiture – albeit caricatural – after 1831. His “exaggeration of ugliness” aptly places him in the *École de la Laideur* which Préault led. Champfleury’s description encompasses Daumier’s working method, which he mastered after making the sculpted busts series.

---


Daumier’s transitional style is exemplified in *Masques de 1831* ( Masks of 1831; fig. 2.11), a lithograph published in *La Caricature*. The lithograph represents Louis-Philippe as a bulging pear surrounded by fourteen deputies and ministers of the Chamber. Daumier’s pear includes faint facial features of what was supposed to look like Louis-Philippe; however, without the shape of the pear to symbolize the Citizen King, he would be unrecognizable. Daumier refrained from portraying – or caricaturing – Louis-Philippe in details, because one needed an official authorization before printing. Daumier uses a traditional cross-hatching technique which he learned from Belliard. He remains within convention even though he darkens the contour on the top part of the pear to represent Louis-Philippe’s often ridiculed hairstyle. Daumier depicts masks of representatives of the *Juste-milieu*, some of whom will soon be immortalized in the series of caricatural busts of the *Célèbrités du Juste-milieu*.

The caption for *Masques de 1831* explains: “Our usual frankness forbids us from using the banal phrase: "You are uncovered: beautiful masks", because if they were handsome, they would not wear this seal of truth that makes them historic individuals, comical, droll, and outrageous friends who generally lack in patriotism. Nonetheless the resemblance is exact”. Although the resemblance was supposed to be *exacte*, the

---

122 *Masques de 1831* was published in *La Caricature* (March 8, 1832). No. 71.
123 “Notre franchise ordinaire nous empêche d’employer ici la phrase banale: “On vous reconnait: beaux masques.” Car s’ils étaient beaux, certes ils ne porteraient pas ce cachet de vérité qui fait de ceux-ci autant d’individualités historiques, comiques, drolatiques, fantastiques, amis en général fort peu patriotiques, Néanmoins la ressemblance est exacte…”Philipon gave a new title for the lithograph, which he published as *Masques de 1832*. See *La Caricature*. No. 71. (March 8, 1832): 2. For the complete list of the figures that Daumier caricatured. The identity of one of them, shown with the letter “D” remains uncertain although it is cautiously believed to be a caricature of Duvergier de Hauranne. See Ségolène Le Men, “The Pear”, *Daumier, 1808-1879*. Exh.Cat. Ottawa: The National Gallery of Canada; Paris: Musée d’Orsay, Réunion des Musées Nationaux; Washington: The Phillips Collection, 1999, 79-80. This identity is unlikely when compared a formal portrait of *Duvergier de Hauranne*. Daumier represents his subject with thick lips and large teeth under a bulky nose that curves over his mouth. These traits also differ from a
initials or first letters of the names are added under each mask to help readers identify the caricatures. Those include Lameth, d'Argout, and Kératry in profile view. Daumier uses the lithographic crayon with more energy than his faded depiction of the pear by delineating the facial characteristics with thick contours. He also uses an eraser to highlight parts of their physiognomy. This method produces solid contrasts with a technique that no longer requires the use of crosshatching even though some parts of the masks are still drawn in this style. Daumier depicts in three-quarter view Étienne who sports a disfiguring grimace, Barthe with eyes that look in different directions and Dupin-aîné whose eyes are hidden by glasses placed on top of a round nose. His thick lips form a smile between two bushy sideburns. Daumier has caricatured Guizot and Soult in profile view. This foreshadows the handling Daumier will soon master. He uses very thick and dark contours, stark contrasts, and deep grooves, as if sculpting instead of drawing. In fact, Daumier represents Soult with a chin that appears as if directly cut with a sharp knife, a direct two-dimensional prototype of the series of sculpted busts that he was ready to undertake.

**G. Dantan-Jeune’s early ethnographic and phrenologic portraiture**

In 1867, Carpeaux was commissioned to make the group sculpture *Les quatre parties du monde soutenant la sphère céleste* ( Allegory of the Four Continents). In 1868, caricature that Daumier made in 1849 of Duvergier de Hauranne for the series *Les Représentants représentés* (The Representatives Represented). Duvergier has an elongated face, which greatly differs to the stout face of the *Masques de 1831*. See *Le Charivari*. (May 31, 1849). For an illustration of the portrait of Duvergier de Hauranne, see Armand Dayot. *Journées Révolutionnaires: 1830-1848*. Paris: Ernest Flammarion, Éditeur, 1897, 121.
Carpeaux sculpted the portrait bust of *Le Chinois* (The Chinese Man; fig. 2.12), one of the four ethnographic studies that he used for the commission.\(^{124}\) Carpeaux portrays *Le Chinois* with individualized features, resulting in a highly realistic and detailed representation of the Asian model. *Le Chinois’* face is turned to the side, which stretches the side muscle of his neck down to the low collar of a traditional costume. As with other portraits, Carpeaux carves deep holes in the slanted eyes to give the sitter a life-like expression. Yet, his attitude is solemn as he looks down and away from the viewer. In contrast to the face and costume, which are finished with a smooth patina, Carpeaux sculpts the top of his head with uneven touches, as if the skull of *Le Chinois* were irregularly shaped or his hair had started to grow. He also adds a long braid that starts on the back of his head and loosely curves down to his lower back. Nonetheless, Carpeaux uses a typical Rococo bust for the torso of his subject.

Dantan-Jeune’s master, Bosio, was reputed for the creation of portraits which resembled the sitter while lessening physical flaws. He used this technique for a portrait bust of Director of the Musée Napoléon, *Dominique Vivant-Denon* (1747-1825). According to a contemporary, the commission was a *tour de force* because of Denon’s old age and ugliness. He explains: “It was a difficult task: the sitter was old and had a trivial and bitter ugliness. Several sculptors had already tried in vain to extract something of this head. Mr. Bosio was more fortunate: he was able to ennoble it without losing the

---

\(^{124}\) Carpeaux made multiple reproductions of *Le Chinois*. The illustration of the bust is in a private collection in Paris. For more information, see Michel Poletti and Alain Richarme. *Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux. Sculpteur.* Paris: les Éditions de l’Amateur, 2003, 122-125. Carpeaux used the head of the Chinese man for the female allegory of Asia, which is less detailed because of the high placement of the group sculpture.
resemblance”. Another critic sarcastically wrote: “…Bosio willingly reproduced the most benign details of the human figure…he copied and recommended his students to copy every crease of the skin”. Bosio followed the traditional method of the École des Beaux-Arts to teach his students the technique to reproduce a faithful likeness. This exercise allowed young sculptors to learn the basic method of sculpted portraiture before they were able to enhance the physiognomy of the model.

Under Bosio, Dantan-Jeune developed a natural ability to reproduce every detail of a physiognomy. In 1827, Dantan-Jeune first participated in the official Salon. He showed eight busts. One entitled Esprit Noir (Black Spirit; fig. 2.13) exemplifies Dantan-Jeune’s artistic facility in Realistic portraiture. It is a sculpture of an American Indian who traveled to France with five other members of the Sioux-Osage tribe. They were introduced to King Charles X and spent eight days in Paris. While there, they were

---

126 “…Bosio s’attachait volontiers aux détails les plus puérils de la nature vivante…il copiait lui-même et recommandait à ses élèves de copier les moindres plis de la peau” Gustave Planche. “Sculpteurs modernes: Benoit Fogelberg.” Revue des deux-mondes. 25th year. 2nd year of the new series. Vol. X. Paris: Bureau de la revue des deux mondes, 1855, 1269-1790. Bosio trained in Paris under Augustin Pajou (1730-1809) with whom he stayed before going to Italy. He returned in 1808 and became the favorite sculptor of Emperor Napoleon and his Court. His reputation was enhanced by Vivant-Denon’s bust. in which he enhanced eatures without losing the resemblance and developed a reputation for making resembling portraits while being able to lessen physical flaws. Louis de Loménie. “M. Bosio.” Galerie des contemporains illustres. Vol. II. Bruxelles: Meline, Cans, et Companie, 1848, 161
127 In 1823, Quatremère wrote on the purpose of copying nature as a first step to reach the Ideal form. He wrote: “C’est là que l’artiste, abandonnant le stérile domaine de la réalité, ou les hommes, les faits, les objets, parvient à nous créer comme un nouveau monde, où les objets se font voir tels que la nature nous dit qu’ils pourraient être. C’est là que toutes les existences s’agrandissent et s’anoblissent…” Quatremère de Quincy. Essai sur la nature, le but, et les moyens de l’imitation dans les beaux-arts. Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1823, 218-220.
invited to all fashionable venues to learn the customs of the French, although Parisian society perceived them as exotic subjects.¹²⁸ A newspaper noted:

Six wild Indians from the Osage tribe arrived today in Paris and have moved in the hotel de la Terrasse, on rue de Rivoli. Naked down to the hips, they wear large silver bracelets around their arms, on the top and the other near the wrist; their neck is adorned with a necklace of rows of pearls; its center is enhanced by a round silver plate...The skin of these Indians is the color of red copper. The chiefs have their chins and eyes colored in Chinese vermillion. They paint their cheeks and their ears depending on their individual taste. Both men and women have very white teeth and very well aligned. The men have their head painted and shaved.¹²⁹

The documentary precision with which the sculptor approaches his subject is expressed in the facial features and the naked torso of Esprit-Noir. They are sculpted with such detailed accuracy that Dantan-Jeune's bust is an early ethnographic portrait that not only precedes Carpeaux's by forty years, but is also comparable to the scientific anthropologic portrait busts of Charles Cordier (1827-1905).¹³⁰ Dantan-Jeune represents Esprit Noir in

---

¹²⁸ The Osages traveled throughout France and other European countries but were left penniless by the man who brought them to France. By 1829, a subscription was organized in the city of Montauban to raise enough money to cover for the costs of their travel back to America. L’Ami de la religion. 1830, 93

¹²⁹ “Six sauvages indiens de la tribu des Osages sont arrivés aujourd’hui à Paris et sont descendus à l’hôtel de la Terrasse, rue de Rivoli. Nus jusqu’à la ceinture, ils portent aux bras de larges plaques en argent, l’une au haut du bras, l’autre près du poignet; leur cou est orné d’un collier à plusieurs rangs de perles; le milieu est garni d’une plaque en argent de forme ronde...La peau de ces indiens est couleur de cuivre rouge. Les chefs ont le menton et les yeux colorés avec du vermillon de Chine. Ils se peignent les joues et les oreilles selon leur goût. Les hommes et les femmes ont des dents très blanches et très bien rangées. Les hommes ont la tête peinte et rasée.” Charles L. Lesur. Annuaire historique universel pour 1827. Paris: Chez A. Thoisnier-Desplaces, Libraire, 1828, 250. For more information on the passage of the Osages in Paris, see the woodcut illustration and text of La giraffe, visitée par les sauvages indiens au jardin du roi à Paris. Paris: Chez Tatin fabricant d’images dominoïter, rue de la Huchette, number. 13. The Osages traveled throughout France and other European countries but were left penniless by the man who brought them to France. By 1829, a subscription was organized in the city of Montauban to raise enough money to cover for the costs of their travel back to America. L’Ami de la religion. 1830, 93.

¹³⁰ Cordier is reputed for his ethnographic studies and his use of colored marble, onyx, and other materials that he combined to emphasize the color of the skin and costumes of his subjects. Cordier exhibited his first ethnographic portrait bust at the Salon of 1848, a plaster bust of Saïd Abdallah of the Darfour People, and showed his polychrome busts at the Salon of 1857. For more
a life-size bust, which enhances the extreme realism of the bust. *Esprit Noir* was second in command to the Chief of the Osage group. Dantan-Jeune emphasizes the pride and seriousness of the warrior by showing his head atop a thick neck and broad shoulders. The sculptor carefully details his subject’s facial features and skull, which is completely shaved except for a small tuft of hair that stands up on top and ends in a tightly knitted braid in the back of his neck. Dantan-Jeune also includes *Esprit Noir*’s necklaces, which he wears directly on his bare chest. The Osages wore earrings but Dantan-Jeune does not include them. Instead, he represents *Esprit-Noir* with large holes in the cartilage and lower part of the ears.

The Osages were considered short yet well-proportioned. They were represented in multiple lithographs, one of them titled *Osages arrivant à Paris en 1827* (Osages Arriving in Paris in 1827; fig. 2.14), which shows the color of their skin and regular features that an eyewitness described as: “la beauté et la régularité de leurs traits sans


131 “Les hommes, au nombre de quatre dont un chef, étaient nus jusqu’à la ceinture, ce qui permettait d’admirer leurs torses de cuivre rouge, et ils s’enveloppayaient la partie inférieure du corps d’une couverture rayée qu’ils ne quittaient jamais. Ils avaient le visage tatoué de lignes parallèles, peintes en vermillon. Leur tête était rasée, excepté au sommet où se dressait une petite huppe peinte en rouge, et d’où partaient deux queues tressées surmontées d’une plaque d’argent et d’une plume de vautour.” (The men, four of them including the chief, were naked down to the waist, allowing admiration of their red copper chests, and they covered the lower part of their body with a striped cover that they always wore. They had tattoos on their face made of vermillion parallel lines. Their heads were shaved except for the top on which a small red painted crest stood up from where two braids with a silver plate and the feather of a vulture emerged.) The Osages were curiosities on various levels. They already visited France during the reign of Louis XIV and were allies to the French during the Indian War (1756-1763) and fought in Missouri against the English. They were also seen as curiosities on a medical level. Phrenologists were interested in studying Indians because they deformed the skulls of their newborns. Alfred Delvau. *Les lions du jour: physiomanies parisiennes*. Paris: E. Dentu, Éditeur, 1867, 37-38. The group of American Indians is depicted in Jean-Baptiste Megard’s woodcut *Portait des six osages arrivés en France le 27 juillet 1827*. 
mobilité.”

Despite the Realistic representation of Esprit-Noir, Dantan-Jeune does not include pupils on the eyes. Instead, he deeply carves eyelids that cast shadows on the eyes, which look to the side. He carves thick orbital ridges and Esprit-Noir’s stern gaze is intensified by lines on his forehead. Dantan-Jeune has cut the bust in the middle of the upper arms, right above the place where the warrior wore thick arm cuffs. The selection of this bust shows more originality and modernist flair that that Carpeaux’s traditional bust of Le Chinois. Dantan-Jeune also sculpts the realistic torso with erect nipples, a depiction improper in an Academic bust. Dantan-Jeune shows acute realism because he represents a subject of curiosity. Esprit-Noir’s stillness and removed gaze allowed the Salon audience to observe the “wild Indian” at their leisure.

*Esprit-Noir* was one of three warriors in the group of Osages. A contemporary explains: “One of the three renowned warriors in the Osage tribe is Washingasha nicknamed Esprit Noir because of the number of enemies that he has killed. In their village, he is the second in command to the Prince and has scalped five men. He is notorious for his prowess as much as for his noble lineage.”

The other warriors were not as illustrious in their exploits. An older Osage had scalped only two victims and the youngest, one. The Osages were not only exotic subjects because of their customs, their physiognomic differences, and the clothing that they wore. They were also frightening because of anthropophagic rumors. They ate the flesh and hearts of their victims. Despite their reputation for savagery, they were described as kind and well-mannered. They were

---


also physically superior to the French. When landing in the Havre harbor and in Paris, large crowds of people gathered to gawk at them. The Osages were shocked to see many men and women with physical deformities.\textsuperscript{134} They had heard tales from their elders, who described the French as elegant and as a beautiful race. Their reactions to the physical ugliness of the French anticipated Dantan-Jeune’s depiction of all kinds of deformities that he would make in caricatures. However, instead of focusing on congenital deformations, he would focus on society’s decadence by showing fat stomachs, short stubby legs, double chins, overly thin or disproportioned bodies, grotesque and ugly physiognomies that showed the degeneration of French society.

Dantan-Jeune’s bust of \textit{Esprit-Noir} was exhibited the same year as David d’Angers’ colossal statue of the \textit{Grand Condé}. As a first timer, Dantan-Jeune had to differentiate his works from those of other sculptors. The circumstances surrounding the making of the bust are unknown. The Osages spent a week in Paris before King Charles X received them. They were invited at elegant gatherings, went to the theater, visited the zoo at the \textit{Jardin des Plantes} and spent the remaining time in their hotel, where a large crowd of gawkers stayed hopefully to see the wonderful curiosities. As a favorite sculptor of King Charles X, Bosio likely facilitated the Dantan-Jeune’s meeting with the exotic visitors. Dantan-Jeune likely selected \textit{Esprit-Noir} over the others because of the subject’s dignified stance and his fierce reputation. Portraying \textit{Esprit-Noir} was a shrewd choice made to interest the audience in his work.

\textsuperscript{134} The Chief’s grandfather had visited the Court of Louis XIV where he was welcomed solely by the aristocracy and did not see the rest of the population. They were allies to the French during the Indian War (1756-1763) and fought in Missouri against the English. They were also seen as curiosities on a medical level. Phrenologists were interested in studying American Indians because they deformed the skulls of their newborns. Alfred Delvau. \textit{Les lions du jour: physionomies parisiennes}. Paris: E. Dentu, Éditeur, 1867, 37-38.
Dantan-Jeune staged his first appearance at the Salon with an exotic subject that generated public interest through the fascination with the “uncivilized” Osages. Dantan-Jeune’s ploy to use a fashionable and current subject worked. An art critic reported: “M. Dantan jeune, under Number 1081, has given us a curiosity. It is a bust of the Osage called Esprit-Noir. His shaved head shows a skull sculpted with such precision that it could be of interest to Doctor Gall.” Dantan-Jeune was of three sculptors that the art critic reviewed. He was featured immediately after a description of a group sculpture by Cortot, who was considered the best Academic sculptor. Dantan-Jeune did not only show a contemporary and fashionable portrait-bust. His portrait bust is also modern in his representation so accurate that phrenologists could have used the bust for scientific advancement. In 1827, the pseudo-science of phrenology was at the edge of becoming a science. It would become an accepted science when the Société Phrénologique de Paris opened in 1831. Dantan-Jeune showed that he was ahead of his time. Esprit-Noir was Dantan-Jeune’s “firecracker”, which promoted his talent and his name as an excellent Realist portraitist.

---

Dantan-Jeune never won the *Prix de Rome*. In 1828, his older brother succeeded. *Le Mentor* described the typical hardship that Dantan-Aîné faced during the grueling competition:

Closed in for three months in the studios of the Royal School of Beaux-Arts, with only a few hours free in the morning, he spent part of the nights building the eight muses that are supposed to decorate the façade of the new theater...He is not alone. A younger brother just as talented supports his effort and helps him at work. The Royale School is forbidden to him. Regulations forbid two brothers to compete in the same competition. He works almost in hiding on the eight terracotta muses that allow them both to live day to day.136

Dantan-Jeune abstained from competing to give his brother, who had reached the age limit of thirty, one last chance. Dantan-Aîné was a Neo-Classical sculptor. His assiduity, conformity, and age played essential roles in predisposing the Jury to award him the Prize. Dantan-Jeune accompanied his brother as a “resident at the French Academy in Rome”, which allowed him to stay at the Villa Medici without having to follow the regular exercises required of all winners.137

136 “Renfermé pendant trois mois dans l’une des loges de l’École Royale des Beaux-arts, n’ayant de disponible que peu d’heures le matin, il a, pendant le temps du concours, passé une partie des nuits à construire les huit muses qui doivent orner le fronton d’un nouveau théâtre...Il n’est pas seul. Un frère plus jeune mais non moins habile, soutient son courage et l’aide de ses mains. L’École Royale lui est interdite. Les règlements [sic] s’opposent à ce que deux frères concourent en même temps. Il travaille presqu’en cachette aux huit muses en terre cuite qui leur procure à tous deux leur moyen d’existence de chaque jour.” *Le Mentor*, 27 December, 1828. Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris,. Fol. 31 209.

Dantan-Jeune’s sojourn in Rome proved instrumental to his subsequent career as a caricaturist. There, he became friends with newly elected director Émile-Jean Horace Vernet (1789-1863) who moved in with his family. Based on the directorship, the working conditions and social ambiance at Villa Medici greatly differed. In 1826, Léon Vaudoyer (1803-1882) wrote:

I ought to tell you that at the Academy, despite a seeming appearance of friendliness, everyone stays to oneself, which leads to a bit of coldness during our meetings; they only take place during the meal...M. Guérin entertains on Thursday and Sunday evenings: nothing is sadder. It is only frequented by men, and we are afraid to even talk. How difficult it is after having worked all day to not find a reason for amusement!\textsuperscript{138}

During Horace Vernet’s tenure, the general mood greatly improved. The amiable reputation of the Vernet family was notable. This was a propitious climate for Dantan-Jeune. Antoine-Charles Horace Vernet (called Carle Vernet, 1758-1836) accompanied his son.\textsuperscript{139} He was a famous historical painter but the public generally preferred his genre scenes of hunting parties and depictions of horses. Carle Vernet was also reputed for his genre scenes of lowly workers and his witty caricatures of Les Incroyables and Les Merveilleuses, young dandies and fashionable women who wore extravagant clothing.

\textsuperscript{138} “Il est bon de vous dire qu’à l’Académie, avec toute l’apparence de liaison qui y règne, chacun garde son quant à soi, ce qui met un peu de froideur dans nos réunions; elles n’ont lieu qu’au repas...Monsieur Guérin a ses soirées le jeudi et le dimanche: rien n’est plus triste. Il n’y a que des hommes, et c’est à peine si l’on ose parler. Combien il est pénible après avoir travaillé toute une journée, de ne pas trouver de motif à distraction!” Charles Blanc. Les artistes de mon temps. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1876, 230-231.

\textsuperscript{139} Horace Vernet was born from a long lineage of artists. His grandfather Claude-Joseph Vernet (1714-1789) lived in Rome for twenty years. In 1753, he was summoned back to France in order to complete a series of fifteen paintings representing Les Ports de France (The French Harbors), a commission requested by King Louis XV (1710-1774). The lineage went even further as Horace Vernet’s great-grandfather, Antoine Vernet (1689-1753), was a decorative painter who taught the rudiments of painting to Claude-Joseph Vernet. For more information see Léon Lagrange. Les Vernets: Joseph Vernet et la peinture au XVIIIe siècle. Second edition. Paris: librairie académique, Didier et Cie, Libraires-Éditeurs, 1864, 451-454.
Carle Vernet’s caricatures were reproduced with lithography, a printing novelty that permitted works on papers to be reproduced in series. Caricature was an art form that Carle Vernet practiced and appreciated. His son perpetuated the family tradition. Horace Vernet was a successful painter of military and contemporary history but also made caricatures on paper that were admired for their wit and compositional mastery.

In contrast to the gloomy description of Vaudoyer’s stay under Neo-Classical painter Pierre-Narcisse Guérin (1774-1833), the working conditions at the Villa Medici changed drastically. In Paris, Horace Vernet’s atelier was an informal space where artists, friends and patrons congregated on a regular basis. A contemporary writes: “It was neither the classical atelier with all of its Olympian, Grecian or Roman paraphernalia, nor the Romantic atelier with its medievalist cast-off clothing; it was the military atelier par excellence.” Vernet specialized in an Eclectic style that combined 

140 Les Incroyables and Les Merveilleuses, also known as Les Muscadins (due to the heavy scent of musk that they wore, were young people who had sympathies for the fallen royalty and the aristocracy. They wore luxurious outfits which contrasted with the austere costumes that French Revolutionary followers favored. For more information on Les Incroyables and Les Merveilleuses, see Valerie Steele. Paris fashion: A Cultural History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, 48-50.

141 Guérin was Director of the French Academy in Rome from 1822 until 1827. When Vaudoyer complained about the disheartening atmosphere at Guérin, he also lamented about his social obligations. He wrote, “Yes, but we do not have three or four good friends to bring together around a small table or a warm hearth and, when I am dizzy at home of at the place of others surrounded by thirty guests, I do not go to bed from tiredness nor with a feeling of satisfaction. Oh well, when will I finally accept this style of life that hardly suits me?” (Oui, mais nous n’avons pas trois ou quatre amis de cœur à rassembler autour d’une petite table ou d’un bon feu, et, quand je me suis étourdi chez moi ou chez les autres au milieu de trente convives je ne me couche ni moins fatigué ni plus satisfait. Eh bien, quand donc me soustrairai-je à ce genre de vie qui me convient si peu?) Marie Étienne Charavay, ed. Revue des documents historiques. Fifth year. Vol. 5. Paris: A. Lemere, Éditeur & C. Motteroz, Imprimeur, 1878, 181-182.

142 “Ce n’était ni l’atelier classique avec tout son attirail olympien, Grec ou Romain, ni l’atelier romantique avec sa défroque moyen-âgeuse; c’était l’atelier troupiert par excellence.” Louis Léonard de Loménie (1815-1878). Galerie des contemporains illustres par un homme de rien. Vol. 4. Paris: A. René & Ce, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1842, 2. In the early 1820s, Horace Vernet painted L’Atelier, which shows his working space in Paris. It is filled with elements that convey action, smells, and noises. Vernet is surrounded by the smoke of his cigar and fencing with a student as
Academic smoothness of surface and compositional clarity; yet he also infused his paintings with Romantic flair for self-expression and improvisation. His atelier and easygoing nature was as casual in Rome as it had been in Paris. A guest at the Villa Medici noted:

…in the midst of the shrubberies and gardens of the Villa Medici, stands a small house in which, as you approach, you invariably hear a tumultuous shouting and wrangling, or music from a trumpet, or the barking of dogs; this is Vernet’s atelier. Everywhere, the most picturesque disorder prevails: guns, a hunting horn, a monkey, palettes, a couple of dead hares or rabbits; the wall covered with pictures, finished and unfinished….\textsuperscript{143}

Winners of the Prix de Rome typically showed their works in an exhibition held at the Villa Medici before they were shipped to Paris for progress evaluations. Dantan-Jeune participated in the week-long show even though he was exempt from official criticism. He showed a \textit{Buste de Papa Pie VIII} (Bust of Pius VIII), which an Italian journalist singled out for its resemblance and the nobility that Dantan-Jeune gave to his sitter. The reviewer reported:

The young French artist Mr. Dantan, a pupil of M. Bosio, no less distinct for his ingenuity than his modesty, has brought to completion a plaster bust that represents his Sanctity Pope Pius VIII. In the portrait bust of his Sanctity, this master has been able to aptly reveal the majesty and depth of thoughts on the forehead and the upper part of the head. His sweetness and kind nature is visible in the mouth and the lower part of the face. Under the artist’s hands,

they both hold palettes and brushes. Visitors and students are gathered in groups, others play loud music instruments and a bulldog growls. A white horse is in the center of the composition, placed as a model. Two bare-chested boxers are present but no Academic nudes, either in plaster casts or live models, are included. For an account of Vernet’s political views underlined in \textit{L’Atelier}, see Nina Maria Athanassoglou-Kallmyer. “Imago Belli: Horace Vernet’s \textit{L’Atelier} as an Image of Radical Militarism under the Restoration.” \textit{The Art Bulletin}. Vol. 68, No 2. (June 1986), 268-280; see also Albert Boime. \textit{Art in the Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-1848}. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004, 123-126.

\textsuperscript{143} Felix Mendelsohn Bartholdy and Julie de Marguerittes (Comtesse de). \textit{Letters from Italy and Switzerland by Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy}. Trans. Lady Wallace. Philadelphia: Frederick Leypoldt, 1863, 122.
the material appears almost animated and the wondered gaze is left with nothing else to desire.144

That Dantan-Jeune was able to approach the Pope attests to the influential connections and opportunities he made in Rome. Horace Vernet worked on a painting of the Pope for the Salon of 1831. Dantan-Jeune likely accompanied Vernet when he went to paint the portrait of the Pope.145 Dantan-Jeune’s bust appears to have been life-size, unlike Vernet’s composition, made from afar. Perhaps Vernet’s composition was made to obscure the physical ugliness of the Pope, who suffered from a long and painful illness that left external inflamed pustules and sores on his neck and body. An English Cardinal recalled:

The appearance of Pope VIII was not, perhaps, so prepossessing at first sight, as that of his two predecessors. This was not from any want either of his character or of amiability of his features. When you came to look into his countenance, it was found to be what the reader will think it in his portrait, noble and gentle. The outlines were large and dignified in their proportions; and the mouth and eyes full of sweetness. But an obstinate and chronic herpetic affection in the neck

144 “Il giovane artista francese Sig. Dantan minore allievo del Sig. Bosio, non meno distinto per il suo ingegno che per la sua modestia, ha condotto a fine un busto in gesso che rappresenta la Santità di Nostro Signore Pio Papa VIII. Questo abilissamo artista ha saputo prendere con una rara maestria il carattere della testa di Sua Santità, dando la maestà e la profondità à de pensieri à la fronte e al di sopra de la testa, e la dolcezza e la benignità nella bocca ed alla parte inferiore del capo. Sotto la mani di costui la materià é quasi animate e l’occhio ingannato non a nulla desiderare.” “Belle Arti” in Lo Zibaldone. (11 Agosto 1829). Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune. Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.

145 Horace Vernet’s made a large painting of the newly ordained Pope, Le Pape Pie VIII porté par les parafrenieri dans la Basilique de Saint-Pierre sur la sedia gestatoria (Pope Pius VIII Carried into Saint Peter’s Basilica on the Sedia Gestatoria). Vernet represents Pope Pius VIII in a white and gold ceremonial costume, seated on a richly adorned chair that is ornate with gold leaf and covered with red silk. On each side of the composition, he includes two large flabella made of white ostrich and peacock feathers that were used to pay homage to the Pope as footmen carry the chair to the Basilica of Saint Peter. Mendelssohn wrote soon after posing for Vernet: “the wall covered with pictures, finished and unfinished…the portrait of the Pope, a couple of Moorish heads, bagpipers, Papal soldiers, my unworthy self, Cain and Abel, and last of all a drawing of the interior of the place itself, all hang up in his studio.” Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy and Julie de Marguerittes (Comtesse de). Letters from Italy and Switzerland by Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy. Trans. Lady Wallace. Philadelphia: Frederick Leypoldt, 1863, 122.
kept his head turned and bowed down, imparted awkwardness, or want of elegance, to his movements, and prevented his counterbalance, being fully and favorably viewed.146

The present location of the Buste de Pape Pie VIII is unknown. Its aforementioned positive criticism attests to Dantan-Jeune’s ability as a portraitist. He emphasized the Pope’s dignity and kindness, and appears to have removed unsightly characteristics unsuited for the illustrious subject. Dantan-Jeune also made a full-length statuette of Pope Pius VIII. Its location is also unknown. Perhaps the sculptor did not exhibit it at the Villa Medici, as this was not mentioned by the journalist in his commentary. The full-length statuette was a collaborative work between the two brothers: Dantan-Jeune sculpted the head and Dantan-Aîné made the body.147 Dantan-Jeune had not yet mastered full-length sculpture, and only concentrated on portraiture.

Dantan-Jeune made two formal portrait busts of Horace Vernet and Carle Vernet (fig. 2.16 and 2.17). He exhibited them upon his return to Paris at the Salon of 1831. Dantan-Jeune portrays Carle Vernet in a bust à la française, which suits the sitter’s artistic connection to the Ancient Regime. Carle Vernet was old but was still considered attractive, charming, and witty. A visitor wrote: “…Charles Vernet (who paints such splendid horses) danced a quadrille the same evening with so much ease, making so many entrechats, and varying his steps so gracefully that it is a sad pity that he should not yet mastered full-length sculpture, and only concentrated on portraiture.

146 Pope Pius VIII was descendant from the illustrious family of the Castiglioni. During Napoleon’s Empire, he was exiled from Rome due to his refusal to vow allegiance to the French Empire. After Napoleon’s fall in 1816, he was made Cardinal. His failing health and overall frailty resulted in rumors of conspiracy, and rumors that Pope Pius VIII was poisoned. Nicholas Patrick Wiseman (Cardinal). Recollections of the Last Four Popes and of Rome in their Times. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1858, 369.

actually be seventy-two years of age. Every day he rides, and tires two horses, paints and
draws a little, and spends the evening in society." Dantan-Jeune represents Carle
Vernet with refined features and poise which convey dignity toward the notoriously
impetuous nature of his sitter. Realistic details include thick eyebrows and a full head of
gently curled hair brushed forward on a high forehead. Heavy sideburns nearly reach his
mouth. The sculptor balances the short curls with deep folds of the overcoat that is
wrapped around Vernet’s shoulders. An open collar reveals an elongated neck that turns
slightly to the right and echoes the creases of the scarf tied loosely on his chest. Carle
Vernet appears relaxed. Despite fatty pouches under his eyes and wrinkles on the sides of
his aquiline nose, his facial features are handsome. Vernet’s languorous gaze, combined
with a refined physiognomy, result in a portrait bust that successfully conveys the
liveliness and presence of the aging sitter. On the base of the elaborated bust, Dantan-
Jeune has included reliefs that represent a paintbrush in-between two of the multiple
decorations that Carle Vernet received during his long career.

Dantan-Jeune also made two sculpted caricatures of Carle Vernet: the first one,
while in Rome; the second, from memory, two years after returning to Paris. It is
probable that Dantan-Jeune’s caricature originated from the old painter's appreciation for

---

148 Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy and Julie de Marguerittes (Comtesse de). *Letters from Italy and
Leypoldt, 1863, 104.

149 Dantan-Jeune inscribed on the base, “Carle Vernet/Membre de l’Academie des Beaux-Arts de
Fra/ Chevalier des Ordres Duro/Ne a Bordeaux en 1758” (Carle Vernet/ Member of the fine Arts
Academy in Fr/ Knight of the Order of Duro/born in Bordeaux in 1758). The formal bust of Carle
Vernet was a success. After the painter’s death, French Minister Camille Bachasson, Comte de
commemorative painting of Heim in which Carle Vernet is represented, and writes: “Carle
Vernet, figure en lame de couteau, aspect de vieux toqué malin, retors, madré, sorte de gnome
the lowly art form. Years later, Baudelaire praised Vernet’s caricatures for their wit and accuracy. He writes:

Carle Vernet was a surprising man. His oeuvre is a world in itself, a small *Human Comedy*; the trivial depictions, the sketches of crowds and the street, the caricatures, are often the most faithful mirror of life... It is not only for having kept a deep sculptural impression and a pretention of the style of an epoch, it is not only, I say, on a historical perspective that the caricatures of Carle Vernet are valuable, they also have a definite artistic value. The postures and gestures have a truthful quality; the heads and physiognomies are in a style that many of us can remember when thinking of the society who frequented the salon of our fathers during our childhood.150

Dantan-Jeune's first caricatural bust represents *Carle Vernet* with eyes partly shut under heavy eyelids that droop on the sides (fig. 2. 18). He deeply carves the eyes in order to add shadows which give the impression of light-colored eyes. He accentuates the puffiness of the pouches under *Vernet*’s eyes and, under high circumflexed eyebrows, the sculptor molds the bony appearance of concave arches that have the same shape, making deep wrinkles on *Vernet*’s forehead. A receding triangular tuft of hair stands straight up; on each side, two thick sideburns peak from a high collar shirt, on which two pointed ends frame a thin mouth and chin. Dantan-Jeune excels at conveying the elongated neck by depicting it in a fitted interior robe with tiny shoulder pads and a large rounded collar.

150 “Un homme étonnant fut ce Carle Vernet. Son œuvre est un monde, une petite Comédie humaine; car les images triviales, les croquis de la foule et de la rue, les caricatures, sont souvent le miroir le plus fidèle de la vie...Ce n'est pas seulement pour avoir gardé profondément l'empreinte sculpturale et la prétention au style de cette époque, ce n'est pas seulement, dis-je, au point de vue historique que les caricatures de Carle Vernet ont une certaine valeur, elles ont aussi un prix artistique certain. Les poses, les gestes ont un accent véridique; les têtes et les physionomies sont d'un style que beaucoup d'entre nous peuvent vérifier en pensant aux gens qui fréquentaient le salon paternel de notre enfance.” Charles Baudelaire. “Quelques caricaturistes français.” *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1961, 994. For an analysis on Baudelaire and the art of caricature, see Michelle Hannoosh. *Baudelaire and Caricature: From the Comic to an Art of Modernity*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
that covers Vernet’s thin upper chest. On the top of the collar, he adds a ruffle shirt carved in horizontal grooves reminiscent of a skeletal rib cage. On the shirt, he digs long vertical lines and a bowtie that hangs diagonally to give Vernet a nonchalant attitude. Dantan-Jeune caricatures Vernet with huge ears, one of which held a hoop earring that the painter had worn since the Ancient Regime. Center stage, an enormous nose protrudes with two huge flaring nostrils. Dantan-Jeune’s humorous depiction of Carle Vernet shows his evolving technique which he started in Paris with the stumpy chunk of Ducornet’s caricature. Under the auspicious directorship of artists who valued the art of caricature, Dantan-Jeune learned subtlety and the method he was still refining.

Dantan-Jeune already shows a natural ability to extract the most essential characteristics of a person’s facial features, which gives a primordial quality to the caricatures. The second caricature of Carle Vernet exemplifies the technical and spiritual prowess that Dantan-Jeune developed since his stay in Rome (fig. 2.19). He caricatures Carle Vernet with the neck of a horse, a neck which can be viewed from all angles since it is made in a loose spiral. This definite improvement from his initial essays which were made to be seen frontally shows that Dantan-Jeune had become comfortable with sculpted caricature.

He made the second version in 1832, when Carle Vernet was still at the Villa Medici with his son. Dantan-Jeune represents the aging artist as an anthropomorphic figure that borrows only the most essential facial traits of his previous caricature. He represents Carle Vernet with the mane and neck of a horse. Dantan-Jeune accentuates the worn-out features of Vernet, who loved riding and painting horses. From the front, Vernet appears with enormous puffed rings under two beady eyes. A large crooked nose
sways to the right. A short beard connects the sideburns and frames a droopy mouth. A
tall patch of hair stands straight up but, unlike the previous caricature, Dantan-Jeune
shows Vernet with a bald head. Two gigantic ears, one of which is adorned with a hoop
earring, stand out from the sickly thin face. In contrast to the worn-out physiognomy,
Vernet’s neck appears filled with strength: from top to bottom it curves in a continuous
diagonal. Vernet is no longer a frail old man, but a vigorous horse with powerful
shoulders and an impetuous mane that reveals well-defined muscles.

Dantan-Jeune has represented a true example of hybridity by including two
different species in one bust. This combination was acceptable in formal sculpture when
representing fantastical and mythological creatures of satyrs, fauns, and hydros. Instead,
Dantan-Jeune borrows directly from Classical sculpture and turns it upside-down by
making caricatures based on a serious tradition. Anthropomorphic sculpture was not a
novelty. Ancient Greeks made statuettes with heads of animals placed on human bodies.
Dantan-Jeune creates a new type of hybrid sculpture by representing the face of the sitter
on the body of an animal. He often used this new interpretation in caricatures that he
made with bodies of animals as well as objects. Bottles, violins, shoes, paint brushes,
tambours, poles, buckets serve as surrogate bodies for the heads that need to remain
recognizable.

A notable example is the 1833 caricature of violinist Jean-Baptiste Tolbecque
whom Dantan-Jeune represents with a haunting-looking head that stands on the top of a
violin (fig. 2.20). The facial features are reduced to the utmost essentials. A curved line
forms the shape of protruding eyebrow bones, Tolbecque’s nose curves up to reveal thin
and elongated nostrils, and his mouth is shaped in a downward curve. The neck of the
violin replaces Tolbecque’s neck and the upper part of the violin has become his body. The lower part of the violin is cut and placed in a hollow rectangular base on which Dantan-Jeune includes a rebus made of the letter “T”, two bones crossing each other, the letter “L”, and the profile of the head of a bird to phonetically read “t-os-l-bee” (t- bones-l- beak) or “Tolbecque”. Dantan-Jeune unleashed his imagination and creativity when sculpting caricatures that do not appear dated today.

Carpeaux rarely included unconventional elements in his busts. In 1870, however, he made a Buste de Charles Carpeaux (Bust of Charles Carpeaux; fig. 2.21), which is one of his most Modernist sculpted portraits. Carpeaux represents his older brother holding a violin with both hands against his chest. He looks to the side from the corner of deep carved eyes, which Carpeaux has accentuated to give enliven the portrait that he made after the death of his brother. He does not idealize his sitter and, rather than showing naturalism, he represents a realistic portrayal of his brother as he remembered him. Charles Carpeaux looks down as if listened to the sound of emanating from his violin. Carpeaux has left the bust in a rough sketch with tool marks and finger marks throughout, resulting in an unfinished surface that appears with multiple facets of low and high reliefs. The inclusion of the violin and the sketch-like nature of the bust of Charles Carpeaux is one of the most Modernist portraits that Carpeaux made.

Dantan-Jeune could show restraint when sculpting caricatures. He made two caricatures of Horace Vernet, one of which is in Rome and only represents the head of the painter (fig. 2.22). It is closely based on the formal Buste de Horace Vernet that Dantan-Jeune exhibited at the Salon of 1831. The somber bust shows the artist with a

151 Carpeaux’s terracotta bust of Charles Carpeaux is held in the collection of the Musée des Beaux-arts de Valenciennes. Ref. S. 90.7.
slight turn of the neck, which results in his eyes looking away. He wears a small scarf neatly wrapped around his neck, under a round collar jacket that is neatly buttoned to the top. He appears caught in a moment of reflection, with a side gaze that enlivens the portrait. The bust is made more simply than the formal bust of Carle Vernet and lacks its majesty. The caricatural head shares similarities and is only slightly exaggerated. It does not reach the outrageous physiognomic distortions that Dantan-Jeune mastered in the second caricature of Carle Vernet. Dantan-Jeune accentuates the length of the face and the size of his elongated chin. The similarities that the formal and caricatural busts share, exemplify the artistic problem that plagued Dantan-Jeune’s reputation: a hybridity between two distinct styles of portraiture which, at times, he struggled to clearly separate.

The second caricature is a full-length version of Horace Vernet’s caricatural bust (fig. 2.22). The statuette emphasizes the subject’s relaxed demeanor. Vernet worked and received visitors wearing a long interior robe that covered his entire body. He held it tightly around his waist with a large belt. Dantan-Jeune caricatures Horace Vernet with the attire that elongates his figure. He represents Vernet in an accentuated contraposto stance with one hand in his pocket and the other against his body, holding a cigarette. Dantan-Jeune made the statuette two years after the caricatural bust. It shows that he had mastered the intricacy of a full-length model. His brother was still in Rome and, unlike the statuette of the Pope, Dantan-Jeune made the statuette on his own. Even though he used his previous caricature as a model for the head, he successfully combined it with the body in apparent fluidity. The head does not appear to have been simply placed on top of the body. It is carefully crafted to represent a flowing and blasé stance that fits with the physiognomy and demeanor of the model.
Dantan-Jeune made the second caricature two years after seeing Horace Vernet in Rome. His acute ability to remember – and capture – the most salient facial and physical characteristics of his subjects is visible in a Self-Portrait that Horace Vernet made in 1832 (fig. 2.23 and 2.24). The painter was still at the Villa Medici and Dantan-Jeune was in Paris. The three-quarter length Self-Portrait represents Horace Vernet standing by the window of his atelier from where one can see the main building of the Villa Medici. His body is turned away, yet he looks at the viewer with his arms crossed against his chest. One hand holds a lit cigarette. He appears to be an introspective, slender man. Dantan-Jeune’s full length caricature exhibits similarities with Horace Vernet’s self-depiction. Dantan-Jeune accentuates the demeanor of a worldly man, with his head upheld by an extended neck.

By 1831, Dantan-Jeune had fully mastered the art of sculpted caricature, both in busts and statuettes. He had a natural skill for the art of Realistic formal portraiture when he returned to Paris in time for the Salon. However, he received little acclaim for the fourteen busts that he exhibited, which included the Bust of the Pope and the busts of the two Vernet. Art critic Augustin Jal reported: "Portraits are everywhere…M. Dautan [sic] Jeune has made many; his style is not elevated but rather realistic… Horace Vernet, Carle Vernet, Ciceri, Dabadie all have the same style; they are fine and that is all." Dantan-Jeune’s excellent debut at the Salon of 1827 with Esprit Noir was forgotten. He made resembling portrait busts but they were bland and repetitive. Dantan-Jeune’s reputation was already faltering because of his ease in sculpting caricatures that were not only witty

---

152 The painting is held in the Collection of the Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio. Ref. 1977. 171.
but done with a freedom of expression that lacked the necessary qualities to make formal busts. His caricatures surpassed his formal work because they were expressive, spontaneous, and dynamic. They also directly answered Hugo’s Romantic call for the ugly and the grotesque as worthy artistic depictions. Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures exemplified the new direction that sculpture was taking. They were not taken seriously or considered to have any artistic value because they were just caricatures, even though they were sculpted.

David d’Angers believed that Dantan-Jeune was talented, yet he loathed his sense of business and his choice to represent ugliness and the grotesque. David d'Angers wrote:

Dantan-Jeune (sculptor) exploits the misery and vicissitudes of the human figure and makes caricatures of our celebrities who (an example that clearly depicts our times) come to pose and are satisfied to catch public attention! These horrible caricatures are exhibited at Place de la Bourse, a perfect spot for an artist who think more about money than the noble vocation that he was meant to fulfill…What a difference from the Ancients; they were so moved by the merit of a man that all physical imperfections disappeared in their eyes.154

Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures differed from formal portraiture on multiple levels. They were made to amuse and entertain, with the intention to make a profit from their sale. However, they differed from portraiture on a fundamental point. Dantan-Jeune had absolute freedom of expression when he made sculpted caricatures. When he made

---

formal portrait busts he had to please the patron. A sculpted portrait was a visual representation of power, wealth, fame, and success. Most sculptors lacked the freedom of Dantan-Jeune. He chose his subjects for his caricatures. In contrast, the portraitist had to negotiate the cost, the pose, the clothing, the style, and the size of the bust with the patron. He also had to enhance features while keeping a resemblance to the sitter. The financial and artistic transaction greatly limited creative impulses because sculptors had to remain within conventional norms of portraiture.155

Formal portrait busts depicting *la nature vraie* (a truthful resemblance) were representative of Modern sculpted portraiture. *La nature vraie* is essentially a realistic portrayal of a sitter, which includes a tinge of Idealism to enhance facial flaws. A realistic portrait bust differs from *la nature vraie* in one essential point. Realistic portraitists did not invent. Instead, they made a faithful resemblance without extracting the inner characteristics of their models. As a result, they were lifeless, dull, and repetitive, and failed to grasp the attention of the public.

In 1827, Dantan Jeune was a promising portraitist who represented *la nature vraie*. By 1831, his artistic status had devalued. In the eyes of the critics, he became a Realist portraitist. This drastic change can be explained easily. Before leaving for Rome, Dantan-Jeune had never shown his sculpted caricatures to an audience. He was thus only known for his formal busts. When coming back to Paris, he quickly gained notoriety with his sculpted caricatures. They were lively, entertaining, refreshing, and accessible to the public.

---

public. His success in a truly innovative style of sculpture lowered the esteem of Conservatives and colleagues for his formal work.

I. David d’Angers: morality and hybridity of medallions

David d’Angers made the majority of his medallions with a much freer handling than his portrait busts because he considered them sketches. He writes: "In the eye of the artist, a medallion is like a draft, only a part of his oeuvre that should be studied in its totality. What would be the work of a sculptor who would leave behind only the notes he took of the human face."\(^{156}\) This statement reveals his superiority over younger Romantic sculptors, especially Préault, who rejected Academic principles by only making sketches, a recurrent criticism against the latter’s sculptures. David d'Angers' writings and his work show clear contradictions. His medallions convey expressiveness and dynamism typical of Romantic sculpture and, according to him, are artistically acceptable because they are not important projects. At the same time, he creates portraits busts that are crucial to the

\(^{156}\) Joseph G. Reinis. *The Portrait Medallions of David D'Angers: A Complete Catalogue of David's Contemporary and Retrospective Portraits in Bronze.* New York: Polymath Press, 1999, xxiv. In the nineteenth century, medallions were often tokens of friendship that were made in clay, wax, or plaster; when made with low grade materials, they were inexpensive and simple to produce. Medallions were also easy to transport due to their small size. Medallions did not require the same patronage necessary to support the cost and time required for sculpted busts, especially when in bronze or marble. Medallions were often made by young Romantic sculptors who depicted friends and artists they admired. They were tokens of friendship between artists who shared artistic and political ideologies. Indeed, large medallions were typically made to decorate architectural monuments and commemorate illustrious figures and historical events. Large medallions differed from medals – and from coins – that were worked on obverse and reverse. Unlike coins that were used for commercial transactions, small size medallions were made to commemorate important events and illustrious figures.
development of Romantic portraiture. This paradox results in hybridity visible in many medallions and portrait busts. In fact, David d'Angers appears torn between his Academic beginnings and his allegiance to Louis David, and his desire for freedom of expression. Some of his busts not only share similar qualities to his "sketches"; they far exceed them.

In 1827, David d'Angers started a galerie des contemporains that he made for didactic purpose. The medallions were not commissioned, which gave the sculptor complete freedom to choose sitters whom he selected on their merit. He writes: "The persistence with which I record the features of whomsoever possesses some form of merit – virtue, genius, knowledge – should suffice to convince unbiased minds that I follow the dictates of a feeling of reverence, free of any thought of profit...I satisfy my heart's desire by building a monument, within my means, to all that is a credit to humanity." He believed in his pedagogical mission to record physiognomies that spread uplifting messages for the greater good of society. David d’Angers emulated Louis David's political stance: to propagate morality and virtue to the masses. Louis David wanted to commemorate heroic deeds with bronze medals that would be distributed to French citizens. He explains:

I desire that the tradition of making medals also be used for all the glorious and commemorative events that have already occurred, and that will happen to the Republic as a way to imitate the Greeks and Romans who, through the medals that they have left us, have not only passed down the memory of exceptional epochs and of great men, but also have instructed us in the advances of their arts.

158 "Je désire que cet usage de faire frapper des médailles soit appliqué aussi à tous les événements glorieux ou heureux déjà passés, et qui arriveront à la république, et cela à l'imitation des Grecs et des Romains qui, par leurs suites métalliques, nous ont non-seulement transmis la mémoire des époques remarquables, celle des grands hommes, mais nous ont instruits aussi des progrès de leurs arts." As the deputy for the Committee of Public Safety, Louis David made the
David d’Angers was just a child when his bon maitre urged artists to follow his civic principles. He likely followed Louis David’s vision because of his undying admiration for the older man. David d’Angers later explained, "Medals are the summaries of important events; they serve to remember illustrious personalities. Consequently, they have to convey the most information without obstacles to clarity, for both the man of taste and education and for the plebeian: art being made to enlighten." His medallions were thus utilitarian objects made for social improvement. However, due to the high cost of bronze casting, the mass diffusion of his medallions was impossible. They remained luxurious objects that could only be purchased by wealthy patrons. Nonetheless, his adherence to Louis David’s principles is exemplified in the medallion of Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres (fig. 2.25). He met the painter in Rome. In 1826, they were both elected members of the Institute. That year, David d’Angers made a three-quarter profile drawing of Ingres at the Institute that shows him fully clothed (fig. 2.26). He also made the medallion that is based on the drawing. An important difference has occurred. In the medallion, David d'Angers does not represent Ingres with...
his Academician costume, but in the nude, a direct reference to Classical depictions. This change attests to the esteem that the sculptor had for Ingres. Based on their merit, David d’Angers represented contemporary sitters either in modern costumes or in the nude. He selected the nude for important subjects whose contributions improved society. This selection is rooted in his education at the École des Beaux-Arts and his Academic training under Louis David. In addition, he also includes Ingres’ name in capitalized letters that spell out vertically, “A. Ingres - Pictor”, which he made in relief lettering. This typography is rare in David d'Angers' series of medallions. He usually includes signatures from his models which he transposes on either side of their profile. The lettering for Ingres’ medallion shares the same aesthetic as Ancient medals typically used for illustrious sitters. Consequently, the medallion of Ingres ranks at the top of d’Angers series, showing a sitter worthy of remembrance and emulation.

David d’Angers admired Delacroix as much as Ingres. This apparent contradiction is reflective of his artistic struggle, which made him appear neutral if not inconsistent. In 1828, David d'Angers made the portrait medallion of Eugène Delacroix at the age of thirty (fig. 2.27). Surprisingly, he portrays him in the same style as Ingres. He presents Delacroix as a steadfast young man whose long neck carries a fully upright head full of hair. David d’Angers’ medallion includes the facial features that a fellow student of Delacroix described. He notes: "A young man with a fine spirit…more nervous than a sensitive woman, more subtle than a blasé diplomat…this boy, with an olive skin and eyes that conveyed a withering glance, a mobile face, cheeks carved-in from early on, and a mouth delicately sardonic. He was slim, elegant, and his black hair, full and
wiry, betrayed his birth in the South."\(^{161}\) Despite his role as the leader of the Modern School, David d’Angers represents Delacroix in the nude with a diagonal incision under the neck that includes part of his upper torso. He also includes lettering reminiscent of Ingres’s but, instead of relief letters, he carves “Eug. Delacroix - Pictor”, to encircle the profile. That year, David d’Angers made a medallion of Eugène Deveria (1808-1865; fig. 2.28) who was then considered a Romantic painter as important as Delacroix. At the Salon of 1827, Deveria showed the large painting La naissance d’Henri IV (The Birth of Henry IV), which was praised by all for its subject, composition, energy, and bright colors. David d’Angers portrays Deveria in a similar profile view as Delacroix and includes the same lettering. However, he represents Deveria in costume. This difference attests to d’Angers esteem for Delacroix, which was greater than his esteem for Deveria. The lettering that he uses for Ingres’s medallion as opposed to Delacroix and Deveria’s also attests to David d’Angers’ homage of Ingres as a worthy leader of the Classicist School. Delacroix follows closely behind him despite their different styles, and Deveria is a disciple of the leader of the New School of Romanticism. David d’Angers’ hierarchy follows the model that he set out to make in differentiating sitters worthy of busts or only portrait-busts.

David d’Angers also made medallions of sitters for whom he had little or no esteem. The year of his medallions of Delacroix and Deveria, he made one of Horace Vernet and, on the left side, carved “David a son ami Horace Vernet” (David to his friend Horace Vernet; fig. 2.29). He portrays Vernet in the nude. Vernet’s long profile ends in a

point at the base of the neck. D’Angers includes short strands of hair brushed forward, and diagonally cut sideburns. It would seem that David d’Angers admired Vernet, since he represented him in the nude and was also his friend. However, his carnet of notes published posthumously reveal that he often made medallions of sitters that he did not admire. He writes: “a painting by Horace Vernet…is affected, wrong in its color and drawing, like everything that comes out of Vernet’s brush. David still remains the great master despite all of the squalling of the modern school”\textsuperscript{162} That d’Angers would represent these sitters is reminiscent of the hybridity of his portraits and attests to his artistic inconsistence.

\textbf{J. Préault and the “infinite” medium of sculpture}

Préault was more upfront than David d'Angers. He compared his artistic goal to Delacroix’s and stated: "I accomplish in sculpture the revolution in which he is the leader in painting”\textsuperscript{163} This straight-forward declaration shows Préault’s admiration for Delacroix and the purpose that he set out to fill. Préault wanted to create a new artistic style by shattering the foundations of Conservative sculpture. The influence that


Delacroix had on Préalut is visible in his series of medallions. From a restrained style and rather finished surface inspired by David d'Angers’ early medallions, he evolved to crude depictions that were seen as failures because of their unfinished – yet forceful – modeling. Delacroix approached his compositions as if he were a sculptor working with a solid material instead of a flat canvas. He built his paintings from the center and added paint to give volume through an additive process. He compared painting to sculpture and explained:

> The sculptor does not begin his work by a contour; he builds with his material the appearance of the object, which first appears coarse but soon exhibits the principal condition of a real projection and solidity. Colorists [. . .] must establish from the start all that is required and essential to their art. They must knead the color just as a sculptor does with clay, marble or stone; their sketch, just like that of the sculptor must show proportion, perspective, and the effect of color.¹⁶⁴

Delacroix was referring to Renaissance and Middle-Ages sculptors as opposed to Greek sculptors. He rejected Louis David’s and Ingres' imitation of Ancient sculpture because they emphasized contour which resulted in hallow figures that lack volume. Delacroix conceded that modern sculpture was possible through expressivity and imagination, but doubted that it could succeed. Sculpture lacked the illusionism that painters resorted to when shaping forms that appeared as volumes with the help of color and impasto. In addition, sculpture could not represent the same effect of perspective, which allowed elaborate narratives.

¹⁶⁴ “Le sculpteur ne commence pas son ouvrage par un contour; il batit avec sa matière une apparence de l'objet qui, grossier d'abord, présente dès le principe la condition principale qui est la saillie réelle et la solidité. Les coloristes [. . .] doivent établir en même temps et dès le principe tout ce qui est propre et essentiel à leur art. Ils doivent masser avec la couleur comme le sculpteur avec la terre, le marbre ou la pierre; leur ébauche, comme celle du sculpteur, doit présenter également la proportion, la perspective, l'effet et la couleur.” Quoted in Michele Hannoosh. “Delacroix and Sculpture.” *Nineteenth-Century French Studies.* Vol. 35. N. 1. (Fall 2006), 105.
Nonetheless, Préault approached sculpture through a method resembling Delacroix's description of painting. He first assembles enough clay that allows him to then remove excesses. He cuts and tears out from the volume, which results in a dynamism and liveliness from the gaps and holes that he has freely removed from the chunk. Although seemingly unmethodical, Préault was nonetheless in control of the material that he handled. He is wholly searching for individualism: he leaves marks and accidents in his work. This technique allows him to diversify shadows and light throughout his sculptures. They vary in tonalities based on the reliefs and crevices that he molds. Préault’s instinctual method was explained as a lack of formal art training and a lack of knowledge of the human body and physiognomy. As a result, his works were consistently labeled as ugly and caricatural. When Préault first exhibited at the Salon of 1833, Gustave Planche wrote with great virulence against his work. He noted:

I am forced to protest with all my might against the encouragement given to M. Préault…he believes that sculpture is a grimacing ugliness that he varies with infinite variety and does not even try to complete the caricatures that he creates. He only remains within the sketch and his friends confuse the laziness and clumsiness of his fingers for genius. I have nothing to say other than that art and critics have nothing to do with such immature wantonness. 165

Préault’s works disturbed most art critics because of their radical novelty from other sculptures. At his first Salon, he submitted two frames of six medallions each, which the Jury accepted. They represent sitters – most of whom are unidentified – and were not

only criticized for their caricatural and grimacing exaggerations, but because of Préault’s
disheveled method.

It is difficult to assert which medallions Préault showed, because art critics did not
refer to them in detail. The two frames likely included medallions of friends and
colleagues that Préault made in the early 1830s after he left David d’Angers’ atelier. One
of them portrays Christophe Pittermann, a sitter whose connections to Préault are not
known (fig. 2. 30). Pittermann is in profile and shows a scowling grimace, beady eyes
and a protruding eyebrow arch. He also possesses a small pointy nose, thin, shut lips, a
round protruding chin, a bony jaw with sagging skin, deeply carved wrinkles on the
forehead and a receding hairline with hair that partially covers the ear. Pittermann seems
irritated. He projects deviousness with his eyes partly shut. His unruly hair goes in all
directions; thin strands blend with the background. The upper part of the costume is made
of a large collar and the upper sleeves typical of a bourgeois. Préault carelessly cuts an
incision with a knife under the thick shoulders, forming an irregular line at the base.

Pittermann’s portrait appears as a hybrid medallion that combines the relief of
sculpture with masses molded to give depth and elevation. Préault applies almost
painterly touches in the thin strands of hair. They appear as if he used a brush to blend

---

166 A medallion of Pittermann in bronze is held in the Collection des Sculptures, Musée du Louvre,
Paris. Ref: RF. 1216. In 1880, the Musée de Lille acquired a frame of forty medallions that Préault
made at the beginning of his career. The frame was dismantled and the medallions are now
displayed individually in even rows. This presentation follows the layout of a series of eight
medallions in a large wood frame that Préault exhibited in 1863 at the Galerie Martinet in Paris.
The medallions were placed in groups of four and the profiles faced one another. An anonymous
artist made a caricature of the frame and medallions that shows two divided rows although
shown askew. For an illustration of the caricature and the identity of the sitters, see Charles W.
musées nationaux, 1997, 195-196. The medallions are held at the Hirshhorn Museum of Sculpture
and Garden, Washington. Ref. HMSG 81.251- 81.267. For a review of the exhibition, see Paul
them into the surface. This method shows the close relation that was developing between Romantic sculpture and paintings. Delacroix, for example, added impasto to show relief and left his canvases unvarnished to reveal brushstrokes that were integral parts of his compositions. This method exemplifies the individualism of Romantic artists, who completely rejected the highly finished style of Academic artists, who removed any visible signs of their hand in compositions.

Foremost defender of Préault, Théophile Gautier, wrote that Préault’s sculpture deserved the public’s attention. But he was not as enthusiastic of Préault’s medallions. He reports: “…as for the medallions, they are just unfinished sketches closer to caricature than reality and we will not cover them.” Préault also made a medallion that shows his complete rejection of established norms. *Portrait of a Man* represents an unidentified sitter whose head is in profile (fig. 2. 31). The upper part of his costume is shown in frontal view. This disjunction is rare. The profile of the man and his large overcoat fills most of the background and anticipates reliefs which will overflow on the sides. Préault portrays the man with a deep eyebrow ridge, a long nose that ends in a point, and large nostrils. His hair flows as if caught in the wind. His forehead and cheeks are made of thick lumps and deep grooves. A mutton chop beard covers the upper part of a thick scarf which is wrapped around the man’s neck and covers his chin. His costume is made of four different layers. The overcoat collar reaches to his nose and above his neck. The profile view of the face and the frontal view of his body appear as if Préault has caught a quick glimpse at a man who just turned to look at something – or someone – that has his full interest.

---

Préault did not inscribe the names of many sitters. Instead, he fills the space usually reserved for inscriptions with large faces and hairstyles and costumes that often appear to go beyond the limits of the medallions' perimeters. The identity of the sitter is thus inconsequential to Préault’s purpose. He is most interested in the material and the modeling. He abstracts physiognomies and is not concerned with an accurate representation. Instead, the material takes precedence over the subject. He dematerializes a medium known for its heaviness and sturdiness. He transforms an artistic medium typically used for immortalization into one of transience and evanescence. He masters these qualities which are usually reserved for the art of painting.

In 1864, Préault made a posthumous medallion of Eugène Delacroix as an homage to the painter, who had an enormous influence on his work (fig. 2.32). He represents Delacroix with his hair parted low on the side, covering his neck and ear, along with a short beard and mustache that he wore later in life. The profile exudes elegance, as Delacroix holds his head erect and is enhanced by the top of a costume that reveals a shirt worn with the tip of the collar to the chin and a wrapped around bowtie that is tucked diagonally into an overcoat. Préault suggests the age of Delacroix with deep concave eye cavities that contrast with high and sharp cheekbones. Préault's handling suggests a method of carving distilled in the grooves that he digs in Delacroix's hair. Préault uses a tool – perhaps a sculptor’s knife – to carve short lines in the collar of the overcoat, as well as horizontal, diagonal, and curved lines around the profile. Préault’s technique is the sculptural equivalent of the painterly style of Delacroix, whose canvases were considered unfinished. After finishing the medallion, Préault made a sketch on paper for publication (fig. 2.33). On the sides of the medallion, he has added
the title, “Pictor” to the original “Eugène Delacroix”, and has written under the ink drawing:

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \text{ am not} \\
& \text{For the finite.} \\
I & \text{am for the infinite} \\
& \text{Auguste Préault} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Préault was as reputed for his \textit{bons mots} as his sculptures and perhaps he was the author of the adage that he scripted under Delacroix. Perhaps he was simply referring to a sentence that he heard from the painter.\textsuperscript{169} Regardless, the aphorism embodies Préault’s artistic quest to reject the Academic tradition of highly finished works that were carefully molded with clarity of contour. Instead, he reaches for the boundless, which makes him a Modern sculptor.

\textsuperscript{168} “Je ne suis pas / Pour le fini. / Je suis pour l’infini” Auguste Préault. Préault made the sketch on brown paper from the medallion for the publication \textit{L’autographe au Salon de 1864 et 1865 et dans les ateliers}. He noted in a letter, “Voici l’autographe demandé, c’est un croquis d’après une médaille d’Eugène Delacroix que je viens de terminer” (Here is the requested autograph, it is a sketch after the medal of Eugène Delacroix that I have just finished). Quoted in Charles W. Millard et al., \textit{Auguste Préault: sculpteur romantique, 1809-1879}. Paris: Gallimard, Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1997, 214. The drawing is held in the Collection of the Département des Arts Graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Ref: RF 29751.

\textsuperscript{169} In 1997, Sylvain Bellanger already alluded to this notion when noting, “Le célèbre mot de Préault, “Je ne suis pas pour le fini, je suis pour l’infini”…est une dédicace du sculpteur au peintre. Mais est-ce Delacroix ou Préault qui parle”? (The famous word by Préault, “I am not for the finite, I am for the infinite”…is a dedication from the sculptor to the painter. But is it Delacroix or Préault who speaks?) See Charles W. Millard et al., \textit{Auguste Préault: sculpteur romantique, 1809-1879}. Paris: Gallimard, Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1997, 215.
CHAPTER 3: ROMANTIC SCULPTURE AND POLITICS

A. Official Salons and the fight for reforms in the art of sculpture

Political revolutions yield more or less influence on the fine arts. The one that just exploded and that has spread from the Capital to the rest of France announces large and generous thoughts germinated from the enthusiasm of children in liberal arts; it seems to assure them a brighter future. We hope that from now on they will find in the authority the protection, support, and consideration that they have the right to expect from a nation in which they excel in enhancing its glory. The government will have to put an end to multiple abuses and to make ameliorations in the arts.170

The July Revolution was a driving force for disgruntled artists who demanded changes within the organization of the Institute, the École des Beaux-Arts, the Salons and the Jury. Within three weeks of the coup, over four-hundred artists from all artistic

branches drew a list of grievances against the official artistic establishment. David d’Angers, Préault, and Daumier were signatories in the petition addressed to the new Chamber of Deputies. The grievance committee demanded a simpler and less costly administration, updated courses at the École des Beaux-Arts that expanded beyond the emphasis on drawing classes, and the implementation of public competitions for official commissions, instead of favoritism toward Professors and members of the Academy. In addition, they also demanded the right to select a new Jury for the Salons to replace the old guard, which was comprised of elected artists who were members of the Institute. Finally, artists demanded an annual Salon to replace the biennial exhibitions that took place during the Restoration. Most of the requests failed, in part because of disagreements between architects, musicians, painters and sculptors who differed in their accusations and complaints. Despite their differences, the sculptors, painters, lithographers, and engravers were able to settle on specific demands, and joined forces to form a commission.

The most radical artists wanted anarchie in the arts to end the biased decisions of the Jury at the Salons and to annihilate the artistic establishment – in their view – an obsolete institution tainted by scandalous favoritism. Philippe-Auguste Jeanron (1809-1877), a close friend of Préault and Daumier since the Atelier Suisse, distributed a petition addressed to Louis-Philippe’s new Chamber of Deputies. In order to replace the Jury elected by the Institute, it asked for the right to choose independent members of the Jury for the Salon.\textsuperscript{171} The Salon of 1827 – the last Salon until 1831 – resulted in an overwhelming number of rejected artworks. Artists wanted to submit their works for peer

\textsuperscript{171} The sheet “Pétition Nationale adressée par les artistes soussignés à messieurs les membres de la chambre des députés” was printed by Firmin-Didot. For a list of the demands, see Guyot de Fère. \textit{Journal des artistes et des amateurs}. 12 September 1830. Fourth year. No. XI. Vol. 2, 180.
review instead of to a Jury comprised of painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, and amateurs who remained within the confines of the Classical school. Louis-Philippe reinstated a yearly Salon instead of the biennial event of the Restoration. Artists embraced the decision. Regular public exposure enhanced their visibility and increased the likelihood of commissions and sales.

In *Histoire du Romantisme*, Théophile Gautier gives an account of the artistic forces that clashed at the beginning of the July Monarchy. The artistic changes that occurred during the tolerant period between 1831 and 1834 at the annual exhibition of the Salon had, in fact, a deeper meaning. Romantic art came to embody a movement that was culturally, socially, and politically opposed to the despotism of the Institute. As a foremost Romantic writer, Gautier epitomized the *nouvelle école* that promoted the concept of *l’art pour l’art* (art for art sake) instead of the Academic principles of art as moralistic and virtuous. He writes:

The Romantic revolution that started under the Restoration and exploded in 1830 was less apparent in sculpture than in all other arts. Painters followed poets, but sculpture stayed almost imperturbable in its marble serenity. The Greeks seem to have determined its laws, conditions, and its ideal forever. One can say that such a noble and pure art still lives today in its antique tradition, and that it has degenerated every time it strayed from praxis. Even though, there was a movement for renovation on its side. It seemed possible for a few audacious souls to inject more truth in the old conventional mold, this mold cracking in some parts: David (d’Angers), Auguste Préault, … The opposition that they met was even more violent than the one against poets and painters…

---

172 The Jury only included two sculptors, Bosio and Cortot, out of seventeen members. For the list of members of the Institute for the Jury committee in 1827, see William Hauptman. “Juries, Protests, and Counter-Exhibitions before 1850.” *The Art Bulletin*. Vol.67, No. 1. (March 1985) : 98, fn.25.

173 “La révolution romantique qui se préparait sous la Restauration et qui éclata en 1830, fut moins sensible dans la sculpture que dans tout autre art. Les peintres suivirent les poètes, mais la statuaire resta presque impassible dans sa sérénité de marbre. Les Grecs semblent en avoir à
Although Gautier notes that a few sculptors had cracked the mold, a dichotomy appears in his aesthetic principles. He was an active proponent for evolution in painting and literature, yet considered sculpture an art form fundamentally opposed to Romantic expression. Sculpture was to remain timeless and decorous. Gautier explains: "We wanted life, light, movement, audacious thoughts and expression…we rejected colorless shades, thin and dry drawings, compositions like rows of mannequins that the Empire had passed on to the Restoration." Although Gautier held a revolutionary attitude by advocating a clear break with traditions in literature and painting, he nonetheless remained conservative vis-à-vis the art of sculpture. Sculpture had reached its perfection during Greco-Roman Antiquity. It had reached a definitive and unmovable place. That a foremost Romantic writer and art critic believed that sculpture had already reached its apogee in Classical times, and believed that sculptors ought to follow Greco-Roman examples, shows the nearly insurmountable problems faced by Romantic sculptors even within their own progressive milieu.

Traditionally, Salon critics began to review the most renowned artists, then lesser known painters, until finally ending with sculpture. Their criticism was published in

newspaper installments. Sculpture was reviewed last because of its low popularity among the public and readers. Théophile Gautier took a novel approach and starts his review with sculpture. This innovation, which contradicted the expected layout of art criticism, showed his reverence for long-established artistic hierarchies. Indeed, Gautier reminded the reader that architecture is “the first of all plastic arts”, closely followed by sculpture, an art form based on the work of architects and sculptors.\footnote{Gautier refused to write about architecture because “... l'architecture est si nulle et si faible cette année, que nous n'en voulons rien dire à cause de l'estime que nous lui portons. Messieurs les architectes n'ont pas l'air de comprendre la haute mission dont ils sont chargés, et se laissent honteusement remorquer par les sculpteurs et les peintres, qui ne devraient être que leurs humbles tributaires.” (Architecture is so null and so weak this year that we do not want to say anything due to the esteem that we feel for that art. These architects do not seem to understand the high task that they are responsible for, and shamelessly let themselves be towed by sculptors and painters, who should only be their humble dependants.) Théophile Gautier. “Salon of 1833.” \textit{La France littéraire}.Vol.6. Paris : Au Bureau de la France Littéraire, 1833.}

Gautier was restructuring the original principles of the École des Beaux-Arts, which valued the art of sculpture above the art of painting. He also addressed the favoritism that plagued the Salon. The entrance at the galleries of the Louvre was reserved for the works of Academic sculptors to exhibit full-length sculptures and portrait busts. The public remained in the painting galleries, in part because fashionable people were there. The works of younger sculptors were relegated to areas where the public rarely ventured. This second-rate location resulted in poor attendance. Sculpture failed to generate interest in a public who viewed it as repetitive and boring. Sculpture was seen as monotonous, especially against the colorful and energetic paintings of Romantic artists such as Delacroix and Sigalon.
B. David d'Angers' Salon of 1831 and Romantic sculpted portraiture

At the Salon of 1872, Carpeaux exhibited the group *Les Quatre parties du monde soutenant une sphère* (Four Allegories Holding the Celestial Sphere), and one bust of artist Jean-Léon Gérôme. The female nudes were compared to "four malnourished savages", yet the same critic lauded the bust "…surprising in liveliness; it moves, it breathes…" The bust was nonetheless criticized by most because of the lifelike expression that Carpeaux infused (fig. 3.1). Another art critic defended the bust and explained: "Mr. Carpeaux has exhibited... a bronze bust of Gérôme, which has been overly criticized. It has been ridiculed and some have mocked by calling it the "talking beheaded". The bust is cut at the base of the neck and placed directly on a small stand it is animated by a liveliness so intense that it appears as a decapitated head." Carpeaux was, thus, subjected to ridicule because of the sitter who appeared to be ready to speak – his mouth is slightly opened – and the physiognomy, which was too expressive for the uneven cut of the base.

David d’Angers was also subjected to ridicule for the *Buste en marbre de Goëthe* (Marble Bust of Goethe; fig. 3.2), shown at the Salon of 1831. It was the first Salon of the July Monarchy and was the most permissive since the post-Revolutionary Salon of 1791. In a gesture of liberality, most paintings and sculptures were accepted, as well as late

---

submissions. The Salon guide showed the prevailing ambivalence of many artists who waited until the Salon had already opened to include their works. In a rare decision, seven supplements were incorporated to the original descriptive text, resulting in detractors to the leniency of the salon:

Let’s have at least equality in the arts! Nothing ought to be done against regulations to which all must submit. It is essential that renowned artists become accustomed to show from the start, just as they did when they did not yet have a reputation. It is fashionable to exhibit at the Salon at a later date the paintings that matter most; one wants an explosion; one wants to capture the attention that has been long drowned in the large number of works; one wants, perhaps, to play the aristocrat and appeared privileged. This is more than ridiculous. In 1831, the administration said that it will no longer allow it. We shall see.

The prediction of inequality expressed by the art critic was correct. David d’Angers’ was conspicuously absent at the opening of the Salon in early May. He exhibited only one...
sculpture, his bust of Goethe, which he sent to the Louvre after most newspapers had already reviewed the works of his peers. The bust of Goethe might be said to exemplify the evolution that sculpted portraiture had reached since Victor Hugo’s theories on beauté and laideur first emerged in the introduction of Cromwell. David d’Angers had a close relationship with Hugo, and appears to have deliberately represented Goethe with exaggerated physiognomic elements that bordered on caricature and the grotesque. By 1831, David d’Angers had become a successful sculptor who worked on official monuments. He was regarded as one of the greatest French sculptors. He was a Professor at the École des Beaux-Arts, owned a reputed atelier and, as a member of the Institute, was exempt from submitting his works to his peers. This enviable position resulted in the possibility of exhibiting any kind of work without fearing censorship from the Salon’s Jury. David d’Angers took advantage of such freedom and showed the bust of Goethe – for one week – before shipping the portrait to the sitter to Weimar, Germany.

In 1829, David d’Angers traveled to Weimar, hoping to sculpt a bust from life of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), whom he revered as the greatest poet of his time. He considered the writer of The Sorrows of Young Werther and Faust as an immortal figure who belonged in his gallery of Grands hommes. David d’Angers wrote to a lifelong friend: "You know my cult for great men; there is one whose physiognomy I want to study and contemplate, it is Goethe".\footnote{Tu connais mon culte des grands hommes; il en est un dont je veux étudier et contempler les traits, c’est Goethe." Pierre-Louis David d’Angers & Henry Jouin. David d’Angers et ses relations littéraires. “Lettre à Victor Pavie”, 27 July 1829. Paris: É. Plon, Nourrit, et Cie, 1890, 42. David d’Angers travelled to Germany with Louis Pavie’s son, poet and writer Victor Pavie. For an} In Weimar, David d’Angers made a
medallion and a sketch bust of *Goethe*, which was cast in plaster before he returned to Paris. David d’Angers worked from the plaster on a colossal rendition in marble, which was on view in his atelier before he sent it to the Salon. David d’Angers’ colossal bust of *Goethe* generated interest among visitors, which resulted in an eagerness and curiosity among the Salon critics who had not yet seen the bust. Once on view, it was received with a sense of shock, bewilderment, and ridicule. As a critic noted:

> I have spoken about the busts, there is one, due to the renowned nature of the sitter, and due to the reputation that friends of the artist who already saw it in his atelier, generated a deep curiosity…it is the colossal bust of Goethe, made in French marble, by the member of the Institute, M. David…Through the numerous portraits of Goethe and the tales from travelers, we have learned that the forehead of the author of *Faust* and *Goëtz de Berlichigen*, has acquired, due to a constant strong and powerful thinking process, an unusual development; yet, however large the forehead of Goethe could be, should it ever look like the forehead of a hydrocephalic?182

Goethe was notoriously tall. David d’Angers represents the head of the poet on a scale three times larger than life. David d’Angers wanted to accentuate the height of the poet who stood above other men. He shows *Goethe* looking down under heavy eyelids that fold over deeply disillusioned eyes. Swollen pouches under his eyes and a deep vertical furrow between bushy eyebrows accentuate the pathos and advanced age of the sitter. His gaze expresses a state of intense – yet dignified – resolution. *Goethe* appears
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182 “J’ai parlé de bustes, il y en a un, qui par la célébrité de l’homme qu’il représente, par la réputation que lui ont fait les amis de l’artiste, qui avaient pu le voir dans son atelier, excitait une curiosité bien vive…c’est le buste colossal de Goëthe, exécuté en marbre français, par M. David, membre de l’Institut…Les nombreux portraits de Goëthe et les récits des voyageurs nous ont appris que le front de l’auteur de *Faust* et de *Goëtz de Berlichigen* a acquis, par la constante habitude d’une pensée forte et puissante, un développement peu ordinaire; mais quelque vaste qu’il puisse être, le front de Goëthe devrait-il jamais rappeler le front d’un hydrocéphale?...”

with realistic features, such as a large aquiline nose with a tip that sinks toward his well-defined and slightly curved lips. Excess skin dangles on the sides of his chin, forming a sagging double-chin on the massive neck. David d’Angers also carved heavy age lines on Goethe’s neck, lines which curve toward the back of a bare neck. Goethe’s hair is made of thick and chunky curls that rise upwards and out. Above his partly-hidden ears, shorter waves of thick hair stand up and form irregular masses which culminate on the top of his skull.

David d’Angers’ handling shares similarities with Carpeaux, who also portrayed Gérôme with individualized facial features. Thick pockets under his eyes and hair flowing, Gérôme appears especially realistic because of the dark eyes that Carpeaux has conveyed through his deep cutting of the pupils. His dynamism is also rendered by turning his head to the left, resulting in a tension in the muscles of the neck. Yet, Carpeaux used exact proportions, which give a truthful appearance of the model and emphasized the sense of realism of looking at the actual model. Hence the derogatory term, “speaking beheaded”.

In contrast, David d’Angers showed more boldness in his depiction of his sitter than did Carpeaux. In an unprecedented, audacious move, he emphasized the size of Goethe’s forehead as an enormous cranial mass that surpassed all other facial features. Such exaggeration is hardly accidental. He wanted to acknowledge the intellect of Goethe. He based his depiction on the pseudo-science of phrenology, which considered the forehead the seat of all intellectual activity. Indeed, David d’Angers was a proponent of the theory of phrenology that had been laid out by the German physicians Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828) and Johann Gaspar Spurzheim (1776–1832), who posited a
correspondence between the external form of the human skull and the shape of the brain, which housed the “organ of the soul,” where all moral and intellectual faculties, as well as sentiments and moods, originated. As such, a large forehead was the seat of intelligence. David d’Angers thus acknowledged Goethe’s superiority, but his method was derided by the Salon’s critic, who referred to Goethe as an individual suffering from hydrocephaly, a disease that resulted in a monstrously distorted cranium.

In Academic theories, the measurement of the face is divided into three equal parts, which are: the chin to the base of the nose; the tip of the nose to the eyebrows; and the eyebrows to the top of the forehead. David d’Angers consistently applied this method to the busts that he had previously conceived. However, in the case of Goethe, he followed the measurements only up to a point. The lower part of the face up to the eyebrows is physically – and artistically – correct. But he adds an additional half size to Goethe’s forehead which results in a portrait bust no longer based on Classical doctrines or on faithful representation. In comparison, a previous portrait made from life in 1822-1823 by the German sculptor and friend of Goethe, Johann Gottfried Schadow (1764-1850), is made with a rigid frontal view, smoothness of details, and symmetrical balance – all elements based on the Neo-Classical traditions (fig. 3.3). In the Bust of Goethe, Schadow nonetheless adds a certain sense of contemporaneity by including realistic facial features and dressing the sitter with a shirt and vest buttoned to the neck; a round collar jacket displays an official decoration on the left breast. Schadow depicts Goethe’s physiognomy with creases near the nose and the mouth, and grooves between his
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eyebrows and on his forehead. The overall serene quality of the sitter is accentuated with a short hairstyle that is carefully combed to the sides. A semblance of a double chin is visible, although Schadow minimizes the sagging skin by representing the high collar shirt up to the top of the neck. In addition, Schadow sculpts the start of a receding hairline in the center of Goethe’s skull, without giving any prominence to the large forehead that Goethe bore.\footnote{Schadow’s \textit{Bust of Goethe} is in the Collection of the Alte National Gallerie, Berlin. Christian Daniel Rauch (1777-1857) also made a \textit{Bust of Goethe} in which he represents the writer in Classical nude and shows him with deeper age lines than Schadow’s, as well as a larger forehead, although not as prominently as David d’Angers’ depiction of \textit{Goethe}. Rauch’s bust is held in the Collection of The Goethe Museum, Düsseldorf.} Schadow follows Academic precepts by equally dividing the parts of \textit{Goethe}’s head, an artistic correctness that David d’Angers rejected.

The closest rendition to David d’Angers’ colossal bust is an 1826 drawing by German artist Julius Ludwig Sebbers (1804-1843). In \textit{Portrait of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe}, Sebbers portrays the writer at seventy-seven years old and shows similar characteristics to the ones immortalized by David d’Angers (fig. 3.4).\footnote{Sebbers noted on the base of the drawing, “Goethe. nach der Natur gezeichnet v. L. Sebbers, Weimar den 7ten September, 1826” (Goethe. drawn from nature by L. Sebben, Weimar, the 7th of September, 1826). Sebbers’ \textit{Portrait of Goethe} is held in the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Libraries, New Jersey.} Sebbers made the chalk drawing from life. He depicts \textit{Goethe} in a left profile, looking straight ahead, with a sharp gaze that implies an inquisitive nature. Sebbers rejected idealized physiognomic elements to instead emphasize realistic features: wrinkles throughout the face and neck, an aquiline nose, a tightly shut mouth, large ears, and wiry gray hair that shot out in every direction. Sebbers represents \textit{Goethe}’s forehead as a protruding mass, although not to the extent that David d’Angers’ sculpture did. In addition, Sebbers portrays \textit{Goethe} in the dressing gown that he typically wore when receiving visitors. Although it shares similarities, Sebber’s unidealized representation was acceptable.
because it was made in chalk and paper – artistic materials that were considered impermanent due to their fragility.

By contrast, David d’Angers made the bust of Goethe in marble, a stone known for its long-lasting durability. Marble is a material that is typically used for official commissions due to its prohibitive cost. David d’Angers could have exhibited the colossal bust of Goethe in plaster at the Salon. Plaster was an inexpensive method used by sculptors who hoped to generate interest among patrons to cover the cost of a block of marble. Instead, David d’Angers purchased the marble and defiantly exhibited the colossal head as a finished product. It is, thus, understandable that critics, artists, and the public were bewildered by the lengthy and costly process that David d’Angers undertook to represent a *Grand Homme* at the Salon of 1831.

The hybridity of scientific, realist, exaggerated, and idealized features in Goethe result in a colossal bust that is infused with otherworldly elements that seemed innovative – even if misunderstood – to the public and art critics of the Salon. Despite the overtly Romantic characteristics, the bust of Goethe is made on a vertical *ligne d’aplomb*, which balances the bust equally on both sides. By combining a pupiless gaze reserved for Classical heroes and Gods and exaggerating the most prominent features found in Ancient colossal statues, made with realistic facial features, David d’Angers showed a hybrid genre that peaked in the early 1830s. He had previously shown contemporary figures as monumental sculptures. But never had he made a bust that purposely seemed to be a part of a statue. In fact, David d’Angers considered the colossal bust of Goethe a fragment. This notion was likely based on David d'Angers’ incapacity to build a colossal
marble statue or column because of the enormous costs and the time that it would have taken to achieve.

David d’Angers shipped the bust to Goethe and wrote: "You are the great poetic figure of our epoch, which owes you a statuary stand, but I have dared to create a fragment; a genius worthy of yourself will complete it." Even Goethe seemed puzzled by David d’Angers’ portrayal. When he received the colossal marble bust, Goethe exclaimed “Kurios!” (Strange!), even though he had seen the original clay. It is therefore likely that Goethe expected David d’Angers to change the features from the original, which he mistook for just a sketch. In spite of the discrepancy, Goethe appeared pleased by the depiction and wrote: "The colossal marble bust, made by the hand of David, has arrived and generates much talk. I maintain all my calm because I already have too much to think as if it were in a small format to understand the effect of a form at double or triple its size. The bust is still of an excellent quality, an extraordinary spontaneity, and is harmonious in every part." Despite Goethe's incomprehension toward the size of the bust, he nonetheless admired its aesthetic value and David d'Angers' obvious mastery. Yet, he appeared unable to imagine the possibility of the whole instead of the actual fragment, which would have transformed his bust into a colossal statue.

David d’Angers’ bust of Goethe seems to have been exhibited prominently at the Salon. He also likely supervised its placement, which demands to be viewed from a lower
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position. As such, David d’Angers subverted the very fundamental conventional viewing
of Classical portraiture, which was made to be seen from an equal level or perhaps
slightly below. This placement allowed the audience to reflect – and aspire to emulate –
the centrally placed figure. The proximity was illusionary however, as the model –
typically set on a herm bust – remained inaccessible due to the timelessness of its
idealized features. Neo-Classicists followed the artistic tradition of including sitters on
herm busts, a tradition that dated back to Ancient Greece, when depictions of Gods were
set on square stones and placed in niches in gymnasia. Greek mythological protectors
such as Mercury, Hercules, and Apollo were depicted and, soon after, illustrious
philosophers were represented. The Romans followed the Greek examples and used the
shape of the herm bust. It was reserved for noble families who honored their ancestors of
the First Republic. In the latter case, the niches that held the herm busts were opened only
during celebrations, so descendants could pay tribute and emulate the examples of their
predecessors.188

David d’Angers reserved herm busts for exceptional men whose great deeds were
worthy of immortalization in his series of *Grands Hommes*. Yet he did not use a herm
bust for *Goethe*, because he envisioned it as a fragment of a colossal statue. As such, he
represents *Goethe* with a neck that ends in a round base, a method that Ancient Roman
sculptors used for colossal statues. As with Classical precedents, the sculptor made a base
that was thicker in the nape than in the front of the neck, to allow the head to fit into the
opening that Ancient sculptors left on the top of statues. David d'Angers likely saw the
marble *Colossal Head of Constantine* when in Rome, and wanted to express his

147-148.
admiration for the aging writer with an imposing and extraordinary depiction (fig. 3.5). Just as the *Head of Constantine* is chipped at its base, David d’Angers exhibited the colossal bust of *Goethe* with a large crack at the base of the neck as if it had accidentally cracked by a tool. David d’Angers was a methodical and meticulous sculptor who was reputed for his carefully made depictions and care for details. The damaged part of the bust was, thus, intentional, and implicitly suggested: the head of *Goethe* had been removed from a colossal statue and had been damaged during the process.

David d’Angers condemned sculptors who made portrait busts on a human scale. He was against the modeling of impressions made directly from the model, which was then used as an accurate depiction. Instead, he sculpted busts that were larger than life, to dramatize the authority of the worthy sitter and d’Angers’ esteem for great men. He explained: "First of all, a face molded directly never shows the man. It must be molded through the mind of the artist. A bust ought to be larger than nature to express the impression one feels when seeing a great man…When these men talk, their features expand and the head appears colossal." As such, David d’Angers represented *Goethe* as a figure that rose above all human beings, a position that equated the writer to the rank of a divinity.

David d’Angers arrived in Weimar without an invitation, and with the certainty that Goethe would agree to pose for a bust. In fact, soon after an initial negative response,
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189 The *Colossal Head of Constantine* and other marble fragments were discovered in the 15th century. The original statue of Constantine the Great (ca. 280-337) was placed in the Basilica of Maxentius. They are now housed in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori, Musei Capitolini, Rome.

David d’Angers feared that his failed enterprise would become the gossip of Parisian ateliers. When Goethe finally welcomed the sculptor, d’Angers’ admiration had grown. His fascination evolved into adulation during the two and half weeks that he spent in the company of Goethe. Upon completion, David d’Angers asked his traveling companion, writer Victor Pavie (1808-1886):

...tell me if I have overdone these things and if this forehead is not his? That it does not resemble the bourgeois measurement, fine, but I translate and do not invent. You will live longer than me and will bear testimony. They will complain nonetheless about the general dimensions. Once again, have I lied? The first time that we saw him, did he not appear to project his torso above the level of the crowd, yes or no? I did not dream such a thing. Remember our impressions to share them with the ones who feel and understand. 191

David d’Angers was aware that he grossly exaggerated the physiognomy and size of his representation of Goethe (Fig. 3.6). He anticipated a negative response in Paris. However, he was unwilling to change any part of the bust and, as such, was embodying the individualism that was at the root of the Romantic Movement. His artistry is apparent in the multiple comb marks that face all directions and the pointed chunks of hair that appear to be unfinished and molded solely by hand. These sketch-like techniques embody the burst of energy that David d’Angers experienced when faced with a sitter whom he

191 “...dis-moi si j’ai outré les choses, et si ce front là n’est pas le sien? Qu’il ne s’ajuste pas à la mesure bourgeoise, d’accord, mais je traduis et n’invente point. Toi qui vivra plus que moi, tu en porteras témoignage. Ils se récrieront de même, sur les dimensions générales. Ici encore ai-je menti? Nous parut-il, oui ou non, la première fois que nous le vîmes, dépasser de son torse le niveau de la foule? Je n’ai pas rêvé cela. Souviens-toi de nos impressions, pour les redire à ceux qui sentent et qui comprennent.” David d’Angers exclaimed, “Battus en règle, au vu et su de tous! Pars, retourne au pays, tandis que moi, la flèche au flanc, j’irai je ne sais où ensevelir ma défaite, pour revenir je ne sais quand, jamais peut-être.” (Beaten fairly in full view for all to see! Go, return to the homeland, while I, an arrow in my side, will go away, who knows where, to bury my defeat, and to come back, who knows when, perhaps never.) Victor Pavie. Oeuvres choisies précédée d’une notice biographique. Vol. I. Paris: Perrin et Cie, Libraires-Éditeurs, 1887, 41.
truly admired. The colossal bust also exemplifies the artistic freedom of expression that Romantic sculptors yearned to introduce to the public of the Salon. Shortly before the July Revolution, Victor Hugo singled out David d’Angers as the leader of new directions in sculpture. Hugo writes: “As several other remarkable men of the time, painters, musicians, poets, M. David is also at the forefront of a revolution in his art. The work is happening from all sides.”

David d’Angers had the opportunity to break from Academic principles due to his valued place within the artistic milieu. This advantage gave him the freedom to create non-commissioned works in the style that he chose. It also gave him the possibility of participating – or not – at the Salon. By exhibiting the bust of Goethe – albeit for a short time – David d’Angers was subverting the artistic and political foundations of the Salon and the Academy of the Beaux-Arts.

192 “Ainsi que plusieurs autres hommes remarquables du temps, peintres, musiciens, poètes, M. David est, aussi lui, à la tête d’une révolution dans son art. De toutes parts, l’œuvre s’accomplit.” In *Les Orientales*, as series of poems inspired by the Greek war of Independence, Hugo lauded David d’Angers’ *Jeune fille Grecque sur la tombe de Marco Botzaris* (Young Greek Girl on the Tomb of Marco Botzaris), a commemorative stele made for the Greek fallen fighter. Hugo noted, “Il est difficile de rien voir de plus beau que cette statue. C’est toute-à-la fois du grandiose comme Phidias et de la chair comme Puget.” (It would be difficult to see anything more beautiful than this statue. It combines the grandeur of Phidias with the modeling of flesh like Puget). Hugo was a close relation of David d’Angers and likely saw the bust of Goethe – perhaps still in its plaster form – when visiting the sculptor in his atelier. Victor Hugo. *Les Orientales*. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1875, 169-170. The subject of the Greek War of Independence from the Turks and the support of French artists for Greece had already been treated in painting by Eugène Delacroix at the Salon of 1824 with *Scène des massacres de Scio*, and the 1826 painting *Greece on the Ruins of Missolonghi*; however, David d’Angers’ monument was sent to Greece as a tribute for the tomb of Botzaris.
C. Attacks against the Jury, the Salon, and David d'Angers' genre hybride

David d'Angers proved to be at the forefront of Romantic portraiture as well as an advocate for the reformation of the Jury. Indeed, just as Préault and Daumier, who signed the 1830 artists’ petition for artistic reforms, David d’Angers’ democratic ideals resulted in his belief that the Salon ought to be an exhibition without peer judging. He explained:

The freedom to exhibit is not only an act of justice but it also a question of kindness. I cannot express how I find guilty the men who elevate themselves as Masters who accept or reject the works of their peers. What give them the right to reduce, by veto, an artist to desperation, all too often to misery, because he sees nature with a different eye?...A jury, however formed, is a creation that is always defective: I am using a gentle word. Members of the jury, whoever they may be, form an exceptional court, especially dangerous because they are all under the influence of preconceptions from the School and often have passing tastes. 193

The Salons of 1831 and 1833 were the golden age for Romantic sculpture. This short-lived flexibility of the Jury accepted non-Academic sculptures in large numbers. However, by 1834 the Jury re-tightened and controlled the fate of sculptors, as they decided which works best embodied the good taste of French sculpture and could be shown. Conformity remained the best way to secure a chance at exhibiting at the Salon, which was still the main commercial venue for private and public commissions. In 1831,

193 “La liberté des expositions est non-seulement un acte de haute justice, mais encore une question d'humanité. Je ne puis dire à quel point je trouve coupables les hommes qui viennent s'ériger en maîtres pour accueillir ou repousser les ouvrages de leurs confrères. D'ou leur vient le droit de réduire par un veto un artiste au désespoir, trop souvent à l'affreuse misère, parce qu'il voit la nature autrement qu'eux? ...Un jury, de quelque manière qu'il soit formé, est une création nécessairement défectueuse: je me sers d'un mot adouci. Les membres d'un jury, quels qu'ils soient, forment un tribunal exceptionnel, d'autant plus dangereux qu'ils sont sous l'influence de préjugés d'école et de goût bien souvent passager.” Henry Jouin. *David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains*. Vol. II. Paris : E. Plon et Cie, Imprimeurs-Editeurs, 1878, 330.
the Jury accepted Romantic works of portrait busts, medallions, and statuettes, in a gesture of support toward all sculptors. David d’Angers’ ideology of an all-inclusive Salon was echoed by Gabriel Laviron and Bruno Galbaccio, who wrote for the revolutionary newspaper *La Liberté, journal des arts.* Their stand, however, was much more radical than David d’Angers’, as they wanted to annihilate the Institute and its privileges. The Salon was intended to be a yearly event but it was cancelled in 1832 due to an epidemic of cholera in Paris. Young artists continued to rebel against the artistic and political establishments that continued to be entwined. Indeed, opportunities were reserved for those young artists who suppressed their style in order to please the powerful members of the Institute. They accused followers of the school of Louis David, who produced outdated and monotonous art but had the monopoly on the best placement at the Salon.

In their review of the Salon of 1833, Laviron and Galbaccio continued to promote an artistic democracy that could be achieved by an open Salon in which the public would be the sole judge. Laviron and Galbaccio reported that only two of the eight sculptors’ members of the Institute showed sculptures at the Salon. Jean-Jacques Pradier (called James Pradier, 1790-1852) showed two sculptures and David d’Angers showed only one bust. The large difference between the number of sculptures that David d’Angers exhibited at the Salons of the 1820s and those of the 1830s were evidence of his success. Instead of having to show multiple works to the general public, he now received friends, admirers and patrons directly in his studio. By the 1840s, a journalist noted: "Since artists whose reputation is already made refrain from exhibiting their works at the Salon, it
becomes necessary to follow them into the shades of their ateliers. David’s is, in fact, a perpetual exhibition, where the quantity of visitors is replaced by quality.”

Indeed, David d’Angers was supposed to have replaced quantity with quality. At the Salon of 1833, he showed the bust of Boulay de la Meurthe, a retired politician and lawyer who embodied Republican principles due to his past affiliations to Napoleon Bonaparte. Laviron and Galbacio noted:

We have no hesitation about reproaching M. David, the Academician, to make busts...almost as a joke to the art. If the Members of the Institute believe that they have acquired impunity, they are mistaken; the public is always ready to add their knowledge to those of the Academicians. M. David has exhibited a bust of Boulay de la Meurthe...It would be difficult to give it a name, at the exception of the type of sculpture that combines two styles, and that the Dictionary of the Academy calls hybrid...We do not advise it to anyone; It is better to be truly bad than timidly neutral.

Their criticism was a direct attack on David d’Angers’ artistic method, which he nonetheless kept throughout his career. Depending on his personal view of the sitter and on the circumstances of the commission, David d'Angers oscillated between Academic traditions and Romantic stylistics. This genre hybride was considered a flaw, as it reflected his ambivalent stance vis-à-vis the Romantic excesses that young artists such as

195 “Nous n’hésitierons pas mieux à reprocher à M. David, l’académicien, de traiter ses bustes...presque en se moquant de l’art. Si ces messieurs de l’Institut croient avoir impunité acquise, ils se trompent; le public, à leur brevet d’académicien, est toujours prêt à en ajouter un autre. M. David d’Angers a exposé un buste de Boulay de la Meurthe...il serait difficile de lui assigner aucun nom, excepté celui qui convient à une sculpture qui participe de deux genres, et que le Dictionnaire de l’Académie appelle hybride...nous ne le conseillerons pour modèle à personne: il vaut mieux être franchement mauvais que timidement neutre.” Gabriel Laviron and Bruno Galbacio. Le Salon de 1833. Paris: A la Librairie d’Abel Ledoux, 1833, 43 and 78-79.
Préault had introduced to the public. Even the sculptor of *Goethe* continued to believe that portraiture was a visual documentation made for posterity. As such, sculpture was an art form that required decorum, as the artist ought to value its solemnity. In 1829, David d’Angers already noted: "L. David often said that he believed that a strong man would come and who would walk between the Romantics and the Classicists, that he would avoid their exaggerations, and then, he would be the great man of the times."196 David d’Angers likely set out to connect the two antagonistic Schools and to become the missing link that Louis David envisioned through the *genre hybride* that Laviron and Galbaccio viewed as artistically reprehensible. On another level, their attack was also directed at David d’Angers – *l’académicien* – who promoted a free Salon, yet had the benefits associated with being a member of the Institute and the Jury. As such, it was an implied insult directed toward his political leanings. David d’Angers advocated merit over privilege. As a die-hard Republican, he ought to have stood against the Institute, which symbolized an outdated system of inequity.

As a supporter of liberal causes and an admirer of French Revolutionary figures – including *Boulay de la Meurthe* – David d’Angers ought to have allied himself with younger artists who had fought during the July Revolution and continued to fight Louis-Philippe and his government. In fact, a parallel can be drawn between David d’Angers’ *genre hybride* and the political climate that the *Juste Milieu* established, which emerged after the fall of Charles X. David d’Angers was consecrated as one of the best living sculptors during the Restoration. He received awards and public commissions. He also

participated in the July Revolution and fought on the side of the liberals who wanted the reinstatement of a Republic. Yet David d’Angers secured the most prestigious commission in 1830, when Minister François Guizot (1787-1874), the head of the art committee, selected him to create a new frieze for the Panthéon. David d'Angers made various sketches, all of which were based on Louis David's unfinished painting of 1791, *Le Serment du jeu de Paume* (the Oath of the Tennis Court). Although based on a tripartite composition, David d'Angers' monumental relief incorporated different elements. In the center of the frame, David d'Angers includes three allegorical figures who distribute wreaths to Napoleon Bonaparte and soldiers who follow his lead. The right side also includes the young drummer from Arcole and is animated with multiple gestures, poses, and accessories, while the left part is extremely subdued. In the latter, David d'Angers includes key figures to embody the French Revolution of 1789: Voltaire, Rousseau, Mirabeau, and Louis David – shown with a painter's palette – the only artist that d’Angers’ considered worthy of representation. Among the rows of profiles, some are depicted in full-length while others remain partially hidden. David d'Angers portrays Cuvier, Malheserbes and Fenelon, each one as dedicated individual statues. Once again, David d'Angers shows a clear propensity toward hybridity, which he depicts even within a monumental project. Louis-Philippe had emphasized his desire for political neutrality in order to please Legitimists, Centrists and Liberals alike.

Such depictions were interpreted as a stand of artistic and political ambivalence. As with Laviron's aversion to David d'Angers' *genre hybride*, Romantic poet Pétrus Borel
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(1809-1859) denounced the sculptor's two-sided stand in a letter published in *La Liberté*.

Borel writes:

> Ah, it is bad, M. d’Anjou, it is bad to suffocate one’s enemy in the guise of an embrace! It is bad to shake the hand with the right and to stab with the left hand! It is bad, daily turncoat, faithless, country-less, to jump from one camp to the other! It is bad to play the Etruscan with M. le Baron Bacchus and the Romantic loud-mouth with M. Middle-Age! You have ambition, M. d’Anjou, you have a thirst for acclamations, and for the Salon and for the lowbrow fair, you want acclamations at any cost. As such, you are making eclectic works to please everyone, and consequently hybrid sculpture. ¹⁹⁸

In the newly created weekly *La Liberté*, Laviron, Galbaccio, and Borel wrote incendiary texts against all establishments under the heels of the Institute. They denounced the Academy, the Prix de Rome, the Salon and the Jury, the mediocrity of students at the École des Beaux-Arts and private ateliers, and artists who remained neutral in the fight against Classical values – values which failed to reflect novel ideas engendered by the July Revolution. In the art of sculpture, they wanted to depict subjects based on Medieval, Renaissance, and contemporary history, to leave their sculptures in rough and sketchy forms, to accentuate expressions and gestures in order to convey the pathos of subjects, and to include modern costumes in contemporary portraiture.

---

D. Préault's subversive entrance at the Salons of the July Monarchy

Préault was rarely allowed to exhibit during the July Monarchy. At his first Salon in 1833, the Jury accepted six works, including two frames of medallions, two reliefs, one sculpture in the round, and one bust. Préault’s sculptures provoked an outrage among art critics who reported on the Salon. They compared his works to sketches, caricatures, and deformities. The models he portrayed were not attacked because of their inherent hideousness, but because Préault chose them and failed to improve their flawed features. Some acknowledged the energy and expressiveness of Préault’s handling and believed that with proper training, he would become an important sculptor. However, they thought that Préault first needed to learn artistic restraint in order to develop an initial idea into a polished work. Despite the recurrent objections against the supposedly hideous depictions by Préault, a common theme nonetheless recurred. Préault had already forged a reputation as an innovator prior to his official entrance at the Salon. Charles Lenormant noted: "How is it possible that M. Préault will become or already is (since this variation already exists) a great sculptor?"199

Gustave Planche also criticized the direction of Romantic sculpture, especially that of Préault’s who was leading L’École du laid. Victor Hugo had already laid out his principles on Beauty and Ugliness in the preface of Cromwell. Hugo continued to develop these notions in the epic novel Notre-Dame de Paris (The Hunchback of Notre-

Dame). Just as the 1827 preface of *Cromwell* was a manifesto against Classical plays, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, completed in 1831, was a cornerstone for sculptors who rejected the Academic concept that Beauty was the only subject worthy of depiction.²⁰⁰ Set in Medieval Paris, the historical novel revolved around two social outcasts, Quasimodo, the hunchback and deaf bell ringer of Notre-Dame Cathedral and la Esmeralda, a gypsy street dancer. Hugo emphasized the physical opposites of the two protagonists with la Esmeralda, who embodied Beauty, and Quasimodo, the grotesquely ugly. Hugo describes Quasimodo:

> this tetrahedral nose, this mouth in horse-shoe, this tiny left eye hidden by a bushy red eyebrow as the right eye disappeared completely under an enormous mole; these uneven teeth, chipped here and there… Grimace was his face or rather all his being was a grimace…with all this deformity, he had a certain allure of frightening strength, agility, and courage; strange exception to the eternal rule that demands that strength, just like beauty, be the result of harmony. ²⁰¹

Hugo went against the conventional rules of Beauty and Ugliness when creating the protagonists of *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Long codified, the concept of Beauty was associated with characteristics of decency, morality, and virtue; it was the external

---

²⁰⁰ Victor Hugo had already been consecrated the leader of the Romantic literary revolution with the play *Hernani*. It embodied *l'école nouvelle*, which rejected the Classical unités that were the basis for Classical French Literature. The first performance, remembered as *La Bataille d'Hernani* (The Battle of Hernani), became a shouting match between a divided audience made of grisâtres (Classicists) and flamboyants (Romantics). Préault was an ardent supporter who shouted to the row of Academicians “A la guillotine, les genoux!” (To the guillotine, balding heads!). An older man was derogatory referred to as a “knee” because it resembled a balding head. Théophile Gautier. *Histoire du romantisme*. Paris: G. Charpentier et Cie, Éditeurs, 1874, 2.

²⁰¹ “ce nez tétraèdre, de cette bouche en fer à cheval, de ce petit œil gauche obstrué d’un sourcil roux en broussailles tandis que l’œil droit disparaissait entièrement sous une énorme verrue; de ces dents désordonnées, ébréchées ça et là…La grimace était son visage. Ou plutôt toute sa personne était une grimace…avec toute cette difformité, je ne sais qu’elle allure redoutable de vigueur, d’agilité et de courage ; étrange exception à la règle éternelle qui veut que la force, comme la beauté, résulte de l’harmonie.” Victor Hugo. *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. II. Paris: L’Imprimerie nationale, 1904, 36-37.
representation of inner qualities which had been developed into physical types. In the arts, the notion of Beauty was equated to balance, symmetry, repose, elevation, and the power to stabilize the viewer. It also had the command to elevate the soul of men with developed sensibilities. Hugo applied his own concept of Ugliness by creating the character of Quasimodo, whose hideous and grotesque features first provoked mockery, disgust, and fear. Hugo, however, turned the accepted concepts of physiognomy inside-out by showing that extreme deformity and ugliness could hide inner beauty: it could issue from base ugliness and displace vice and malice. In 1831, Antoine Johannot (called Tony Johannot; 1803-1852) illustrated the frontispiece for the cover of *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Quasimodo stares out from an oculus for the competition of the ugliest grimace.²⁰² Quasimodo is a hybrid species in-between a wild boar and a human. His hair covers most of his face. One eye is opened; another is shut because of a deformed cheek and an overgrown eyebrow bone. His nose is a groin that protrudes next to his slanted mouth, from where a large canine tooth comes out. A tuft of hair falls on his uneven and distorted ears, and a ragged beard makes him look like a hunter's trophy. The depiction of Quasimodo was acceptable as long as it was on paper. The reading of Hugo's *Notre-Dame de Paris* was compared to seeing a painting. A reviewer explained: "We read

²⁰² Victor Hugo. *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Vol. I. Paris: Charles Gosselin, Libraire, March 1831. Tony Johannot illustrated the first edition of Hugo's novel, which was published in-8 and in-12. The edition in-12 was published in four installments and included Johannot's illustrations in wood engravings by Henri Désiré Porret (dates). Each volume was published in quantities of two thousand and included the illustration of Quasimodo looking from the oculus. The popularity of the novel led to seven fake editions in the first year of its publication. The edition in-8 was made of two volumes, which included two of the original four illustrations, which Johannot designed. The edition was also published in counterfeited reproductions. For information on the multiple editions, see Charles Asselineau. *Bibliographie romantique*. Paris: P. Rouquette, 1872, 9-10.
words, lines, and believe to be in front of a painting; each written description becomes, unbeknown to us, a living painting."\textsuperscript{203}

In contrast, the representation of Quasimodo in three-dimensions was poorly received, because it was deemed as going against artistic decorum. Romantic sculptor Jean Duseigneur (called Jehan Duseigneur; 1808-1866) was a proponent of l’école de la laideur and, consequently, regularly compared to his friend Préault.\textsuperscript{204} At the Salon of 1831, Duseigneur exhibited Roland furieux (Roland Furioso; fig. 3.7), which was hailed as the sculptural equivalent of Hugo’s introduction of Cromwell. Roland furieux depicted the jealous lover in a contortioned pose, with his nude body tied with a rope and a face that showed the paroxysms of torment and furor. Deep furrows creased his forehead and ran between deeply carved eyes with round pupils that accentuated his fury. The tension of the lower jaw was palpable, with muscles clenched. His open mouth revealed upper teeth reminiscent of those of an untamed wild animal in the style of animalier sculptor Antoine-Louis Barye (1796-1875). That year, Duseigneur started Une larme pour une goutte d’eau (A Tear for a Drop of Water), a sculptural group based on a chapter of Notre-Dame de Paris. La Esmeralda gives water to Quasimodo, who was attached to a pillar and subjected to the derision of the populace. Duseigneur showed the group at the Salon of 1833, where it received mixed reviews. The group – now lost – was criticized for the choice of subject: the pillory that separated la Esmeralda and Quasimodo, the pet  


\textsuperscript{204} Jehan Duseigneur entered the École des Beaux-Arts in 1822 and was a student to Bosio, Dupaty, and Cortot. At the Salon, Duseigneur also exhibited a bust of Victor Hugo that was better received. For a biography and a list of works by Duseigneur, see Paul Lacroix and Marsurzi de Aguirre. “Jean Duseigneur, statuaire.” Revue universelle des arts. Vol. 23. Paris: Veuve Jules Renouard and Bruxelles: A. Mertens & Fils, 1866, 69-110.
goat, and the gold coloring on its horns and the bracelets of la Esmeralda. Duseigneur was also criticized for having chosen to represent a narrative that was unsuited for a sculpture in the round. He should have, critics said, selected a relief, a form closer to a painting.

In 1821, Bernard Griffoul-Dorval (1788-1861) wrote on low relief sculpture and defined its basic rules. Sculptors were expected to respect illusionism by representing diminutive figures according to their spatial recession, to include a maximum of two or three rows of figures, to omit excessive contrasts between high and low planes, to fill in most of the surface, to avoid excessive foreshortenings, and to stay away from the perspectives used in painting. In 1823, Quatremère de Quincy published an essay in which he also emphasized the need to avoid perspective, which was solely reserved for painting. He also emphasized that representing conversations should be omitted. Instead, figures were to communicate through a pantomime of gestures. Finally, sculptors were required to introduce only one specific scene in order to avoid confusion for the viewer.

In its historical context, a relief was made as a decoration for monumental architecture. Reliefs were divided into three distinct styles: high-, half-, and low-reliefs. A high relief typically included figures that were almost sculpted in the round, although they required subdued movements. Excessive projections would result in casting unsightly shadows on other parts of the relief that were made to be placed in full daylight. High reliefs were sculpted for the highest parts of a monument and thus required fewer

---

details than reliefs seen in close-up. Legibility was essential. Diagonals were accepted as a way to contrast against the purity of architectural lines. On the other hand, half reliefs depended upon greater mass and voids than high reliefs to counteract the lower degree of light that they received. The figures were carved to about half of their thickness, which was based on the Academic principle that a deeper form casts undesirable shadows, resulting in an indistinct contour of the figures or subject. A low relief was expected to receive little light and, consequently, required less relief to allow clear legibility. Soft contours that allowed the low light to pass over the relief without clashing with an excessive mass or void were essential for the successful depiction of a scene. Clearer details were possible, as the viewer could observe a low relief from a closer place. Sculptors were warned to omit any succession of gestures that might result in incoherent scenes in which the proper identity of a body, an arm, a leg, or a head was only understood with difficulty. To counteract this problem, sculptors had to follow the method of flattening the bodies that were supposed to recede in space.207

E. Préault and the audacity of sculpting ugliness

At the Salon of 1834, art critic Hilaire Léon Sazerac reported on the plethora of ugly subjects and sitters that were shown. He expressed the overall sentiment of conservative writers when he asked rhetorically:

Must one make nature absolutely ugly to be truthful today? Since M. Victor Hugo has given us the ideal of hideous forms in the dreadful yet sublime character of Quasimodo, is it essential that kings and princes, soldiers and priests, resemble every feature of the poor bell ringer of Notre-Dame de Paris? Must they have, like him, warbly legs, crooked knees, long arms, scrawny hands? Is it necessary that they looked cross-eyed, their mouths grimacing, and that they looked like men either possessed or in convulsions?

Préault submitted five sculptures to the Jury Salon of 1834: a group sculpture Les Parias (The Pariah), two large medallions of Empereurs Romain (Roman Emperors), a Tête de Juif Arménien (Head of an Armenian Jew), and a colossal relief of Tuerie, fragment épisodique d’un grand bas-relief (Slaughter, Episodic Fragment of a Large Low Relief; fig. 3.8). They were all rejected except for Tuerie. Tuerie was supposed to exemplify the decadence of Romantic sculpture and to serve as a warning for young artists to stay away from Préault’s lead. Cortot was part of the Jury. He embodied the Academic conservatism by stating that Tuerie “was supposed to be exhibited at the Salon like a thief hung at the gallows.”

When in Rome, Carpeaux conceived his final envoi to Paris with the group Ugolin et ses fils (Ugolino and his Sons; fig. 3.9). The pyramidal group sculpture represents Ugolino in a tense stance, clenching his feet and gnarling at his hands as he contemplates the prospect of eating his sons from hunger. Based on Dante’s Inferno, Carpeaux

---

208 “Faut-il absolument enlaidir la nature pour être vrai maintenant? Depuis que M. Victor Hugo nous a donné l’idéal des formes hideuses dans l’affreuse mais sublime figure de Quasimodo, est-il indispensable que rois et princes, soldats et prêtres, ressemblent trait pour trait au pauvre sonneur de Notre-Dame de Paris? Qu’ils aient comme lui les jambes croches, les genoux cagneux, les bras longs, les mains décharnées? Faut-il que leurs yeux soient louches, leurs bouches grimacantes, et qu’ils aient l’air de possédés ou de convulsionnaires?” Hilaire Léon Sazerac. Lettres sur le Salon de 1834. Paris: Chez Delaunay, Libraire, 1834, 81.

originally planned to sculpt the gruesome subject on a low relief instead of a group sculpture in the round. An 1858 sketch shows similarities with Préault’s *Tuerie*. Carpeaux’s drawing *Projet du bas-relief* (Project of a low relief; fig. 3.10) is an amalgam of untwined figures who are stretched and flexed, have pleading gestures, or have given in to the grim fate that awaits them. Carpeaux includes an allegory of hunger that floats menacingly with wide open arms above the figures. When looking at parts instead of the whole sketch, the figures loose complete narrative elements. Body parts and faces are in disjunctions that resemble the impossible narrative of Préault’s *Tuerie*.

Carpeaux changed his original project into a pyramidal group, in which the head of *Ugolino* is at the apex. *Ugolino*’s sons form two loose diagonals on each side of the principal figure. Despite being a standing group, the sculpture is nonetheless best viewed from a frontal position. From the sides, the group loses the expressive power that generates from *Ugolino*’s agony. From the back, his body remains expressive because of the play of light and shadow that clash against his spine, and the flexure of his diagonal muscles. Despite his starvation, *Ugolino* embodies physical strength as he holds one of his sons with one arm. The agonizing struggle from the tortured expression that tightens his body is not decipherable. Carpeaux is concerned that the frontal view conveys the unbearable emotional state of *Ugolino*. Carpeaux appears to have worked on a sculpture in the round as if it were a high relief.

When exhibited at the Salon of 1863, caricaturists ridiculed *Ugolino*’s physiognomy because of his excessive expression. Originally titled *Désespoir* (Despair), Préault tried, unsuccessfully, to exhibit the sculpture at the Salon of 1835. He valued his sculpture enough to keep it for years, and finally showed it at the Salon of 1863 as
Hécube (figs. 3.11 and 3.12). Préault exhibited his sculpture in the round Hécube, which was also mocked because of the lack of anatomical coherence of his statue. Préault’s Hécube – now only known by a photograph – represents a woman in despair who has thrown herself on the tomb of a beloved. Although admitting that Préault showed passion, life, and dynamism, Ernest Chesneau nonetheless noted: “The body of Hécube is a bunch of wood trunks twisted in convulsions, which one cannot reassemble.”

Both Ugolino and Hécube were, thus, ridiculed when exhibited. One should not, however, forget that Préault made his sculpture thirty years before Carpeaux’s, and that it continued to stir controversy because of the modernism of his composition and his treatment of material. In contrast to the academically trained Carpeaux who showed his knowledge of anatomy, Préault was unconcerned with physiologic accuracy. In fact, he surpassed Carpeaux in his ability to imbue Hécube’s despair. Préault represented her contorted back, and her hair that fell loosely over her face covered by her arm. Unlike Carpeaux, Préault could express feelings of despair without needing the help of physiognomic clues. However, despite the general belief that despair engendered great compassion, Préault’s sculptures failed to touch the sensibility of art critics who, in the 1860’s, still rejected his artistic independence.

In contrast, when Préault made Tuerie, he directly depended on physiognomy to express the emotions of his subjects. Tuerie is a colossal relief that represents seven

---

figures entwined in violent contortions. Each is difficult to decipher because of their chaotic embrace and the small surface into which Préault has pushed them. In fact, the figures overflow on the sides, a visual clue that they are, indeed, part of a larger relief. On the left, a dying figure is represented, head thrown back with hair flowing on the lower part of the relief. Her nude arm serves to frame the side of the relief. Her hand rests above the heads of two men – one black, the other white and wearing a medieval helmet. Her roughly-sculpted hand curves dramatically and resembles a claw holding the tightly curled hair of the grimacing black man. Both men gaze upon a shrieking woman who holds a dying man, fatally wounded from deep cuts on his chest. She also holds an infant away from the fury of the black man and the cold passivity of the man with the helmet. The female figure expresses a maddening impotence as she is unable to fight back. Her hair blends with that of a horrified male figure who has turned away from the carnage. Préault represents the wounded man and the infant with the most visual coherence. The other figures are part of a compositional frenzy in which hands, hair, and clothing is difficult to make legible. Tuerie lacks the coherent narrative that is typical of relief sculpture. A puzzled critic could only write: "...an incredible hodgepodge of all the horrors, all the poverty, all the misery, all the extravagance, all the monstrous."²¹¹

Préault carved in diagonal the word “Tuerie” between the two assassins and the anguished woman. Even though the subject was incomprehensible, it was still compared to a Dantesque episode. Sazerac had criticized the predominance of ugly models since the publication of Notre-Dame de Paris and the description of Quasimodo. Yet, he reviewed

²¹¹ "...un incroyables salmigondis de toutes les horreurs, de toutes les pauvretés, de toutes les misères, de toutes les extravagances, de toutes les monstruosités." W. "Beaux-Arts. Salon de 1834." Le Constitutionnel, journal du commerce, politique et littéraire. 7th article. No 104. (14 April 1834), 1.
Préault’s *Tuerie* and interpreted it as: “a sanguinary page from Alighieri…this remarkable low-relief…the work from an already forceful hand and an imagination as impetuous as energetic.” Such a stand was courageous, as Préault was ostracized due to his vocal criticism against the Institute and the Jury. Indeed, the majority of art critics who reviewed the Salon of 1834 failed to mention the name of Préault or his relief, as if part of a common consensus to ignore his presence at the Salon.

Laviron reviewed *Tuerie* in greater detail, although he failed to explain the subject of the relief. Instead, he focused on the fact that Préault was the only modern artist to have understood the principal function of low reliefs, which were intended to be parts of architectural projects. Laviron singled out *Tuerie* as the relief par excellence that could sustain its placement on a large monument, because Préault worked in a way that allowed parts of the relief to reflect sunlight without casting excessive shadows on other parts. Préault also left empty areas and accentuated the masses of his figures in order to make them legible from afar.

In fact, Préault sculpted *Tuerie* by following the principles of deep voids and greater mass recommended for the sculpting of half reliefs. He also applied certain rules for high reliefs that recommended the use of fewer – yet larger – details and the possibility of including strong diagonals. In his review, Laviron acknowledged compositional flaws resulting from the excessive number of figures compressed in a space as causing confusion. Laviron focused on individual figures instead of the general subject, which shows that even he, a close friend of Préault, had difficulty understanding the narrative of...
the relief. Préalù made *Tuerie* with a cryptic narrative and his addition, “Episodic Fragment of a Large Low Relief” implied that other parts of the fragment would have resulted in a more coherent narrative. Perhaps Préalù hoped to generate public interest for other parts that he could complete for a later Salon.

---

**F. Sculpture and the depiction of excessive expressions**

In 1833, the Administration Chamber elected to finalize a project for the ornamentation of the *Arc de Triomphe*, which had been abandoned at the beginning of the Restoration. Newly elected Interior Minister Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877) considered Préalù for a low relief but instead chose other sculptors to work on the project. Cortot, who demanded a year later that Préalù’s *Tuerie* be “hung on the scaffold”, was an influential member of the Institute and may have been instrumental in Thiers’ decision to exclude Préalù. Cortot, for whom "sculpture is a serious art", was commissioned for one of the four colossal high reliefs to be placed on the pillars of the monument.\(^{214}\) Cortot made *Le Triomphe de Napoléon, 1810* (The Triumph of Napoleon 1810; fig. 3.13), which represents an allegorical female figure of Victory crowning Napoleon – dressed in a Roman tunic – with a laurel wreath. Cortot’s static high relief was placed on pillar opposite from Rude’s high relief of *Le Départ des volontaires 1792* (The Departure of the Volunteers 1792; fig. 3.14).\(^{215}\) Rude's colossal frieze went through various stages to end

---


\(^{215}\) The program of ornamentation for the Arc de Triomphe was started under Charles X and evolved until his fall in 1830. It was supposed to include two colossal statues of “Fame” on each
with the large figure of *le Génie de la guerre* (the Genius of War; fig. 3.15), which is represented in a female allegory who calls the French people to reunite against the threat of a Prussian invasion. The allegory is filled with movement, accentuated by a sharp diagonal between her open arms and legs. The model for the head was Rude’s wife, who posed in his atelier where he demanded that she screamed, "Louder! Louder!...", to show the intense expression of the call to arms.\(^{216}\) The decoration of the monument was unveiled on July 29, 1836, to commemorate the first six years of the July Monarchy. It was a colossal project that had taken three years to complete. David d’Angers was repulsed by Rude’s depiction of *le Génie de la guerre* and noted:

> A grimacing passion in the most pregnant moments is ridiculous for everybody. Ugliness never drives men, and the head is hideously ugly. Pain can scream, in sculpture, but never the enthusiastic passion. In this work, Rude has understood art, in this work, as an expression of false warmth; it is similar to an actor who screams too intensely believing that he is moving the audience; he annoys the nerves or makes them smile out of pity.\(^{217}\)

According to David d’Angers, Rude had rendered an ugly grimace that was unsuited for sculpture. This theory followed Lavater’s principle of physiognomy that warned against the depiction of grimaces. Ignorance degenerated in grimaces while fortitude showed

\(^{216}\) “Plus fort! Plus fort!...” Louis De Fourcaud. *François Rude, sculpteur: ses œuvres et son temps (1784-1855).* Paris: Librairie de l’art ancien et moderne, 1904, 174-183. Etex was commissioned for the two pillars on the opposite side and made Résistance 1814 and Paix 1815.

restraint.\textsuperscript{218} An allegory was sufficiently explicit through gestures and attributes that conveyed its purpose. The implication of screams and noise through excessive physiognomic expressions resulted in the embodiment of Ugliness, which was fundamentally abhorrent to the art of sculpture. And even though David d’Angers portrayed unsightly sitters, he nonetheless aimed to infuse sober elements that elevated the moral value of the sitter.

On the other hand, Préault admired Rude’s rendition of the \textit{Génie de la Guerre} and explained: "M. Rude was an honest man all his life. He had a great inspiration, the day that he ripped from the stone the great shriek of revolutionary France (The \textit{Departure at the Arc de Triomphe})…He was merely a genius. He only made prose with art."\textsuperscript{219} Préault was notoriously acerbic and was often feared for stinging \textit{bons mots}, which were generally reserved for Academic artists. Théophile Silvestre explains the temperament of Préault:

\begin{quote}
In appearance light, volatile, tempestuous; deep down reflective, cunning, devilishly obstinate, everything is fair game for him to engage and persuade you…For him, the newest gossips, the first breaths of the opinion! Look at him in the solemnity of the theaters flying to thirty different seats, scouting the halls, mix his thought to the concerto of critics, often with more wit and accuracy, haunting the literary circles as soon as a new book appears and sharpening his tongue like a scalpel blade one month before the opening of the Salon of the Beaux-Arts.\textsuperscript{220}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{220} “En apparence léger, changeant, orageux; au fond réfléchi, rusé, opiniâtre en diable, tout lui est bon pour vous engrener et vous convaincre…Il a déclaré une guerre mortelle à l’indifférence. A lui les nouvelles fraîches, à lui les premiers souffles de l’opinion! Voyez-le dans les solennités théâtrales voltiger à trente places différentes, silloner les couloirs, mêler sa note au concert des
Préault was, thus, everywhere, and knew everything that was happening in Paris. He was likely aware of the modernist development that Rude exemplified in his high relief, which influenced the physiognomic paroxysm of the screaming figures depicted in *Tuerie* (fig. 3.16). Préault’s antagonistic nature and his penchant for harsh criticism made him a feared artist, yet he was an entertaining figure whose witticisms were often recorded in the printed press. When questioned, he compared the style of Delacroix – whom he considered his equal as leader of the new school – to the style of Ingres, by answering: "Yes, my dear friend! Ingres embodies constipation; Delacroix is the diarrhea." Consequently, Préault was applying Delacroix’s loose and uncontainable technique as a model for the unrestrained and tortured depictions that he instilled in his reliefs. Sculpture was no longer an immutable art form but was as expressive as a painted canvas.

Delacroix, like Préault, had been criticized for his *ébauches* (sketches) and his choice of ugly models. At the Salon of 1831, Delacroix exhibited *28 Juillet, La Liberté guidant le people* (July 28, Liberty Guiding the People; fig. 3.17) with an allegory of liberty, who was considered a *poissarde* (a fishmonger). Rude’s *Génie de la Guerre* was directly influenced by Delacroix’s allegory of *Liberté*. The sculptor infused the *Génie de la Guerre* with similar expressive gestures that show what led French men to fight for their country. In contrast to Delacroix’s depiction of *Liberté* with a calm physiognomy, Rude portrayed his *Génie* with a terrifying scream that appeared to shout with all her


strength. Consequently, traditionalists criticized Rude’s *Génie de la guerre* as a grimacing model that was closer to the lower class than to the decorous figures of the higher ranks. Delacroix was also criticized by words lifted from a *Catéchisme poissard* (a low life vocabulary), which Théophile Gautier summarized in *Histoire du Romantisme*. Gautier writes: "He was a savage, a barbarian, a maniac, an enraged, a madman who needed to be sent back to his birth place, Charenton. He had the taste for the ugly, the disgusting, the monstrous; and then, he could not draw, he broke more limbs than a bone-setter could have fixed. He threw buckets of color against his canvas; he painted with a drunken broom…”

This summary resembles the criticism that Préault received since his first Salon exhibition. It describes the techniques and inclinations of the sculptor who nonetheless continued his quest for changes in sculpture. In fact, Préault took the physiognomic exaggerations of Rude’s *Génie de la Guerre* and included excessive expressions throughout *Tuerie*. Despite David d’Angers’ solemn judgment against Rude, the emphasis of expressions was necessary for colossal works because they were seen from afar. When viewed from close up, however, overtly expressive physiognomies resulted in exaggerations that could be interpreted as frozen grimaces. In the case of Préault, viewers experienced *Tuerie* as a frenzy of ugly grimaces, which accentuated the fantastical subject in the unfinished fragment that Préault exhibited. In addition, it also highlighted the ugliness of the models and the overall impenetrable subject of the scene.

---


Consequently, Préault likely made *Tuerie* with the distinct idea that it was to be viewed from afar, as part of a monument – perhaps the Arc de Triomphe – instead of hanging on a wall at the Louvre. His wish was unattainable because monumental sculpture was required to be unambiguous, elevated, didactic, moralist, and beautiful.

Préault’s *Tuerie* dismantled the very core of relief sculpture and showed his hybridity because he borrowed from various sources, styles, and techniques to create a new type of sculpture. He appears to have taken elements from Rococo portraiture, which emphasized twists of the neck and the face, the use of multiple focal points, the direction of the gaze away from the central base of the face, the emphasis of realistic traits, and the inclusion of unsightly elements, which are exemplified in the portrait busts of Mirabeau. The supposedly derogatory moniker of *Chef de l’école du laid* was, indeed, a compliment. In his review of the Salon, Laviron described the physiognomies of *Tuerie* (fig. 88) as distinctive of their inner nature. Laviron explains: "His faces are well characterized, each in their proper type, the impulses are truthful and well understood."  

Laviron underlined the concept that was still *au courant* at the École des Beaux-Arts where the Caylus Prize for *l’étude des têtes et de l’expression des passions* (the study of expressive heads and passions) was still offered. 

Préault rendered facial characteristics based on the *passions composées* (mixed passions) that Charles Lebrun had codified for the French Royal Academy. However,

---


225 In 1829, Joseph Marius Ramus (1805-1888) won the competition of the Expressive Head, which subject was “colère mêlée de mépris” (anger mixed with contempt). His bust embodied the control of the sitter that was completely obliterated in Préault’s depictions of passions. Emmanuel Schartz. *Les sculptures de l’école des beaux-arts de Paris*. Paris: École Nationale supérieure des Beaux-arts, 2003, 84.
Préault accentuated their extreme characteristics. His close-up renditions of anger, desperation, rage, horror, acute pain, despair, and composed calm are visible in the physiognomies. Beaux-Arts Professors, however, emphasized the need to select expressions that allowed viewers the most freedom to imagine the outcome of the passion. Such a principle favored the interpretation of acute pain by depicting models who heroically sustained extreme distress with calmness and resignation. The depiction of widely opened mouths was thus against artistic practice because of the indication that the model was screaming. Such rules were also applicable to all other depictions of passions, which were expected to remain decorous. Préault broke these long established Academic ideas and instead developed a novel style of expressions. The style embodies an element of Romantic portraiture, thereby forcibly acknowledging that human nature can be shown in all of its negative characteristics. Men are no longer to be represented as examples of Ideal Beauty. Depictions of their repulsive hidden sides are valid subjects that Préault creates in the ugliness represented in *Tuerie*. Préault depicts the black man with rage reverberating in every muscle of the clenched face. His eyes look in furor at the screaming woman; in turn, she holds his face away as his opened mouth reveals clenched teeth ready to attack. Deep creases around his terrifying gaze emphasize the doom palpable throughout the composition. Préault represents the black man with thick curls and beard in a manner similar to his handling of earlier medallions. However, his style of showing physiognomic traits has become more expressive. Beneath the black man, Préault contrasts the passion of anger and hatred with the portrayal of a young woman who has surrendered to the brute force of the massacre. She is represented with serene features and appears as an anomaly in the chaotic depictions of extreme pain and horror.
Her hair flows beneath her and, despite a clenched fist grabbing a large strand, she appears unscathed in contrast to the massacre. Préault appears to have included two opposite forces of Beauty and Ugliness as two complimentary facets that reflect opposite – yet closely related – aspects of human nature.

G. Préault's colossal medallion and early censorship at the Salon

In contrast to the laissez faire climate of the Salons of 1833, the consensus was favorable toward young painters who had exhibited artistically appropriate works at the Salon of 1834. Unlike sculptors, they had listened to previous criticism and showed improvement. A reviewer notes:

Our young talents, those that we encouraged or held back by our benevolent or strict guidance in 1833, we have found them again in 1834. No one has missed the call, and the majority is represented with new or developed qualities. What a sweet spectacle for men who are interested in the future of our school…freed from all system and given to this personal inspiration for freedom and not from anarchy, all our young artists march toward a common goal, through an individual and distinct path, the true imitation of nature…Sculpture is represented by a number of works that are almost as large as those of last year. However, sculpture has not generally progressed since then.226

226 “Nos jeunes talents, ceux que nous avions encouragés ou retenus par nos conseils bienveillants [sic] ou sévères en 1833, nous les avons retrouvés en 1834. Aucun n’a manqué à l’appel, et presque tous s’y sont présents avec des qualités nouvelles ou développées. Spectacle bien doux pour les hommes qui s’intéressent à l’avenir de notre école…Affranchis de tout système et livrés à cette inspiration personnelle de liberté et non pas l’anarchie, nos jeunes artistes marchent tous, par une voie propre et distincte, à un but commun, l’imitation vraie de la nature…La sculpture est représentée par un nombre d’ouvrages presqu’aussi grand que l’an passé. Mais pour elle, il n’y a pas eu de progrès général accomplis depuis cette époque.” “Beaux-arts. Salon de 1834. Peinture, architecture, et sculpture. Le jury d’admission.” L’Artiste, journal de la littérature et des
The sculpture galleries at the Louvre had been renovated. They were supposed to spark interest in the audience who had shunned the damp areas and unattractive lighting that came from side windows which cast dark shadows on the opposite walls, resulting in an inadequate viewing of the sculptures. In addition, the rooms were cold and hardly ever visited because they were located on the opposite wing of the painting galleries. This setting was explained by the lack of interest of the administration and the difficulties artists faced trying to make a decent living in a government that showed complete disdain for sculpture and architecture. In contrast, the conservative newspaper *Le Constitutionel* approved of the updated location for the exhibition of sculpture, which was one of the most beautiful renovations. Visitors could linger in the hallways separating the two exhibition spaces, as if to clear from their minds the colorful paintings that they had just seen. They would arrive at the opposite side of the gallery with a refreshed mind, able to focus on the sculptures displayed in the new area.\(^{227}\) This renovation was propitious for sculptors who expected to generate public interest in their works.

The system for the Jury of the Salon remained the same as for the previous exhibitions and showed, once again, its despotic power against progressive artists who differed from Academic tradition. A disgruntled writer equated the rejections from the Salon to censorship of the arts. He explains:

> This Jury, established against all reason to decide the admission of artworks exhibited at the Louvre as shown its true self with the most outrageous, the most incredible exclusions…Who would still want to defend an institution, which under the pretext that it ought

---

to save the public from viewing works deemed terrible, can proscribe at will the creations of the best artists? The public is the sole and legitimate judge of artists. Only he has the right to be the policeman of the Louvre. Allow entry without prior examination: the ridicule will know well how to stop the overflow of bad artworks. All these preventive measures are odious: it is censorship applied to the arts!  

In the same article, the anonymous writer defended Préault’s sculpture group Parias (Pariahs) that the jury had rejected. The writer cited the jury’s power to undermine Préault’s name among the public, who were only shown the low-relief Tuerie. Through their censorship of non-members of the Institute, the jury had the power of life or death over young artists who depended upon the exposure of the Salon.

When Préault submitted Tuerie, he also included a colossal plaster medallion of a Vieil Empereur Romain (Old Roman Emperor; fig.3.18), which the Jury rejected. The Vieil Empereur embodies Préault’s expressive modeling, the very style that was condemned as exemplary of his lack of artistic knowledge and propensity for hideous depictions. The Vieil Empereur represents a profile view of a grotesquely overweight old man with beady eyes and a caved in nose with large open nostrils that embody physical characteristics of cruelty. He also has tightly shut lips and fleshy cheeks that hang over an enormous neck resembling that of a bull. Physiognomists had agreed since Antiquity that

---


229 The original plaster is now lost. The bronze medallion of Vieil empereur romain, also called Aulus Vitellius, is housed in the Collection of the Musée des Augustins, Toulouse. Ref: D 1872-1.
men with bovine features lacked an elevated soul, were hypocrites, heartless, sluggish, and prone to anger; in addition, a large neck was a visual sign of ferocity. Préault represents *Vieil Empereur Romain* with a crown of large laurel leaves that covered a mass of spongy hair reminiscent of the wigs worn during the Ancient Regime. He also wraps the corpulent sitter in large folds of Antique tunics. Perhaps Préault’s colossal medallion concealed a subliminal message aimed at the Jury that he was forced to face in order to exhibit at the Salon. Indeed, the Jury had already made him the scapegoat. They accepted *Tuerie* in order to ridicule Préault publicly. Préault was notoriously vociferous against members of the Institute, whom he compared to pawns instead of artists, and who had climbed the ranks only because they perpetuated antiquated principles. In addition, he compared Academic sculptors to *empailleurs* (taxidermists) who made poor copies of Greek works, copies which were a calumny against the memory and genius of Phidias.

In Ancient Greece and Rome, crowns of laurel leaves were awarded to victorious warriors and athletes, and to poets, singers, and artists. The practice continued at the École des Beaux-Arts where *Lauréats* (Prize Winners) were compensated with awards and the opportunity to sojourn at the Villa Medici to further their studies. Préault’s multiple attempts to enter the École des Beaux-Arts had been unsuccessful and resulted in a lifelong abhorrence for the artistic establishment. In spite of this, Préault was the first

---


to admit: "what I need is a laurel leaf in my soup." However, by submitting *Vieil Emperor Romain*, Préault was perhaps showing the Jury committee its own reflection as a despotic and aging ruler whose moral and physical ugliness was hardly contained under the overstuffed classical laurel wreath and antique tunic. Préault was aware of his status as a renegade artist, which he proudly bore. He knew his submissions would likely be rejected for the Salon of 1834. Art critics and Academicians had branded Préault a pariah, which resulted in the Jury’s dismissal of most of his works. Alexandre Decamps (1804-1852), reported that the Jury rejected Préault’s best sculptures – including *Vieil Empereur Romain* – and accepted *Tuerie* as an eyesore. Decamps explains: "We truly regret that the public has appeared to sanction the only decision of the Jury who, by proscribing the best submissions of a young man and only accepting his weakest work, does not blush in admitting that they wanted to disgust the artist and, at the same time, to offer young people a frightening example at the exhibition, to translate what they call the extravagances of the new school." Préault often stated that he collaborated with Decamps on the writing of *Musée*, which was a review of the Salon of 1834. If, indeed, Préault was a silent voice in the review, he believed that *Tuerie* was the worst sculpture of the five that he submitted to the Jury.


Vieil Empereur Romain can be interpreted as a criticism of the Institute; it is also fitting as a disapproval of Louis-Philippe, who embodied the promise of change while failing its implementation. The first monetary coins with the effigy of Louis-Philippe were made in the summer of 1830. They portray the profile of the Roi des français (King of the French) with thick wavy hair and sideburns that Charles Philipon would soon lampoon in the shape of a pear. Nicholas-Pierre Tiolier (1784-1843) made the first coin “à tête nue” (bare head) in which he idealized the bulging cheeks and neck of Louis-Philippe, who signed the ordinance for the design of the new coin. Louis-Philippe ordered, "Gold and silver coins will be engraved according to our effigy and will have for words the phrase: Louis-Philippe I King of the French. The reverse will bear a wreath of an olive branch and one of laurel…” Tiolier omitted to include “I” between the name and title of Louis-Philippe, who ordered the error to be fixed without delay; however, Louis-Philippe had already opened a new competition that was offered to all French artists. The requirements for the effigy were vague, while the inscriptions that he wanted were detailed. The posting states:

Louis Philippe, etc. believing that the best manner for obtaining, in the making of coins for the production of French currency, all the perfection allowed by the progress in the arts, is to open a competition amongst all specialists in engraving who wish to participate…A special Jury will decide on the preference to be given to the impression for the currency. This Jury will be made of seven persons: three will be chosen by artists who are members of the Institute, another by the Minister of Finance…”

236 “Louis-Philippe, etc. considérant que le moyen le plus certain d’obtenir dans la confection des coins destinés à frapper les monnaies françaises, toutes la perfection que les progrès des arts permettent de leur donner, est d’ouvrir un concours parmi tous les graveurs qui voudront y participer...Un jury spécial prononcera sur la préférence à accorder pour la gravure du coin de
Academically trained engraver Joseph François Domard (1792-1858) won the contest with a portrayal of Louis-Philippe known “à la grosse tête laurée” (large laurelled head; fig. 3.19). The new version represents a clear change in the political standing that Louis-Philippe wanted to emulate. Within months, he transformed from the Roi des français into a Roman Emperor who wears a thick wreath that blends with the curls of his hair. Domard abstained from idealizing the features of Louis-Philippe. He represents his double chin and thick neck as partially hidden behind a Ancient ribbon – typically worn by victorious athletes – which curves on the nape of his neck. When the coins were first produced, Domard’s effigy of Louis-Philippe was compared to the Roman Emperor Aulus Vitellius: after the Revolution of 1848, a competition was opened for an allegory of the Republic to replace Louis-Philippe’s currency. Domard was one of the finalists and Gustave Planche reported: "For the currency of the last reign, M. Domard had found an elevated and severe style, even though its principal flaw was to recall too closely the bust of Vitellius…" It is, thus, probable that Préault submitted his colossal medallion of Vieil empereur romain as a satirical embodiment of Louis-Philippe and his government. In addition, Préault also ridiculed members of the Jury for the Salon of 1834, some of nos monnaies. Ce jury sera composé de sept personnes: trois seront choisies parmi les artistes eux-mêmes parmi les membres de l’institut, une autre par le ministre des finances....” “Louis-Philippe Ier. 8 Novembre 1830.” Collection complètes des lois, décrets, ordonnances, règlements. Vol.30. 2nd edition. Paris: Chez A. Guyot et Scribe, Libraires-Éditeurs, 1838, 239-240. 237 Arthur Engel and Raymond Serrure. Traité de numismatique moderne et contemporaine. Vol. I. Paris: Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1897, 623. 238 “Mr. Domard qui avait trouvé pour la monnaie du dernier règne un type plein de grandeur et de sévérité, dont le seul défaut est de rappeler trop directement le buste de Vitellius...” Gustave Planche. “Chronique.” Revue des deux-mondes. Vol.24. 18th year. First series. Paris: Au bureau de la revue des deux mondes, 1848, 671.
whom had participated in selecting the new effigy of the King on the French monetary currency.

The plaster medallion *Vieil Empereur Romain*, submitted by Préault, did not include any inscription. However, when the medallion – in bronze – was finally exhibited at the Salon of 1864, Préault added the letters “A.V.” to its right side, perhaps to acknowledge the title that the medallion had since received from colleagues who referred to it as “a sort of Vitellius”.239 The *Bust of Vitellius* had been in view at the Musée du Louvre during the First Empire and the cataloguer for the collection described the nature of the sitter:

Aulus Vitellius spent the first years of his youth in Capri, where he strengthened his infamous and baneful inclinations. Debauchery of all kinds, an insatiable gluttony, a cold and blind cruelty, such are the traits of his character…The excesses of Vitellius reached their apogee and raised the people and legions against him…Informed of the fate that menaced him, the monster went to hide at the porter of the palace, in the box for the dogs…From there, he was taken to the scene of his torture, where he purged, through a slow and cruel death, all the crimes that he soiled his life and his reign of about a year.240

The gluttony and corruption that personified the reign of Vitellius – and his subsequent fall from power – ought to have impressed Préault as a possible fate for Louis-Philippe, whose reign was based solely on the protection of the bourgeoisie. In

Profils et grimaces (Profiles and Grimaces), Auguste Édouard Vacquerie (1819-1895) summarized the talent of Préault as masculine, in contrast to other Romantics who were said to exhibit fragility and feminine qualities. Vacquerie explains: "One shows greatness when, under boos, anger and betrayals, one gives to art and society a new form; when, through a book or an action and, even better, by combining both, one opens a door toward the future, when one enters first in the unknown, when one is the leader of the century." Préault always considered that he personified the artist mâle and, consequently, fits the description of Vacquerie as a strong precursor who, despite adversities, continues to fight for new artistic directions and to lead the march that others can follow. Préault – the unequivocal sculptor de l'école du laid – continued to search for sculptural directions that knowingly disrupted the Institute’s antiquated system. The colossal relief of Tuerie, accepted at the Salon of 1834 to be exhibited as a "thief hung to the gallows" has a symbolic equivalence to the sordid death of Quasimodo, who perished at Montfaucon, "the oldest and most superb gallows of the Kingdom."

241 "On est grand quand, à travers les huées, les colères et les trahisons, on donne à l’art et à la société une forme nouvelle, quand, par le livre ou par l’action, et mieux par les deux ensemble, on ouvre une porte fermée de l’avenir, quand on entre le premier dans l’inconnu, quand on est le conducteur du siècle." In 1842, Préault made a medallion of Auguste Édouard Vacquerie (1819-1895) as a token of friendship between the sculptor and the younger writer. Vacquerie was a member of Hugo’s family by marriage and wrote plays, poetry and essays, which were successful with the Romantics and after the fall of Louis-Philippe. Vacquerie was writing about Alfred de Musset whom Préault nicknamed “Mademoiselle Byron” because of his delicate and fragile nature. Auguste Vacquerie. Profils et grimaces. 218-219. Paris: Lévy, 1856, 218-219.

H. David d'Angers' sculptural evolution and his *Pantheon of Great Men*

Despite David d'Angers' lifelong conviction that the art of sculpture was made to elevate the soul, he nonetheless incorporated contradictory styles. Perhaps he was influenced by young sculptors who followed Victor Hugo’s belief of artistic freedom, new subjects, and techniques. Just as David d’Angers followed Louis David’s principles that art was didactic, serious, and a means to moralize the masses, he also infused Hugo’s Romantic principles in portraiture, resulting in artistic contradictions. David d’Angers was a close friend who regularly attended Hugo’s cenacle, where the writer read from his works and poetry. In 1827, David d’Angers noted: "He just read to us the preface of *Cromwell*. What depth of thought! On its own, this preface is a manual for literature."  

David d’Angers foresaw the implications of Hugo’s call for literary novelty but failed to anticipate the influence that Hugo’s preface would have on Romantic sculptors, who took up the writer’s call for the representation of ugliness and the grotesque literally.

David d’Angers vacillated between Romantic and Academic portraiture and tried to reconcile the two styles. Between 1827 and 1842, he made five portraits of Hugo, which exemplify the evolution of d’Angers sculpted portraiture according to his admiration for the subject. Two medallions of *Victor Hugo* are based on a low-relief that David d’Angers made for a funerary monument to legislator and General Maximilien-
Sébastien Foy (1775-1825). In 1827, *Les Funérailles du général Foy* (The Funerals of General Foy; fig. 3.20), David d’Angers depicts Victor Hugo as one of the pall-bearers. He is in full-length and wears a contemporary costume. He looks up to the sky and his hand holding the casket appears to be a praying gesture. David d’Angers only dated one of the two medallions of *Victor Hugo* (Figs. 3.21 and 3.22), although both versions represent a profile view similar to the low-relief depiction. The undated medallion shows Hugo dressed in a similar costume as the one he wore as a pall-bearer. In the rough sketch, deep incisions are included throughout the medallion. Hugo’s hair resembles swirls that protrude. David d’Angers has inscribed behind the neck, “A mon célèbre ami Victor Hugo, P.J. David” (To my famous friend Victor Hugo, P.J. David). The curved lettering adds to the overall disarray of the medallion, which appears to lack enough surface for the portrayal and acknowledged friendship that David d’Angers intended to convey. Hugo’s features are more expressive because the clay is treated more coarsely.

---

244 General Foy was a chief figure in the opposition against King Charles X’s repressive reign and was surrounded by liberal politicians who wanted democratic changes. David d’Angers was commissioned for a full-length statue of Général Foy, whom he depicted in the nude, covered with a tunic in the style of Roman orators. Victor Hugo walks among political figures Jean-Ponce-Guillaume Viennet (1777-1868), Auguste-Hilarion de Kératry (1769-1859), and André-Marie-Jean-Jacques Dupin (1783-1865; called Dupin Aîné), all of whom were to become important figures in the Deputy Chamber of Louis-Philippe’s new government. Most of them were soon to be subjected to ridicule from the political caricatures of Daumier and his series the *Célébrités du Juste Milieu*. For an insightful analysis on David d’Angers self-aggrandizing role in the conception for the Monument to General Foy, see Nadine A. Pantano. “Liberal Politics and the Parisian Cemetery: David d’Angers and Leon Vaudoyer’s Monument to General Foy, 1825-1831.” *Oxford Art Journal*. Vol.20. No.1. (1997), 23-32. In 1826, Léon Vaudoyer (1803-1872), a recipient of the Prix de Rome, received the commission for the funerary monument. David d’Angers was selected for the statue of General Foy and made its dimensions larger than originally planned. Léon Vaudoyer’s father, a reputed architect since the Ancient Regime, was taking care of the construction during the absence of his son. He complained about David d’Angers and other sculptors noting: “C’est la manie de tous les statuaires, et David en convient. M. Lebas me dit que par ce despotisme colossal, MM. les sculpteurs tuent notre architecture…” (It is the way of all our sculptors, including David. M. Lebas tells me that through this colossal despotism, Misters the sculptors are killing our architecture…) Charles Blanc. *Les artistes de mon temps*. Paris: Librairie Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1876, 228.
than in the 1828 medallion, where the sculptor depicts Hugo in a more reserved style. The dated version is still based on the same profile, although David d’Angers greatly changes his method, resulting in an idealized version of the undated medallion. He has smoothed the rough texture and delineates Hugo’s features with more care and delicacy. Hugo is still depicted with recognizable features, but they have been tactfully refined to ennoble the physiognomy of the sitter. In addition, David d’Angers cut a clean curve directly under Hugo's exposed neck and divides the name “Victor” and “Hugo” onto two opposite sides of the medallion, each made with an even smoothness. Consequently, the 1828 version is more legible than the undated medallion. These two versions already show David d'Angers' different styles as his respect for a sitter evolves.

In 1835, David d’Angers was traveling. He wrote to Victor Hugo, reminding him of past conversations about the improvement of the human condition. Artists needed freedom to create, exhibit, and disseminate their works in order to reach as many people as possible, without the censuring from a small group of privileged peers who held power over all artists. David d’Angers also reminded Hugo of his artistic mission. He writes:

> I felt the need to write you the following lines, inspired by our discussions on the subject that makes all the reason and the inspiration to my life as an artist…Perhaps they are just utopias, just as it is understood to call anything that can improve the fate of man. However, in 1829, I developed, in the salon of Goethe at Weimar, my opinion for a new monetary system, which made an

---

245 David d’Angers’ first biographer believes that the 1828 medallion was made before the undated version, a dating that has not been challenged. However, it is arguable that David d’Angers made first the “Romantic” version of Hugo prior to the “Classic” medallion by following the sculptor's artistic principles that he later applied for the two busts of Hugo. David d’Angers started with the Romantic portrait-bust of Hugo and elevated him subsequently in a Classical bust. Henry Jouin. “Victor Hugo à David.” *David d’Angers et ses relations*. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit, 1890, 35. See also No. 226 “Victor Hugo” and No. 227 “Victor Hugo”, which follows Jouin’s traditional dating in Joseph G. Reinis. *The Portrait Medallions of David D’Angers: A Complete Catalogue of David’s Contemporary and Retrospective Portraits in Bronze*. New York: Polymath Press, 1999, 226-227.
impression on the illustrious old man and on a few distinguished men who made up his society. I learned since that the idea was spreading in Germany and they were hopeful (Germans feel the need for a similar type of currency) to see it implemented.246

David d’Angers and Victor Hugo had a mutual admiration for one another. In 1837, the writer posed for the sculptor for a portrait bust where he is dressed in contemporary clothing. David d’Angers represents *Victor Hugo* with detailed physiognomy that results in a realistic portrayal (fig. 3.23). *Hugo* appears frontally with his head slightly tilted forward, emphasizing the deepness of his stare. His carved pupils are faintly directed to the right – away from the viewer – and his eyelids are deeply carved under eyebrows that protruded to cast a dark shadow over his eyes. David d’Angers highlights the notoriously large forehead of *Hugo*, although not to the point of gross exaggeration, and a thick wave of hair parts on the top of his head, coming forward to the sides of his well defined cheeks. Deep cuts delineate strands of hair, echoing the folds of his large necktie and high collar costume, one that David d’Angers represents in great detail. Typical of the sculptor's portrayals of contemporary figures, he leaves tool marks on the face of *Hugo*, on the hair, on the costume and on the sides of the herm bust.

on which he wrote, “A mon ami Victor Hugo, David d’Angers, 1837” (To my friend Victor Hugo, David d’Angers, 1837). 247

The inclusion of marks from the sculptor’s handling of tools mark a decisively Romantic artistic style that breaks with the established convention of the artist's invisibility in the highly finished Neo-Classical busts. As such, David d’Angers is suggesting a symbiosis between the artist and the writer; each is equally present in the completed bust. David d’Angers greatly admired Hugo although he acknowledged character flaws and recalled:

When Hugo was posing for his portrait, in the middle of all of his great poetic ideas, some of them disappointed me because of their material interest. If I spoke of the invention of Collas, the mechanic, to reproduce copies of our works in sculpture, he grasped right away the financial gain that could result for all of us. It is doubtless due to our epoch, which is based on speculation, which such lowly ideas emerge sometimes to stain the beautiful and great genius. 248

David d’Angers was disappointed by Hugo’s pecuniary interest in the possibility of the sculptor capitalizing from Achille Collas’ invention of reproducing relief and chiaroscuro of medallions on engravings, which he called “numismatic engraving.” 249 Instead, David d’Angers was trying to promote an inexpensive way of distribution to make

---


248 “Quand Hugo posait pour son portrait, à travers toutes ces grandes idées poétiques, il y en avait quelques-unes qui m’accablaient par leur positif matériel de la vie. Si je lui parlais de l’invention de Collas, le mécanicien, pour reproduire par le calque tous nos ouvrages de sculpture, il saisissait tout de suite l’avantage pécuniaire qui pouvait en résulter pour nous. C’est sans doute à notre époque, qui est toute spéculation, qu’il faut attribuer ces mesquines idées qui viennent quelquefois tacher ce beau et grand génie.” Léon Cerf. Souvenirs de David d’Angers sur ses contemporains. Paris: La renaissance du livre, 1929, 133.

249 For information on Collas’ reproductive method, see Trevor Fawcett. 'Plane Surfaces and Solid Bodies: Reproducing Three-Dimensional Art in the Nineteenth Century'. Art History through the Camera's Lens, ed. Helene E. Roberts. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1995, 59-85.
reproductions of his medallions accessible to all classes. When making medallions, he did not gain financially and, instead, offered them to sitters and friends. Indeed, when receiving a request for reproductions, he sent patrons to the foundry where the reproductions were produced in bronze.\(^{250}\) The disparity between David d’Angers’ personal impressions of models for his *Panthéon des Grands Hommes* and their character flaws did not affect his working method. Despite disappointments, he continued to make portraits or busts because the sitters’ social significance was greater than their failings. As for Hugo, his literary contribution was more valuable than his ideas on financial gain, which resulted from the July Monarchy principle of an economic soundness based on bourgeois speculation.

In 1842, David d’Angers made a second bust of Hugo as an idealized version of the first one. He explained: "I just finished a testimony that will prove my admiration and my tender friendship toward Hugo: it is his bust; for the first essay was only a portrait. I have removed his clothing; I have placed a crown of laurel on his head."\(^{251}\) David d’Angers made *Victor Hugo Lauré* (Victor Hugo Laurelled; fig. 3.24) as a tribute to the writer who was criticized for his publications. In contrast to the first portrait bust, David d’Angers depicts Hugo as an immortal figure. Still made in a herm bust, *Hugo Lauré* is in the conventional nudity of Greco-Roman busts to suggest his lineage to previous *Grands Hommes*. David d’Angers idealizes the features of Hugo by smoothing his skin and removing the blemishes visible in the original portrait. *Hugo Lauré* retains the same

\(^{250}\) For information on David d’Angers’ technique for making medallions, his financial lack of interest, and the foundries that he used, see Viviane Huchard et al., *Aux Grands Hommes, David d’Angers*. Saint-Rémy-lès-Chevreuse: Fondation de Coubertin, 1990, 65-66.

features but David d’Angers clears all tool marks, effectively removing his visible presence from the bust. He also enhances the physiognomy of Hugo Lauré through the emphasis of transcendent features by carving much larger pupils than in his first portrait, an implication suggestive of Hugo’s inner inspiration and otherworldly presence. The gaze of Hugo Lauré is directed straight ahead, yet no connection between the audience and the sitter is possible. In effect, David d’Angers omits the irises in the eyes of Hugo, a technique that typically gave realism to sculpted busts and allowed a direct connection between the viewer and the sitter.

David d’Angers wrote: "In some of my busts, I like to simulate the gaze by a flattening in the center of the eye and a circle that enlivens the pupil. It results in a kind of mystery that agrees with the bust of a poet. As such, sometimes we see a moon shape traversing a light cloud." 252 David d’Angers proceeded as such to express the poetic world of Hugo; yet, his depiction of Hugo Lauré exceeds the world of the poet and places him with immortals. David d’Angers explains: "The laurel crown that I have placed on Hugo without his knowledge is not a flattery…By including the sign given to great men on this bust; I believe to be the interpreter of the numerous admirers of the immortal poet. The future will confirm the thought of the sculptor." 253

---


form a peak on top of his head. David d’Angers also emphasizes the size of the nude herm bust, which is taller and wider than the first portrait, resulting in an overall effect of solemnity and fortitude. David d’Angers enlarges the forehead of Hugo Lauré to accentuate the physical testimony of a creative genius, based on the phrenologic concept that large foreheads were the visible form of higher intelligence.

The two busts of Victor Hugo are representative of the hybridism of David d’Angers, who differentiated between a simple sculpted portrait and a bust. The portrait was made for contemporary figures who made important contributions to society, while the bust was reserved for sitters worthy of remembrance by posterity. Artistic hybridism is, thus, a result of the sculptor’s selection and choosing men worthy – or not – of being immortalized. On the one hand, David d’Angers represented physiognomic features based on a modernist handling of Romantic vocabulary slightly tainted by pessimism toward the surge of a powerful bourgeois class. On the other hand, David d’Angers offered an optimistic vision of society by depicting sitters in Greco-Roman herm busts to express his confidence in future generations. Models worthy of Classical representations were representative of a continuum of traditions dating back to the Ancient World, which had left an artistic legacy of Grands Hommes to emulate.

David d’Angers knowingly vacillated between medallions, portraits, and busts – at times even combining different styles within a single work, depending on his admiration of an individual. Even so, these combinations were considered negatively in the artistic context of the 1830s, because hybridism was judged as a lack of commitment under the guise of a safe neutrality made to please all sides; it can now be interpreted as a bold artistic commitment to sculpt according to one’s own principles instead of following
either the Neo-Classical or the Romantic School. Indeed, David d’Angers’ ability to combine different techniques and styles in portraiture showed a creative freedom and profound mastery. He could follow Academic precepts and sculpt Ideal Beauty; he also was able to represent realistic features while aiming to render the truthful likeness of sitters; he exaggerated physiognomies to the point of the grotesque without doubting of his abilities; and was also willing to portrait sitters – known for their physical ugliness – as long as they contributed to a social, artistic, or political cause that he supported. He notes: “I prefer an ugly face that exudes deepness of thought to a copy made after the Antique; indeed, as pure as it might be, it still frozen in its nullity.”254 This statement attests that, despite the sculptor’s supposed preference to represent beauty, he would rather sculpt the physiognomy of an ugly sitter than imitate Academic sculptors, who continued to emulate an art that was passé.

I. Dantan-Jeune and the criticism of his sculptural hybridity at the Salon

Salon reviewers always compared Dantan-Jeune’s formal busts to his caricatures. They all preferred his sculpted caricatures because he made then with a freedom of expression and creativity. He regularly failed to imbue these Romantic qualities in his formal busts. The latter were anatomically correct and resembled the subjects, but they

lacked the expressive qualities of the inner nature of the sitters. Dantan-Jeune highly individualized the facial features of the subjects that he placed on herm busts, either in the nude or fully dressed. The disjunction between the detailing of the faces, with the generic bases, resulted in a series of portrait-busts that lacked imagination, resulting in a series of busts criticized as repetitive and uninspiring. Dantan-Jeune was unable to have art critics and the audiences connect with the portrait busts that he exhibited at the Salon. The dichotomy between Dantan-Jeune’s two distinct careers – and styles – resulted in artistic contradictions, which he often failed to bridge. At the Salon of 1834, he exhibited fewer busts than the previous year, attesting to an artistic ambivalence with which he struggled.

A sculpted portrait needs to express liveliness or depth of character to move the audience, who can then connect with the model through admiration, empathy, or even dislike. Dantan-Jeune was unable to facilitate the emotional dialogue between his public and his formal representations. In contrast, his sculpted caricatures had an immediate impact on viewers. Viewers laughed; they were shocked; they were amused by the creativity and insight of Dantan-Jeune's sculpted caricatures. These caricatures, produced at a prodigious speed, showed impulsively, wit, and a freedom of expression that Dantan-Jeune failed to express in his formal busts made for the Salon.

At the Salon of 1834, Dantan-Jeune exhibited a portrait of British connoisseur and collector John Webb (1776-1869; fig. 3. 25), whom he sculpted during a trip to England in the summer of 1834.255 Art critic Sazerac deplored the lack of originality in Dantan-

Jeune's formal busts. Sazerac writes: "In all truth, when one attentively observes these models, without even singling out that of Webb, one is tempted to believe that M. Dantan puts all his spirituality in his caricatures and that nothing is left to enliven his busts: they are as cold as the material."²⁵⁶ Sazerac singled out John Webb’s bust above the others and commented on the rigidity of Dantan-Jeune’s handling of serious depictions. Dantan-Jeune portrays Webb in a herm bust which borders on a caricatural depiction. Webb has sickly, thin features and his head is turned downward and sideways, which emphasizes his skeletal physiognomy. Two arched eyebrows are raised as if Webb were trying to keep his beady eyes opened; bags underneath form pouches above concave cheeks. Webb was fifty-eight years old when Dantan-Jeune made the bust, yet, he appears as a much older man, with wrinkles that run across his forehead and sagging lines along the sides of his tiny mouth and neck. He wear a full costume with a broken tipped collar that falls down, reinforcing the overall sense of the sitter’s melancholy. On top of a vest, the large collar of an overcoat dwarfs Webb's neck, which is tightly wrapped with a scarf. Webb's bust is more successful when viewed from the sides. The uninviting frontal stance appears more balanced as Webb’s profile follows a continuous shape that conforms to the size of the base. From the side, Webb’s features even show some refinement, with a continuous line that follows the round shape of the skull covered with short hair, and a curved forehead that harmoniously works with the aquiline nose and the gently

²⁵⁶ “En vérité, quand on observe attentivement ces figures, sans même faire exception pour celle de Webb, on est tenté de croire que M. Dantan mets tout son esprit dans ses charges et qu’il ne lui en reste plus pour animer ses bustes: ils sont froids comme la matière dont ils sont fait.” Hilaire Léon Sazerac. *Lettres sur le Salon de 1834*. Paris: Chez Delaunay, Libraire, 1834, 355-356.
protruding thin chin. Dantan-Jeune is able to express pathos in Webb's tilted head, a sensation that is uncomfortably exaggerated from frontal view.

Dantan-Jeune was aware of the constant criticism to which his serious busts were subjected. Perhaps, he tried to imbue the portrait of Webb with the very missing qualities that were constantly criticized. By representing Webb with realistic features and suggesting the inner nature of the sitter, Dantan-Jeune appears to have tried to please his critics by sculpting the bust according to "Romantic" qualities. In contrast to David d’Angers, who employed various styles, based on the sitter and the audience, Dantan-Jeune showed less mastery in his ability – or willingness – to make a clear demarcation between his serious busts and caricatures. His formal busts were often ridiculed for their lack of creativity and for their dryness, while his caricatures always showed extreme wit, energy, and invention.

In his review of the Salon of 1834, Gabriel Laviron notes: "Despite the infinite number of statuettes and busts that M. Dantan has exhibited at the Salon, it offers only an incomplete range of what has accounted for the fecundity of the artist…Everyone knows his gallery of grotesques… It is singular that M. Dantan is able to give suppleness to his caricatures, and does not know how to keep it in his serious busts."257 The dichotomy between Dantan-Jeune’s two distinct careers – and styles – resulted in a hybrid style, which he often failed to master. Dantan-Jeune made an 1833 caricature of John Webb, which has similarities to the formal bust; however, the caricature is a tour de force of creative energy and sculptural innovation (fig. 3.26). It represents Webb in a three-quarter

257 “Le Salon, malgré le nombre infini des statuettes et des bustes que M. Dantan a exposés, n’offre qu’un étalage incomplet de ce qu’a produit la fécondité de cet artiste. Tout le monde connait sa galerie de grotesques… Il est singulier que M. Dantan donne du moelleux à ses charges, et ne sache pas le conserver sur ses figures sérieuses.” Gabriel Laviron. Le Salon de 1834. Paris: A la librairie de Louis Janet, 1834, 208.
length statuette in which the upper part of the body emerges from the center of a print holder larger at its base and tied on each side. Webb's elongated left arm holds the base of the portfolio and his right arm is bent in a sharp angle, allowing his hand to grasp the top of the print holder. While neatly dressed, Webb’s upper torso appears to cover a skeleton; from the back, vertebrae are visible through the overcoat and on the base of his neck.

This brazen inclusion shows the audacity of Dantan-Jeune. He was a trained artist who could depict anatomy with great accuracy. When working in sculpted caricature, he broke with Academic tradition by emphasizing an unsightly protruding spine and the sickly thin back of Webb. In addition, he accentuated the anatomic failings of Webb by covering his bone structure under a jacket that did not hide his protruding bony back. Carpeaux exaggerated the spine of the back of Ugolino to show his anatomical knowledge (figs. 3.27 and 3.28). Dantan-Jeune turned a routine exercise professed at the École des Beaux into a humorous depiction of the study of anatomy. In fact, he showed more originality and imagination than Carpeaux. Dantan-Jeune renders the bony structure that is visible through the overcoat of Webb. He shatters the very concept of decorum of sculpture by showing a realistic anatomical study that he mocks by covering the skeleton under a costume. Dantan-Jeune's knowledge of anatomy appears with even more force in a 1834 caricature of Dominico Ferri, the stage decorator for the Théatre des Italiens (fig. 3.29). He represents Ferri's back covered with a costume, yet shows two uneven scapulae that protrude as thick chunks on top of a rib cage that he molds with deep grooves and projections. The spine is also made of lumps that retain a mastery of anatomic knowledge, yet one that Dantan-Jeune completely rejects to express the skeletal physiology of Ferri.
This clear break from the expected nobility of sculpture is also expressed in Dantan-Jeune's rendition of facial features of his models. In the case of Webb, his head resembles that of cadaverous Studies of Severed Heads and Study of a Head of a Thief that Théodore Géricault (1791-1824) painted in preparation for Le Radeau de la Méduse (The Raft of the Medusa) in 1818-1819. Webb’s face is made of deeply sunken caved-in blank eyes; the arches of the eyebrows follow the shape of two stubby ears that conspicuously protrude on each side. As with Géricault’s studies, Dantan-Jeune gives prominence to the bone structure of the jaws of cadavers. In addition, Dantan-Jeune sculpts a sagging and opened mouth, implying that Webb is taking his last breath. An incongruous element, however, deviates from Géricault’s depictions. Through the center of Webb’s deviated eagle-shaped nose, Dantan-Jeune has carved a hole that passed through and is only visible when seen from the side.

John Webb was an avid art collector and purchased multiple lithographs by Richard Parkes Bonington (1801-1828). After his premature death, the value of Bonington’s artworks augmented and, in 1833, the English auctioneer Harry Phillips (d.1840) held a sale that proved to be a financial success.258 In 1834, Webb followed Phillip's lead and held a sale from his collection of Bonington’s watercolors. Webb was a connoisseur and a collector and also showed a keen business sense, as he knew exactly when to purchase and sell artworks. In 1837, he held another auction in which he addressed potential buyers in M. W. au public (M. W. to the public). Webb writes:

It would be superfluous to talk with praises of the painting by Bonington…Would you like to become promptly and effectively enlightened and distinguished connoisseurs? Surround yourselves with his works. Would you like to get rid of mislaid preconceived

notions? See before you the means. Would you like to boast of possessing the most remarkable productions of a man whom nature has lent its palette?...Would you like to admire simultaneously from your armchair the laughing Italy or the beautiful France? Seize this unique occasion...  

Webb set out to reach the vanity of a bourgeois public whose members could presumably become instant connoisseurs through the purchase of his artworks.

It is likely that Dantan-Jeune caricatured John Webb with a hole in his nose as a visual clue to embody his shrewd sense of business. In 1831, the French Academy described the expressions “avoir le nez fin” or “avoir le nez creux” (To have a fine nose or to have a hollow nose) and wrote: "One says figuratively and familiarly, A man has a good nose, to say that he has sagacity, that he foresees things from afar. One also says, He has a fine nose. He has a hollow nose." Dantan-Jeune was, thus, developing a new concept for sculpted caricature, which had been considered a non-art form unworthy of the art of sculpture. He transformed the concept of nobility and elitism of sculpted portraiture into an artistic genre that was exceptionally original. The general public was confronted with a new type of sculpture that included satirical physiognomic features, incongruous accessories, elaborated rebuses, and witty puns. From a solemn art form, Dantan-Jeune turned sculpture upside-down. He showed his personal interpretation of...
humanity, resulting in a *Galerie des grotesque* that portrayed his contemporaries as a collective societal variety.

**J. Dantan-Jeune's hybridity between sculpted caricature and portraiture**

It was during the Restoration that we saw literature and the arts shatter all the barriers that public morality and sound reasoning compelled us to respect. And, as beauty will always be, by its essence, the expression of what is good and virtuous; artists who desired to translate in marble impure thoughts adopted the ugly for their model! They put it on a pedestal. They established the principle: “beauty is ugliness”. Valuable artistes applied their talent to reproduce unsightly infirmities, the ridiculous side of men, and the saddest thing is that we saw a great number of people rush to these spectacles. 261

Conditions as described in this quotation are suited for the production of two-dimensional caricatures. But they did not impede the prodigious number of sculpted caricatures that Dantan-Jeune produced. He was renowned for his great memory and did not require a model to pose in his studio. He had the ability to work rapidly on his small caricatural busts and to continuously produce caricatures of the latest celebrities within days. The rapidity of his technical skills resulted in caricatural busts that showed artistic

261 “C’est à l’époque de la Restauration que l’on a vu la littérature et les arts briser toutes les entraves que la morale publique et la saine raison commandaient de respecter. Et comme le beau sera toujours, par son essence, l’expression de ce qui est bon et vertueux, les artistes qui souhaitaient de faire parler au marbre des pensées impures ont adoptés le laid pour le modèle! Ils le mirent en honneur. On érigea le principe: “le beau, c’est le laid.” Des artistes de valeurs s’attachèrent à reproduire les infirmités disgracieuses, les cotés ridicules de l’homme, et, ce qui est plus triste, on vit un grand peuple se ruer à de tels spectacles.” Henry Jouin and Pierre-Jean David d’Angers. *David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains*. Vol. II. Paris: E. Plon, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1878, 23.
impulsivity; they were not as overworked as his formal busts. Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures were filled with energy and unfinishned qualities that were representative of a creative force that Romantic sculptors favored. However, his technique and style were criticized because he expressed his talent through the lowly art form of caricatures. In his review of the Salon of 1833, an art critic noted: "In an atelier, caricatures have a useful purpose; they allow us to learn the different make-ups of individuals, to understand the causes of exaggeration of some forms; but these studies ought not to see the day, let alone to serve as the means to enhance the reputation and fortune of an artist."262 By expressing his artistic versatility in sculpted caricatures rather than with formal portraiture, Dantan-Jeune was living parallel artistic lives which, at times, intersected.

Knowledge of Dantan-Jeune’s political leanings during the July Monarchy is vague because of his self-censorship. When working in Paris, he seldom sculpted political figures but, when abroad, he regularly caricatured members of the government. Between 1833 and 1834, Dantan traveled twice to England, where he satirized Parliament members, the Chamber of the Lords and the Royal Family. These statuettes were some of the most caustic of his oeuvre. His grotesque depictions of English figures were exhibited and sold in London, where Dantan-Jeune was described as the creator of “ingenious Caricatura Models, which are not only curious as novelties, but admirable for the extraordinary skill and spirit with which the character and resemblance of the individual

is blended with the ludicrousness of the extravaganza.”

He also sold them with great success in Paris, where they were considered harmless because they did not represent French politicians.

In 1833 while in London, Dantan-Jeune made a caricature of the Ambassador of France, Charles-Maurice, Prince de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754-1838; fig. 3.30), which showed that he could be a ruthless artist. Talleyrand had been politically active since the Ancient Regime and, after the Revolution, became Napoleon’s Grand Chamberlain. At the beginning of the Restoration, Louis XVIII appointed him Minister of Foreign Affairs and in 1830 Louis-Philippe entrusted Talleyrand with the smoothing out of strained political relations between France and England. Talleyrand was considered a political opportunist and untrustworthy because of his political alliances with successive French rulers. A contemporary described Talleyrand:

> It is difficult to see an individual look as puny and as dull. His air of physical exhaustion and his worn out physiognomy indicate a man unnerved by enjoyment; his emaciated body drags with difficulty and with jerks from his deformed feet from birth. It is necessary to be a profound physiognomist to guess that under this repulsive and gloomy cover, under this languishing gait, in these blue eyes, almost dead, where no sparkle of life shines, in short, through all the characteristics of an insipid blond type, hides the clever and cunning diplomat that dupes France and Europe.  

---

263 Dantan-Jeune’s sojourns to England were based on financial reasons. The English were avid collectors of his caricatures, especially those of international renowned, including the Vernet, Paganini, and Rossini. Janet Seligman. _Figures of Fun: The caricature-statuettes of Jean-Pierre Dantan_. London, New York & Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1957, 74.

264 “Il est difficile de voir une individualité d’aspect plus chétif et plus terne. Son air d’abattement physique, sa physionomie éteinte indiquent l’homme énervé par les jouissances; son corps émacié se traîne péniblement et par saccades sur des pieds difformes de naissance. Il faut être profound physionomiste pour deviner sous cette enveloppe répulsive et morne, sous ces allures languissantes, dans ces yeux bleus presque morts où ne brille qu’une étincelle de vie, en un mot, à travers tous les caractères du type blond affadi, l’habile et rusé prélàt diplomatique qui dupe la France et l’Europe.” Anonymous (Comte de Schlabrendorff). _Napoléon Bonaparte et le peuple français sous son consulat_. 1804.
At the Salon of 1810, Dantan-Jeune’s previous master, Bosio, exhibited a bust of Talleyrand—registered as *Buste de S.A.S. le prince de Benevent*—a title bestowed upon him by Napoleon (fig. 3.31). Bosio’s close relations with the Emperor and his entourage were clearly expressed to the public. *Talleyrand’s* bust was shown next to Bosio’s busts of *Napoléon*, the Empress, the King and Queen of Westphalia, and other family members of the Emperor.265 Talleyrand was fifty-six years old, yet Bosio portrayed him with the facial features of a younger man. His eyes are turned away from the viewer and his face is held up high and tilted to the side. *Talleyrand* appears to be an unapproachable figure. Bosio conveys the smoothness of his skin and, with the exception of two vertical furrows running from the middle of the arched eyebrows to the forehead, *Talleyrand* is without blemishes. The ridge of his straight nose is well defined and, although his upper lip is slightly thinner than the lower lip, his mouth is in harmony with the rest of his face. *Talleyrand* has large lower jaws, which Bosio de-emphasized by placing a folded scarf high up around his neck. Long, carefully-curled hair also serves to detract the attention from the thick jaw line. Bosio represents *Talleyrand* in a bust *à la française* that curves under a regal costume of the Grand Chamberlain that he wore at the Sacrament of Napoleon in 1804 and other official ceremonies. The sculptor skilfully carves embroideries on the high-collar jacket, the folded bow of the long tie, and the interior folds of the cape. A large necklace made of Napoleonic emblems of eagles and commemorative medals rest on his shoulders. The portrait bust appears to be a realistic depiction of *Talleyrand*, even though Bosio uplifted his physiognomy. Talleyrand had almond-shaped eyes that drooped at the sides; he had a pointed turned up nose and thin

---

lips; in-between, there was a large, vacant space. As did many other artists – both painters and sculptors – Bosio beautified the features of Talleyrand, who was, in fact, an ugly man, in order to keep his advantageous artistic position.

Dantan-Jeune perhaps saw Bosio’s bust of Talleyrand when studying in his Master’s atelier; if so, it failed to influence his depiction of Talleyrand, which was hideous. Dantan-Jeune’s caricature of Talleyrand exemplified an artistic hybridity that he showed in multiple formal busts. However, this time, Dantan-Jeune made a caricature that resembled a portrait bust. He sculpted the caricature immediately after observing Talleyrand during a dinner at the French Embassy. The statuette represents Talleyrand seated on a large armchair that encircles his large frame. Talleyrand’s long hair – perhaps a wig – is parted in the center and frames his decrepit face. Dantan-Jeune is especially brutal in his depiction of Talleyrand. His subject's eyes lack vividness, as they are framed by heavy eyelids and fatty pockets made with thick rolls of clay. Bumps of fleshy matter resemble furrows. They contrast with the deep carving in the flesh of the cheeks and forehead. Talleyrand’s mouth is shut and his upper lip nonexistent. His mouth appears as a crevice above a smoothed out lower lip that is grotesquely thick and hangs on top of a

\[266\text{In Le Sacre de Napoléon, Louis David portrayed Talleyrand with the same costume made of red, white, and gold materials. David represents Talleyrand in profile and, like Bosio's bust, shows large cheeks partially hidden with a scarf worn up to the chin. In contrast to Louis David, David d'Angers refused to make a portrait bust of Talleyrand who visited his atelier with a fellow Academician. He cited an overload of works as an excuse, although his refusal was based on Talleyrand’s treason against Napoleon. For more information on the meeting, see Henry Jouin. David d'Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains. Vol. I. Paris: E. Plon et Cie, Imprimeurs-Editeurs, 1878,257. Napoleon was aware of Talleyrand's political opportunism and blamed him for his fall in 1814. His distrust of Talleyrand is noted in a biography in which the writer notes: “Napoléon disait….Le visage de M. de Talleyrand est tellement impassible qu'on ne saurait jamais y rien lire. Aussi Lanne disait-il plaisamment de lui que si en vous parlant, son derrière venait à recevoir un coup de pied, sa figure ne vous en dirait rien.” (Napoleon said…. The face of M. de Talleyrand is so impassive that one cannot read anything. Lanne would jokingly say when talking about him that if someone kicked his derriere, his face would not remain unchanged.) Louis Bastide. Vie de Talleyrand. Paris: Faure et Compagnie, 1838, 466-467.}\]
high collar that completely covered the nape of his neck. Every bump and crease echoes the folds of the overcoat, which is buttoned only at the top because of Talleyrand’s apparent corpulence.

Talleyrand was already sick and feeble when Dantan-Jeune made the caricature. Six months before his sojourn in London, the French newspaper *Le Temps* reported the alarming news regarding Talleyrand’s failing health. The following day, the editor reassured the readers that Talleyrand was in better health than previously announced. The writer notes:

> The Prince of Talleyrand is practically cured from a bad cold that he caught last week. This cold occurred when, after an invitation to a ceremonial diner, the prince ate a little more than usual...people who saw him regularly last year find that he has aged in the past three or four months...He fails to realize the effects of his age as clearly as others see them, and he imagines that he still has several years to deal with affairs of diplomacy. However, we must do him justice that his intellectual faculties are as sharp as ever. 267

In his own style, Dantan-Jeune also reported on the state of Talleyrand’s physical and mental health. The scalding bust of Talleyrand is atypical of Dantan-Jeune’s other caricatures of Parisian celebrities. There were typically gentler and made with the intention of amusing the sitters and the audience. In this way, caricatures could be sold to a growing clientele. The caricature of Talleyrand is of another nature. Dantan-Jeune showed complete lack of care vis-à-vis his unwilling model or the potential political

267 “Le prince de Talleyrand est a peu près remis des suites d’un gros rhume qu’il a eu la semaine dernière. Ce rhume provenait de ce qu’ayant été invité à un dîner d’apparat, le prince avait mangé un peu plus que de coutume...Les personnes qui l’ont vu habituellement l’année dernière trouvent qu’il est bien tombé depuis les trois ou quatre derniers mois...Il ne s’aperçoit pas des effets de l’âge aussi bien que les autres les voient, et il s’imagine pouvoir encore pendant plusieurs années traiter les affaires de la diplomatie. On doit toutefois lui rendre cette justice, que ses facultés intellectuelles sont aussi fraîches que jamais.” The excerpt was a re-print taken from the paper *Le Courtois-journal*. The writer warned the readers against the defamatory nature of the text. *Le Temps, journal des progrès*. N. 1151. (12 December 1832).
ramifications when he put the caricature of Talleyrand for sale. However, just as reported in *Le Temps*, Talleyrand’s intellectual faculties were still sharp. Upon seeing his caricature, he said: "It is too much for a portrait…and too little for a caricature."²⁶⁸ Indeed, *Talleyrand* is as much a portrait as it is a caricature. The bust could be mistaken for a portrait, albeit a ruthless depiction of an aging, slouched, and tired old man.

The sculpted caricature of Talleyrand conveys a depth of psychological insight that Dantan-Jeune lacked when making formal busts. The latter closely captured the external appearance of the sitter but failed to convey the inner nature of the sitter, which would have elevated Dantan-Jeune's reputation to that of a great formal portraitist.

A. Dantan-Jeune’s political sculpted caricature and Philipon’s lithographic counterparts

Since the mid-1820’s, Republican artists used caricatures as political weapons to denounce the repressive regime that King Charles X established under his six year reign. Caricatures against figures in power were often anonymous, and were made on paper, which removed the notion of durability associated with sculpture. The end of censorship led to a surge of newspapers that openly ridiculed Charles X. A journalist noted: "The lithographic printing press…has not yet produced anything of importance. The crowd entertains itself by looking at multiple caricatures against Charles X; they are not hostile and only inspire gaiety and disdain."\textsuperscript{269} Despite the so-called “good natured” caricatures published against King Charles X, liberal artists turned their lithographic weapons against the “Citizen King” Louis-Philippe, who had declared the end of censorship against the

\textsuperscript{269} “La presse lithographique…n’a encore produit rien d’important. La foule s’amuse à considérer force caricatures contre Charles X; elles sont peu hostiles et n’inspirent que de la gaité et du dédain.” Guyot de Fère. \textit{Journal des artistes et des amateurs}. (15 August 1830). Fourth year. No. VII. Vol. 2, 119.
press. The huge success of caricatures that developed at the beginning of the July Monarchy was a combination of political, cultural and social changes. Those included a newfound freedom of self-expression; the growing popularity of the pseudo-sciences of physiognomy and phrenology; the incursion of cholera in Paris in 1832, resulting in a vital need for entertainment; and in a disillusioned Romantic youth who wanted a clear break from the growing bourgeoisie that took advantage of Capitalist laissez-faire.

In general, social, cultural or political caricatures are made to provoke amusement, or to outrage or ridicule a person. To succeed, the successful caricaturist is required to capture the essence of an individual with acute observations. A successful caricature needs to be immediately recognizable to have the most impact on the viewer, who then becomes an accomplice to the joke. The idea of the most salient physiognomic and behavioral characteristics allow the best caricaturists to shatter the external mask that hides what is assumed to be the inner nature of an individual, and to reveal it to the unsuspecting audience. The best caricaturists are regarded as unveiling the hidden and less attractive side of human nature. Despite the small number of artists who specialized in sculpted caricatures, the three-dimensional form of sculpture is, in fact, better suited to caricature; the medium pushes caricature to its absolute limits by showing the model from every angle. On a technical level, however, the making of sculpted caricatures is a slower and more costly process. In order to maximize their impact among an audience, caricatures depend upon the satirical depiction of contemporary subjects,

---


and thus have to be quickly produced. These conditions are suited for the production of two-dimensional caricatures. But they did not impede the prodigious number of sculpted caricatures that Dantan-Jeune produced. He was renowned for his great memory and did not require a model to pose in his studio. He had the ability to work rapidly on his small caricatural busts and to continuously produce caricatures of the latest celebrities within days. His technical skills resulted in caricatural busts that show a freedom of expression; they are not as overworked as his formal busts. Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures are filled with energy and sketch-like qualities that are representative of a creative force that Romantic sculptors favored. In contrast, his technique and style were criticized because he popularized a lowly art form. A critic writes: "In an atelier, caricatures have a useful purpose; they allow us to learn the different make-up of individuals, to understand the causes of exaggeration of some forms; but these studies ought not to see the day, let alone to serve as the means to enhance the reputation and fortune of an artist."272 By expressing his artistic versatility in sculpted caricatures instead of his formal busts, Dantan-Jeune was living parallel artistic lives that, at times, intersected.

Dantan-Jeune’s political leanings remain vague because of his self-censorship. He rarely sculpted caricatures of French political figures. Unlike most caricaturists whose satirical works on paper are politically driven, he carefully chose his subjects to appear politically neutral. Instead, he focused the body of his work on literary, theatrical, artistic, and musical celebrities. Nonetheless, Dantan-Jeune made two caricatures of Charles X, which were unknown to the public and were likely made for the amusement of his close

relations. One of the two caricatures represents Charles X in a bust à la française, a style in vogue during the Rococo period of the Ancient Regime. Dantan-Jeune dresses Charles X in the costume of a Jesuit, including a skullcap an accoutrement that caricaturists used to ridicule the King’s religious devotion and to denounce his lack of liberalism (fig. 4.1). The sculptor caricatures Charles X facing down as in deep contemplation; yet, the pose accentuates Charles X’s thick lower lip that barely conceals a huge set of horse teeth. Dantan-Jeune also emphasizes the elongated shape of his subject’s face and partially hides his forehead with strands of hair that converges on its center. Two arched eyebrows over protruding eyelids cover his eyes, curving toward a large distorted nose completing the physiognomy of an idiot. Dantan-Jeune left the caricature unsigned, although he carved on the back of its base, “Charles X, 1830 Mars” (Charles X, March 1830). Dantan-Jeune has thus created a caricature that blasphemes the image of the King five months before his fall from grace. The second caricature of Charles X focuses on the facial flaws of the King (fig. 4.2). As with the bust of Charles

273 Dantan-Jeune also made two caricatures of Louis-Philippe, which remained unknown to the public and early biographers. He only carved “1830” on the bust but added in ink - likely after 1848 - “Louis Philippe, Septembre 1830, DJe.” Philippe Sorel. “Les Dantan du Musée Carnavalet: portraits-charges sculptés de l’époque romantique.” Gazette des Beaux-Arts. 6ème période. Vol. CVII. 128th year. 1986, 38. At the Salon of 1824, Bosio exhibited a Buste de Charles X in a military uniform, which Dantan-Jeune likely saw when frequenting his atelier. Bosio had been the official Court sculptor since the reign of Louis XVIII and remained in favor under the short rule of Charles X who gave him the aristocratic title of “Baron” in 1825. The bust was a realistic portrayal of Charles X and Bosio was able to lessen his heavy features with the costume that was overly decorated. As a result, the viewer focused on the overall bust instead on just the face of Charles X. while working under Bosio, Dantan-Jeune participated in the decoration of Charles X’s coach and throne that were prepared for the new King’s coronation in 1825. Even if Dantan-Jeune only glanced at Charles X, his photographic memory would have allowed him to make the caricatures at an ulterior date. For information on Dantan-Jeune’s participation, see Janet Seligman. Figures of Fun: The caricature-statuettes of Jean-Pierre Dantan. London, New York & Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1957, 31-32.

X, Dantan-Jeune does not sign the second caricature. This time, he also does not carve the name or the date of completion. Dantan-Jeune cut the head directly under the neck, which serves as a round base. He captured the most recognizable features of Charles X, who has a long face and a drooping lower lip. The eyes of Charles X are almost shut under his arched eyebrows, creating a grossly misshapen nose. Charles X smiles and reveals a grotesque set of huge teeth, and his thick lips fall over his a protruding curved chin. On the back of the head, Dantan-Jeune carves shorter hair than in the previous caricature, reminiscent of the haircuts made on condemned victims in anticipation of death by guillotine. Even so, the nape of his neck is still covered with a Jesuit collar, and Charles X wears a clergyman's shovel hat that is too small for his large head. Thin straggly strands of hair emerge from the curved rim hat and fall over his face, forehead, and above his large ears.

The aim of the caricaturist is to find the most salient traits and to exaggerate them disproportionately in order to produce a grotesque physiognomy. Théophile Gautier explains: "To be good, a caricature must contain the true features of the model, deviated and accentuated in a ridiculous way, but easy to recognize".275 In addition, caricature demands that the inner flaws of a sitter be exposed. These flaws are often masked in conventional portraiture. Caricatures are the reverse opposite of portraits that are made to flatter the model by enhancing physiognomic deficiencies. A writer synthesized the difference between a caricature and a portrait:

The portrait represents us the way that it wants us to be, in a way, alas! that we are seldom; the caricature accepts us as we are usually seen, and, while it also somewhat idealize us in this sense,

is truer than the other by remaining nearer to resemblance. The portrait is the representation of what we should be; the caricature, of what we are; it is an enlarging mirror, but it is at least a mirror.  

In 1825, sculptor Théophile-François Marcel Bra (1797-1863) made a colossal bust of Charles X en costume de sacre (Charles X in his Consecration Costume; fig. 4.3). Bra portrays Charles X with realistic features that nonetheless disguised the physiognomic flaws of the King. His eyelids are deeply carved – a method used in Greco-Roman portraiture to convey depth of character of heroes and Gods – resulting in the successful erasing of the otherwise heavy gaze that was typically shown in caricatures. Bra represents Charles X’s large and distorted nose without emphasizing the crooked cartilage that was also exaggerated in satirical depictions. His mouth is slightly open, although his upper and lower lips are of even size and form a gentle curve toward creases on the sides of his cheeks. Bra faithfully renders the curly side burns that Charles X wore to the middle of the cheeks. He also portrays thick hair that is combed from the back and rests in large delineated chunks around his forehead, which form an imaginary laurel

276 “Le portrait nous représente tels qu’il veut que nous soyons, tels, hélas! que nous sommes bien rarement; la charge nous accepte tels qu’on nous voit habituellement, et, tout en nous idéalisant aussi quelque peu dans ce sens-là, plus vrai que l’autre, elle reste par cela même bien plus voisine de la ressemblance. Le portrait est la représentation de ce que nous devrions être; la charge, de ce que nous sommes; c’est un miroir grossissant, mais du moins, c’est un miroir.” Prosper Viro. Charges et bustes de Dantan Jeune: esquisse biographique. Paris: Librairie nouvelle, 1863, 63.

277 Charles X commissioned the colossal bust in 1825. In 1826, Bra made a marble copy, which was exhibited at the Salon of 1827. The bust of Charles X replaced the bust of Louis XVIII at the Chamber of Commerce after the latter’s death. For a biography of Bra and a list of his sculptures, see A. Cahier. “Notice historique sur une famille d’artistes Douaisiens.” Mémoires de la Société Nationale d’agriculture, sciences, et arts. Douai: Adam d’Aubers, Imprimeur, 1850, 295-326; and Jean du Seigneur “Théophile Bra, statuaire.” Revue Universelle des Arts. Paul Lacroix (Bibliophile Jacob) and M.C. Marsuzi de Aguirre, eds. Vol. 18. Paris: Veuve Jules Renouard, 1863, 97-102. Bra may have been the person who attempted to murder David d’Angers in the 1828 assassination attempt. Bra suffered from mental lapses and then competed against David d’Angers for the Monument to General Foy, which was awarded to the latter. For more information see Jacques de Caso. David d’Angers. Sculptural Communication in the Age of Romanticism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988, 152-156.
wreath on the top of the head. The consecration costume is carved with great care and results in an elegant and regal portrayal of the King of France that is based on realistic features, although they are idealized, through the talent of Bra. Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869) described Charles X:

Under the first frost of age, the new king retained the vigor, the stature, the agility and the beauty of his youth. It is the process of thought that matures men. The Count of Artois had thought little during his life... All the royal provisions of his soul were written on his physiognomy: nobility, frankness, majesty, kindness, honesty, candor, all revealed a man born to love and be loved. Only depth and sternness lacked on this face; when looking at him, one was drawn to the man but was skeptical of the king.  

Bra successfully extracted and conveyed inner qualities that Lamartine described, and sculpted a portrait bust of Charles X that resembled the subject, yet, it was also an effigy made for admiration and respect. In contrast, Dantan-Jeune represented Charles X in a reduced scale and – although recognizable through the exaggerated physiognomy – lowered the status and image of the King to one of inconsequence, derision and irreverence.

A month after Dantan-Jeune sculpted the caricatures of Charles X, Philipon made a woodcut caricature titled Un Jésuite (A Jesuit; fig. 4.4), which was published on April 1, 1830, in the short-lived newspaper La Silhouette (1829-1831). Philipon was a co-founder with Victor Ratier and Benjamin-Louis Bellet of the weekly journal, the first

French newspaper to regularly include lithographs in each publication. *La Silhouette* was a satirical journal that reported on theatrical, artistic, literary events. Honoré de Balzac (1799-1850) was its principal writer and editor and contributed short stories and essays alongside Romantic lithographs and caricatures by Achille Devéria (1800-1857), Charles-Joseph Traviès (1804-1859), J.J. Grandville, and Daumier. Within months, political caricatures and texts ridiculing the Ministry of Charles X took predominance and reached a point of defiance against the Crown when Ratier published Philipon’s *Un Jésuite*, which was a small caricature of *Charles X* inserted as a vignette within a large text. Despite stiff censorship laws, Philipon’s caricature passed through the Censorship Office because they focused on the larger lithographs included in the newspaper. The effect of the printed caricature of *Charles X* was enormous and the scandal resulted in the prosecution of Bellet and Ratier. Philipon left the caricature unsigned and was able to steer clear of the controversy.

Philipon’s caricature of *Un Jésuite* is a two-dimensional replica of Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted bust of *Charles X*. Philipon’s *Un Jésuite* is in profile view and shows the King looking down from heavy eyelids. A crooked nose falls on his open mouth. His lower lip droops to reveal his teeth. His long round chin touches the collar of his clerical habit. A skullcap rests on the back of his head and pointy strands of hair fall forward his forehead and large ears. Considering that Dantan-Jeune’s subversive caricatures of *Charles X* remained unknown to the general public, he must have shown them to Philipon who, in turn, made two-dimensional studies with the intention of publishing them in *La Silhouette*. The similarities are striking. Until Philipon published *Un Jésuite*, he

---

specialized in pretty genre scenes that depicted young girls from various areas of France, and made other inconsequential visual commentaries about fashionable young aristocrats.\textsuperscript{280} Although Philipon frequented the atelier of Antoine-Jean Gros (1771-1835) for a short time, his style remained rather common and dull, and lacked three-dimensionality. In contrast, when he caricatured \textit{Un Jésuite}, his artistic method showed sculptural qualities. Philipon represents sharp contrasts between dark and light areas of Charles X’s physiognomy and clearly delineates the profile contour with dark lines that add to the modeling of the features. In addition, in the lower part of the caricature, he adds a dark background made of quickly-drawn zigzag lines, which highlight the top half of the profile against a white background. Such a method emphasizes a sense of depth that Philipon had hardly touched upon until he made a two-dimensional rendition of Dantan-Jeune’s seditious bust of Charles X.

The incriminating publication was immediately seized and, two months later, publishers Bellet and Ratier were tried for having committed a \textit{crime de lèse-majesté} (Crime against the reigning sovereign). In an outrageous statement, they explained that \textit{Un Jésuite} was not an insult but a compliment to the King and his religious affiliations with the Jesuits. Their plea was unsuccessful and their sentences carried jail time and fines. They published an article in \textit{La Silhouette} to explain their position:

\textit{...You will not forget that editors and draughtsman at La Silhouette are only fools searching, in their wandering drollery, to collect some pieces on the traces of Callot, that they are harmless as lambs, and that a lithographic pencil can never replace the dagger of Ravaillac or the knife of Jean-Châtel. A little black will never create a deadly weapon and regardless of a magnifying glass ...}

that one takes, one will only discover that pens cannot, like the
teeth of Cadmus, metamorphoses in an army of fighters. 281

Ratier and Bellet minimized the importance of caricaturists by emphasizing that
their works were not to be taken seriously. The medium of caricature was a guileless
entertainment made without subversive intention. Good natured caricaturists only wanted
to entertain their readers. The trial of La Silhouette took place a month before the July
Revolution. Less than two weeks after the fall of Charles X, La Silhouette reprinted Un
Jésuite. The editors advertised the sale of single sheets to benefit the widows and
children who had lost family members during the three days of fighting. More than
twenty-thousand copies were sold of the sheet that now included the additional text:
"Portrait declared resembling to Charles X by judgment of the correctional police
court" 282 Philipon’s Un Jésuite elevated his reputation as political caricaturist, even
though the malicious depiction of Charles X resulted in a fatal duel. A contemporary
recalls:

I named the Silhouette; it was a newspaper with illustrations, with
worldly pretentions, dotted with apocryphal anecdotes, a weak
precursor of la Vie Parisienne. Its editors had nothing of the fierce
revolutionary demeanors…To what inspiration, mad and wicked,

281 “…Vous n’oublierez-point que les rédacteurs et dessinateurs de la Silhouette ne sont que des
fous cherchant dans leur gaité vagabonde à ramasser quelques bribes sur les traces de Callot,
qu’ils sont inoffensifs comme des agneaux, et qu’un crayon de lithographe ne peut jamais
remplacer le poignard de Ravaillac ni le couteau de Jean-Châtel. Un peu de noir ne fournira
jamais une machine infernale, et quelque loupe qu’on prenne, on ne pourra découvrir que des
plumes puissent, comme les dents de Cadmus, se métamorphoser en une armée de combattants.”
Quoted in James Bash Cuno. Charles Philipon and La Maison Aubert: The Business, Politics, and
282 “Portrait déclaré ressemblant à Charles X par jugement du tribunal de police correctionnelle.”
Robert Justin Goldstein. Censorship of Political Caricature in Nineteenth-Century France. Ohio: The
Kent State University Press, 1989, 115-116. Philipon also likely copied the head of Dantan-Jeune’s
bust of Charles X for the caricature, Ayez pitié d’un pauvre aveugle!! (Have pity for the poor blind!!)
that represented Charles X on his knees, begging with his upturned shovel hat. For both
illustrations, see James Cuno. “The Business and Politics of Caricature: Charles Philipon and La
Maison Aubert.” Gazette des Beaux-arts. N.106. (October 1985) : 98
did these young people obey, when publishing an abominable
caricature, under the title *A Jesuit*, portraying Charles X in habit
and cape, hands clasped, his lip dangling, looking dazed, all with
the more insolent resemblance? Alas, it was one omen among a
thousand, a breath of that pestilential wind that was knocking all
Paris with vertigo.  

In society salons, journals were typically displayed on a table for guests to browse.

Young poet Jean Gariel was leafing through *La Silhouette*. He was looking at *Un Jésuite*
when an officer of the Royal Guard stated: "What infamy! One must be as much of a
coward to look at it as to make it!" The following morning, a duel ensued. Gariel was
unable to fight against the trained officer, and was killed. Perhaps the political and deadly
ramifications of Philipon’s caricature kept Dantan-Jeune from making other political
caricatures.

The end of press censorship was the catalyst for the surge of satirical newspapers
and the publication of caricatures that ridiculed the deposed King. Soon after,
caricaturists turned against Louis Philippe and the failed promises of his *Juste Milieu*
government. After Louis-Philippe declared that there would no longer be trials against
the printed press, Philipon co-founded *La Caricature* in a similar format as *La Silhouette*,
which shut down in January 1831. Philipon employed artists and writers who had

---

283 “J’ai nommé la *Silhouette*; c’était un journal à images, à prétentions mondaines, parsemé
d’anecdotes apocryphes, débile précurseur de la *Vie Parisienne*. Ses rédacteurs n’avaient rien des
farouches allures révolutionnaires…A quelle inspiration folle et méchante obéirent ces jeunes
gens, en publiant une abominable caricature qui, sous le titre, *un Jésuite*, représentait Charles X en
soutane et surplus, les mains jointes, la lèvre pendante, le regard ahuri, le tout de la plus grande
insolente ressemblance? C’était, hélas, un présage entre mille, une bouffée de ce souffle empesté
Paris: E. Dentu, 1882, 123.

284 “Quelle infamie! Il faut être aussi lâche pour la regarder que pour la faire!” The officer,
Vicomte Raoul de Valleran, had ulterior motive for the provocation. He and Gariel were courting
the same young woman and Philipon’s caricature was a pretext to end a rivalry between the two
contributed to *La Silhouette* and published the first issue of the *La Caricature* in November 1830. Philipon’s most notable employees, Daumier, Grandville, and Traviès, helped popularize *La Caricature*, although Philipon was the mastermind of the whole enterprise. He was an entrepreneur and a trained lithographer who had mastered the art of combining both lithographs and texts on a single page, a combination that had crucial consequences. Newspapers were cheaper to produce and were sold at a lower price, making them available to a larger public. Philipon also reached a lower market who could not afford the subscription by displaying caricatures in the windows of his publishing house, La Maison Aubert, where he sold individual lithographs and albums, and published *La Caricature* and *Le Charivari*.

In the summer of 1830, Philipon continued to profit from caricatures against Charles X that were still based on Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted models. Philipon likely made sketches of Dantan-Jeune’s two caricatures in one sitting and, due to the criminal charges against *La Silhouette*, stopped using them until the reinstatement of the freedom of the press. Within a month of the July Revolution, Philipon was free to print openly political caricatures. He took advantage of the resentment against Charles X to sell lithographs ridiculing the deposed King, based on Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures of *Charles X*. Philipon’s lithograph *Oh! Le vilain masque!!!* (Oh! What a hideous mask!!!; fig. 4.5) was more imaginative than his faithful rendition of *Un Jésuite*. Philipon represents only the front of Charles X’s head and recasts it into a hollow mask worn at carnivals.\(^{285}\) He excludes the shovel hat to focus solely on Charles X’s facial features, exaggerating his lower lip and huge donkey teeth to grotesque proportions. Nonetheless, similarities

\(^{285}\) For illustrations of the Philipon’s *Oh! le vilain Masque!!!* and Dantan-Jeune's head of *Charles X*, see Armand Dayot, *Journées révolutionnaires: 1830–1848*. Paris: Ernest Flammarion, 1897, 1 and 78.
between Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted head and Philipon’s mask remain. Philipon reproduces faithfully the forehead creases and the bony structure that protrude on the side of the eyebrows. He also copies the wrinkles on the cheeks and chin, the thick crooked nose, and curly sideburns that Dantan-Jeune sculpted. By adding a string attached to the mask, Philipon objectified Charles X as a ridiculous buffoon; in addition, he implies that his smile is a façade covering his empty head.

Philipon also reproduced Dantan-Jeune’s head of Charles X in a second lithograph that he sold as individual sheets at La Maison Aubert. In August 1830, he published the lithograph, *Cruche* (Pitcher), which represents Charles X as a cracked jug with an open cover top that reveals a dark and empty space. The lithograph *Cruche* is a faithful replica of a side view of Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricature. *Cruche* represents the opposite profile of *Un Jésuite*, confirming that Philipon copied Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures from at least two different angles. *Cruche* has a pronounced three-dimensionality that is emphasized by a three-quarter view of the sculptor’s caricatural head of Charles X. In contrast to the back lighting of *Un Jésuite*, Philipon shows a bright frontal exposure, resulting in sharp contrasts of dark and highlighted areas. Through the use of a subtle range of tonal shading, Philipon represents a partly visible eye and shows the thickness of the distorted nose. As a result, *Cruche* has sculptural depth that was lacking in Philipon’s other caricatures of Charles X. Philipon includes the collar of the Jesuit cut at the base of the neck that Dantan-Jeune caricatured. *Cruche* is a detailed reproduction of the head of Charles X; yet, in his renditions Philipon creates new elements to convey that Charles X lacks a brain. With *Cruche*, Philipon ridiculed Charles X visually and figuratively. A “cruche” is a pitcher. But it is also refers to a stupid
person. Philipon was thus using his wit to convey to his audience his subversive thoughts. Indeed, if Charles X was an idiot, he was hardly suited to lead the French people.

The political ramifications for *Oh! Le vilain masque!!!* and *Cruche* were inconsequential due to the freedom of the press. Dantan-Jeune’s name was not associated with Philipon’s caricatures of Charles X, and the sculptor specialized in non-political, neutral caricatures for the rest of his career, even though he was soon challenged to make them. A writer for *la Mode* notes:

While Mr. Philippon [sic] pursues this poor middle of the road with his satirical pen…a spiritual caricaturist, Mr. Dantan, finds amusement in delivering our important artists a little caricatural war in a genre as fresh as it is stinging…The power! there is the rich mine that the caricaturist must exploit; it is there, Mr. Dantan, that you must pick up your models; it is within the happy ones of the day that the ideal beauty of ridicule and the grotesque is found…from now on, only throw in the mold political heads; knead the doctrine in clay; translate for us, in plasterwork, all the glories of the *Juste-milieu*…The power provides you with all the types of ugliness, both physical and moral; so go to work! You will have plenty to choose.

---


287 “Tandis que M. Philippon poursuit de son crayon satirique ce pauvre juste milieu…un spiritual sculpteur, M. Dantan jeune, s’amuse à livrer à nos principaux artistes une petite guerre de caricature d’un genre aussi neuf que piquant...Le pouvoir! voilà la mine féconde que le caricaturiste doit exploiter; c’est là, M. Dantan, qu’il faut aller chercher vos modèles; c’est parmi les heureux du jour que se trouve le beau idéal du ridicule et du grotesque…ne jetez désormais en moule que des têtes politiques; pétrissez la doctrine en terre glaise; traduisez-nous, en plâtre, toutes les gloires du juste-milieu…Le pouvoir met à votre disposition tous les genres de laideur, tant au physique qu’au moral; à l’œuvre donc! Vous n’aurez que l’embarras du choix.” Anonymous. “Caricatures de M. Dantan.” *La Mode.* (19 September 1832) : 335-336. Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris. Album “Souvenirs de Dantan-Jeune.” fol. 31 209. Dantan-Jeune made political caricatures when traveling abroad to England. In 1834, he returned from London with multiple statuettes, among them, *King Guillaume IV*, *Minister Lord Grey*, and other members of the Parliament. Those were the cruelest depictions that Dantan-Jeune exhibited and sold. For more information see “Variétés. Dantan à Londres.” *Le Télégraphe.* (10 November 1834). Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris. Album “Souvenirs de Dantan-Jeune.” fol. 31 209.
Dantan-Jeune and Philipon were not professionally linked although they worked in analogous territories. The production of caricatures – in print and in sculpture – required rapid execution to relevant to the public. As a journalist, Philipon was required to know the latest political and social developments so that he could share current news with his readers. Dantan-Jeune, the caricaturist, was also performing the role of a journalist – albeit in sculpture – by producing sculpted contemporary records of celebrities from all artistic branches. Dantan-Jeune was a societal entertainer who specialized in the harmless amusement of the Parisian public. Even though he was referred to “le Philipon du plâtre” (The Philipon of Plaster), their agenda differed. They worked on similar business, yet a friendly rivalry was established based on their specializations: Philipon in political and satirical caricatures and Dantan-Jeune in apolitical productions.

B. Daumier's creation of the series Les Célébrités du Juste-milieu

In 1831, the censorship office was already increasing control over the political newspapers that defamed Louis-Philippe. Nonetheless, Philipon had a window of opportunity until censorship was fully reinstated with the September Laws of 1835. Until then, he continued the production of seditious texts and lithographs in La Caricature with a team he hired from La Silhouette. Charles Baudelaire writes:

The beginnings of Daumier were hardly exceptional; he drew because he needed to draw, an unavoidable vocation…The 1830 revolution caused, like all revolutions, a fever of caricatures. It was truly a great epoch for caricaturists. In this relentless war against the government, and especially against the king, we were wholeheartedly on fire. It is truly curious to contemplate today this vast series of historical buffoonery that we called La Caricature…It was a hurly-burly, a bazaar, a prodigious satanic comedy, sometimes droll, sometimes bloody, where all the political honoraries paraded decked out in different and grotesque costumes.289

Daumier produced mostly genre scenes for La Silhouette before it shut down in early 1831. He worked concurrently for La Caricature, where he started to make a specialty of political caricatures. His name rose to public awareness after he signed the damming lithograph, Gargantua (fig. 4.6). It shows Louis-Philippe swallowing taxes taken from the poor and defecating medals and titles before a swarm of attendants. Favoritism, sinecures, and societal injustice are themes central to Daumier’s composition. The image also ridicules Louis-Philippe as a giant with an avid appetite. The artist based this on François Rabelais’ (ca. 1494-1553) satirical book series La vie de Gargantua et Pantagruel.290 Freedom of the press was reinstated, yet publishers were required to

289 “Les commencements de Daumier ne furent pas très-éclatants; il dessina, parce qu’il avait besoin de dessiner, vocation inéluctable…La révolution de 1830 causa, comme toutes les révolutions, une fièvre caricaturale. Ce fut vraiment pour les caricaturistes une belle époque. Dans cette guerre acharnée contre le gouvernement, et en particulier contre le roi, on était tout cœur, tout feu. C’est véritablement une œuvre curieuse à contempler aujourd’hui que cette vaste série de bouffonneries historiques qu’on appelait La Caricature…C’est un tohu-bohu, un capharnaüm, une prodigieuse comédie satanique, tantôt bouffonne, tantôt sanglante, où défilent affublés de costumes variés et grotesques, toutes les honorabilités politiques.” Charles Baudelaire. Œuvres Complètes. Curiosités esthétiques. Vol. II. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1868, 397-398.

290 Daumier was condemned to jail time on February 3, 1832 and started his sentence on August 27. In a letter addressed to the King, Daumier, Aubert, and Delaporte begged for clemency. They explained, “Trois hommes qui n’ont jamais été jamais animé contre vous d’aucun sentiment de haine viennent d’être condamnés à six mois de prison… l’artiste, jeune homme de vingt trois ans, n’avait mit aucune importance à un dessin qui lui semblait inoffensif; l’imprimeur a cru sa
submit their prints for approval prior to publication. Daumier’s *Gargantua* was immediately seized and La Maison Aubert was ordered to destroy the lithographic stone and every sheet already printed. As a result, Daumier, editor Gabriel Aubert, and printer Hippolyte Delaporte were put to trial for defamation. In early 1832, Daumier was condemned to six months in jail and ordered to pay a steep fine. Philipon was also entangled in judicial matters and was serving time for subversive caricatures against Louis-Philippe. While incarcerated, Philipon nonetheless continued to manage *La Caricature* and conceived the publication of a second newspaper, *Le Charivari*.

Philipon used *La Caricature* to keep his readers informed of his incessant problems with the Court and the fines that he received. This technique of openness served to promote his political position as a fighter for societal injustice and an adversary of Louis-Philippe and the *Juste-Milieu*.291 As a result, the reputation of *La Caricature* grew. It became the most successful satirical and political journal, and Philipon forged a reputation of die-hard Republicanism. Through his biting commentaries and the reproduction of Court reports, Philipon denounced the inequality of the judicial system that harassed his publishing house despite the so-called freedom of the press. He printed

responsabilité à couvert par la signature du dessin, par la formalité du dépôt et par le nom de l’éditeur.” (Three men without any hatred against your person have just been condemned to six months in jail… The artist, a twenty-three-year-old man, paid no importance to a drawing that seemed harmless; the printer believed that he was protected by the artist’s signature… and the name of the editor.) Letter addressed to Louis-Philippe and signed by Daumier, Aubert, and Delaporte (May 1832). Archives Nationales BB 21. 373. Dossier 4172. S. 8. Of the three, Daumier alone was held responsible. He spent a short time at Sainte-Pélagie prison before being transferred with the help of Philipon to a private Maison de Santé. For more information on Daumier and censorship, see Elizabeth C. Childs. “The Body Impolitic: Press Censorship and the Caricature of Honoré Daumier.” *Making the News: Modernity & The Mass Press in Nineteenth-Century France*. Dean de la Motte and Jeannene Przyblyski, eds. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999, 43-77.

his plead to the jury, which clearly describes the political slant of *La Caricature*. Philipon wrote: "For a year, Gentlemen, I have been tracked by the public ministry, like a wolf by a hunter…Do you know why?...I created a newspaper that reproduces the democratic grimaces of a few unfrocked Jesuit, the aristocratic antics of some traders at the stock market…our foxes, our puppets, our political slaves. I have wounded their vanities…”

Philipon had mastered the art of self-promotion through an intrepid fight with words and pencils against the government of the July Monarchy.

Daumier also used his name as self-promotion when he signed the lithograph *Gargantua* with his real name. His signature was equivalent to strategy of *lancer un pétard* that Préault and other young artists used to be noticed at the Salon. Daumier was also following the lead of Philipon, who was forging a name as the result of his oppositional and bold irreverence for the new government. Daumier’s outrageous depiction of Louis-Philippe as *Gargantua* was bound to result in judicial Court. While in jail, Daumier wrote to a friend: "…you must have good excuses to keep you from coming to see your friend la Gouape, also known as Gargantua. I must have been born for nicknames because as soon as I arrived, they remembered my caricature rather than my name, and Gargantua has stuck... prison will not leave me any difficult memories, to the


293 Daumier signed “Rogelin” on the lithograph, *Masques de 1831* (Masks of 1831), a pseudonym that he used prior to signing his political and societal caricatures either under “honoré” or “h. Daumier.” He used the latter to sign *Gargantua*. Daumier’s nickname “la Gouape” was then used in slang for lower class men who were hooligans, vagrants, or idlers. Lazàr Sàinéanu. *Les sources de l’argot ancien. Le dix-neuvième siècle (1800-1850)*. Vol. II. Paris: Honoré et Édouard Champion, Éditeurs, 1912, 236.
contrary… I work four times more in pension than I did when I was at my dad’s. I am overwhelmed and tyrannized by a crowd of citizens who make me do their portraits…”

Daumier realized that despite his signature, his name did not stick among inmates, and was not likely to stick with the general public. “la Gouape” was a slang term then used for lower class men who were hooligans, tricksters, vagrants, drunkards, or idlers. Such nickname shows that Daumier lacked a sense of initiative and stamina for self-promotion. He also was notoriously lazy and acknowledged that without Philipon's constant pressure, he would have been incapable of producing much work. He lacked the will to start or finish his works and usually made his lithographs rapidly in order to meet deadlines. As a result, Daumier's artistic style was expressive and retained a freshness that set him apart from – and ahead of – other caricaturists. In addition, Daumier was refining his technique by portraying inmates and making lithographs that he continued to produce for La Maison Aubert.

While incarcerated, Philipon conceived the daily newspaper *Le Charivari*, which included a new drawing each day. He explained to the readers that the two newspapers were not rivals but complementary. The weekly *La Caricature* was to remain "a journal

---

294 "…tu as des raisons qui t’empêchent de venir voir ton ami la Gouape dit Gargantua. Il faut que je sois né pour les sobriquets, car dès mon arrivée ici, comme on se souvenait plutôt de ma caricature que de mon nom, celui de Gargantua m’est resté…la prison ne me laissera aucun souvenir pénible, au contraire…Je travaille quatre fois plus en pension que je ne fesais [sic] lorsque j’étais chez mon papa. Je suis accablé et tyrannisé par une foule de citoyens qui me font faire leur portrait…” Arsène Alexandre. Honoré Daumier, l’homme et l’œuvre. Paris: H. Laurens, Éditeur, 1888, 54.


of choice; its drawings, made with care, printed with caution, and made on fine linen paper, makes it a collectible newspaper. From now on, those of our friends whom the public has increasingly encouraged will be EXCLUSIVELY in charge of the execution of these works... Daumier continued to draw for La Caricature, attesting to Philipon’s and the readers’ appreciation of his work. He also contributed regularly to Le Charivari. Philipon was still incarcerated in April 1832, when he announced the imminent publication of lithographic caricatures based on a series of clay busts of political figures of the Juste-Milieu. Philipon explained:

*La Caricature*, in the past, had promised its subscribers, a portrait gallery of the celebrities of the Juste-milieu, their resemblance conscientiously studied was, in addition, supposed to possess this energetic character, this burlesque feature, known as charge (load). Accustomed to give in its publications all the conditions possible to succeed, *La Caricature* has postponed for some time the realization of this project, because it has commissioned the modeling of each person in sketch. It is after these clay molds that the drawings have been made.

Philipon kept the identity of the artist secret when he advertised the creation of the series of caricatural busts. He was likely protecting Daumier, who was convicted for *Gargantua* because of further judicial problems. This unique commission in the art of

---


sculpture was the brainchild of Philipon who employed Daumier to caricature *Les Célébrités du Juste Milieu* (The Celebrities from the Middle of the Road; fig. 4.7). The genesis of the series was likely influenced by Philipon’s earlier lithographic reproductions of Dantan-Jeune’s busts of *Charles X*. With the help of the sculpted caricatures, Philipon had been able to make lithographs that exhibited three-dimensional qualities unseen in his previous works. In addition, Dantan-Jeune had established a very profitable market from which Daumier benefited. Dantan-Jeune had sold his sculpted caricatures to an aristocratic and bourgeois clientele and reproduced his most popular caricatures in single sheets and albums. Newspapers regularly mentioned new celebrities that had been "Dantanisés" (Dantanized), which were exhibited and sold successfully.299 Philipon and Dantan-Jeune shared a savoir-faire for entrepreneurship and worked in parallel business ventures, which explains Philipon’s reason for commissioning sculptures in order to make lithographs.

Philipon's idea to commission the series *Les Célébrités du Juste Milieu* was, perhaps, influenced by David d'Angers' series of portrait busts that he made for his *Galerie des Contemporains*. It also may have been a satirical parody of a vast project that Louis-Philippe envisioned for the creation of a Museum at the Chateau de Versailles. The project was officially announced to the public in 1833, even though it had already been conceived the previous year. As a journalist, Philipon was likely aware of Louis-

Philippe's desire to create a gallery that would house a series of historical and contemporary portraits. Interior Minister Comte de Montalivet (1801-1880) explained:

The central building of the palace would hold…a gallery of portraits of all the personalities that we consider of historical importance and whose careers have received the merit of celebrity. These portraits would be placed in a chronological order, so when walking through the apartments we could start from the oldest to reach the modern ones, and always finding the contemporaries of each period placed one after the other. 300

Philipon was creating – with the help of Daumier – his own gallery of contemporary sculpted portraiture, which he described as "a monument that we elevate to contemporary idiocy." 301

It is nonetheless remarkable that Philipon selected Daumier to make the series. He was clearly aware that Daumier had the capacity to sculpt – although in a small scale – in addition to drawing lithographs. Daumier’s beginnings in sculpture remain unknown. Daumier’s friendship with Préault and his unconventional sculpting style ought to have played a decisive role in his method. In a style similar to Préault, Daumier sculpted quickly and left the marks of his hands and tools in the clay. He also represented the most essential physiognomic elements, while showing a lack of care for details bound to result in a polished surface. Daumier’s method was analogous to the unfinished and expressive nature of Préault’s sculptures – the very qualities that would be criticized at the following

---


Salons. Both artists worked in three-dimensions with the expressive techniques of Romantic painters, creating what appeared to be sketches, rather than finished works.

Between 1832 and 1835, Daumier made at least thirty-six busts. Prior to his conviction, he sculpted the busts of Comte Charles-François-Malo de Lameth (1752-1832), Baron Maurice-Apollinaire d'Argout (1782-1858; fig. 4.8), and André-Marie-Jean-Jacques Dupin (called Dupin-aîné; 1782-1865). He also made a bust of Charles Philipon—likely as a joke—that may have been the catalyst for Philipon’s to sculpt the series (fig. 4.9). Philipon is decked out in a contemporary costume that is attached to one side of his chest with round buttons that Daumier applied directly on the bust. Daumier has used a tool comb on the costume, resulting in a loose pattern of lines in relief. He uses the same method for Philipon’s puffy hairstyle. The face is smoother than the costume and was likely finished with his hands rather than with sculpting tools. Daumier carves directly into the mouth of Philipon, who looks straight out with a large toothless smile that rises to the cheeks. Daumier also digs deeply into the clay to produce the suggestion of small eyes, resulting in a lively gaze highlighted by two pointy eyebrows. His long cylindrical nose stands up and ends in a square shape that Daumier appears to have flattened with his palm.

302 He made the busts of Comte Charles-François-Malo de Lameth (1752-1832), Baron Antoine-Maurice-Apollinaire d'Argout (1782-1858), and André-Marie-Jean-Jacques Dupin (1782-1865; called Dupin-aîné). A recent study of the material and technique that Daumier used in the first batch of busts has confirmed that the bust of Philipon was made at an early date. For more information, see Agnès de Cascio and Juliette Lévy “Étude et restauration des Célèbrités du Juste milieu” in Édouard Papet. Les Célèbrités du Juste milieu: 1832-1835. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2005, 30-39. The bust of Charles de Lameth is typically regarded as the first bust that Daumier created because Philipon announced “M. Charles Lam. ouvre la marche…” (M. Charles Lam. opens the march...). The lithograph was indeed the first published; however, Daumier’s caricature of Philipon was never published in the same series as his gallery, and thus could have been made prior to Charles de Lameth’s bust. For the argument on Lameth’s bust as the first of the series, see Édouard Papet. Les Célèbrités du Juste milieu: 1832-1835. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2005, 80-82.
Although extremely unconventional in its sculptural method, Daumier shows a clear understanding of Academic conventions by stabilizing the bust with a herm shape that is equally balanced. He also represents Philipon in a direct frontal view, a position that Neo-Classicists favored. Philipon’s face is divided equally, yet, Daumier adds on each side of the head a huge mop of hair that is larger than the base of the bust. Daumier ridiculed the principles of Neo-Classical sculpture by shattering the concepts of timelessness, morality, and decorum with anti-traditional values. Similar to the other busts, Daumier painted the faces and costumes. The tips of Philipon’s nose and his cheekbones have a reddish tone; his lower jaw is covered with a combination of ochre and bluish colors that evoke the sensation of a five o’clock shadow. The rest of the face is also colored with shades of light ochre that blend into the hair. The hair is covered with light brown paint. In-between the brownish tones of the face and the dark blue and black of the overcoat, Daumier has painted Philipon’s high-collared shirt white. This sharply highlighted contrast separates Philipon’s head from the base, which is a complete contradiction to the decorum of sculpted portraiture based on the principle of monochromatic harmony.

The series of busts that Daumier sculpted reveal the condition of portraiture at the beginning of the July Monarchy that was left over from Napoleon’s Empire. Conservatives criticized the works of Romantic sculptors – especially Préault’s low-reliefs and medallions – who showed painterly expression and a disdain for antiquated aesthetic values. They repudiated the blurring of two distinct art forms – painting and sculpture – that Préault embraced, by carving deep crevices, resulting in high contrasts, and an impression of impasto. In addition, marks from tool combs resembled the thick
strokes of paintbrushes filled with undiluted color. In essence, Daumier showed an astonishing and unprecedented modernity in the art of sculpted portraiture. He was deconstructing the very core of Academic sculpture, an art form that had been traditionally elevated above painting, by contradicting every principle taught at the École des Beaux-Arts.

Daumier turned a timeless art form upside down by making caricatures, some of which bordered on realistic portraits. By adding paint of complimentary values, he showed his opposition against the established principle that sculpture was a colorless art. Daumier’s use of color embodies an extreme version of "les sculpteurs coloristes" (colorist sculptors) who were criticized at the Salon of 1833. Préault regularly used a combination of high areas and deep grooves for sharp contrasting effects. The critic lamented over: "...projections, hollowness, the mountain and the plain, to get large blacks next to bright lights...Sculptors who want to imitate colorists painters...seem to be in the worse possible path in the world".303 In contrast to Préault, who thrived on public recognition and had to stay within the fringes of acceptability to show at the Salon, Daumier could sculpt as freely as he wished because of the unconventional purpose of the commission.

Préault and Daumier used very different means to include coloring in their sculptures. Just as Carpeaux was criticized for using a technique that resulted in a sense of color in his works, Carpeaux's sculptures were also compared to a painterly technique.

303 “...des saillies, des cavités, la montagne et la plaine, afin d'obtenir de grands noirs à côté de lumières vives...Les sculpteurs qui veulent imiter les peintres coloristes...me semblent dans la plus mauvaise voie du monde.” Duseigneur also added gold color to the plaster group Une larme pour une goutte d'eau, which was equally criticized. Augustin Jal. Salon de 1833, Les Causeries du Louvre. Paris : Charles Gosselin, Libraire-éditeur, 1833, 432-433.
that resulted in shades of colors. His technique was compared to Delacroix's method.

Chesneau explains:

... It is important to note a peculiarity of Carpeaux's studies ... I mean his gift for color ... The knowledge that he brought to his calculation of lights, of mid-tones and shadows, I mean the color of his modeled compositions, is one of the factors that gives them the greatest force of liveliness, of "shivering" – in his own term – that animates them...This is exemplified in his use of the "modeling with small balls of clay", which endlessly multiply the seemingly smooth surface with an almost unperceivable relief, which attracts and keeps the light and gives it a vibration that the eye perceives as a simulation of movement. One will notice the resemblance of this technique to that of Eugène Delacroix...

Chesneau's description of Carpeaux's colorist sculpture is similar to the effects that Préault's rendered in his works starting in the late 1820s. In fact, he upstages Carpeaux's technique because he rarely had the possibility to have his sculptures made in materials other than clay or plaster. Even when made in bronze, the crevices and projections were so exaggerated that they did not lose the sense of color. In contrast, Carpeaux's sketches showed colorist qualities that were lost when his technicians made them in bronze or marble. They lost the immediacy and relief that Préault's sculptures retained and, consequently, lost their expressivity and the effect of coloring that Carpeaux favored. Such difference is exemplified in the plaster sketch that Carpeaux made of his

---

304 "...Il importe de signaler une particularité des études de Carpeaux...je veux parler du don de la couleur...La science qu'il apportait au calcul des lumières, des demi-teintes et des ombres, c'est-à-dire de la couleur en ses compositions modelées, est un des éléments qui concourent avec le plus de force à leur donner cette émotion, ce "frémissement -- ce mot est de lui-- qui les animent...Tel est par exemple le procédé du “modelé à la boulette”, qui, multipliant à l'infini sur toutes l'étendue des parties lisses d'insensibles aspérités, y accroche et retient la lumière et lui donne une vibration perceptible à l'œil, comme une simulation de mouvement. On remarquera combien ce procédé est voisin de celui d'Eugène Delacroix...” Ernest Chesneau. Le Statuaire J. B. Carpeaux: sa vie et son œuvre. Paris: A. Quantin, Imprimeur-Éditeur, 1880, 126-127.
Chinese Man, which was made in bronze, showing an evident loss of tactility (figs. 4.10 and 4.11).

The discovery of traces of colored paint on Ancient Greek statues had raised questions of aestheticism among Institute members. The consensus remained that sculptures were to be carved out of white plaster or marble, or cast in bronze. David d’Angers was against the coloring of sculpture. He noted:

Unlike painting, sculpture cannot pretend to be a trompe-l'oeil, and a statue, regardless of how well it may be painted, would be no less horrifying because of its immobility, and would contrast in an absurd and frightening way with nature...To perfectly understand how crude colored sculpture would be is to see those heads exhibited in the windows of hairdressers. They have the color of life, natural hair, pupils that look without seeing; it is horrible. We will never, through the application of colors on a form on relief, give the transparency of skin that man receives from life.


David d’Angers clearly stated his alignment with the Academy. Sculpture, an elevated art form, had its nobility lowered by the use of color, which turned it into a popular and lowly style that resembled lifeless mannequins. Even though Daumier did not include actual hair, or fake pupils, he nonetheless painted the eyes on some of the busts, including those of Philipon, which were painted blue. Daumier used paint directly on his busts; he showed a clear shift by turning sculpture into a plebeian genre and showed complete carelessness vis-à-vis artistic decorum. Indeed, Daumier’s colorings were finishing touches that could be compared to an antithesis of Academic values of the polished and smoothed out surfaces that sculptors wanted to obtain. Daumier was able to express artistic license because his sculpted busts were made for a very restricted audience.

To this day, the precise dating of Daumier's series remains unknown, although the majority of lithographs based on the busts were published when Philipon was released from jail in early 1833. Philipon openly announced to his subscribers that the commission was completed and that their lithographic counterparts resembled the portraits of the Célébrités du Juste-Milieu. Philipon writes:

> The chamber of sell-outs will have the honors tied to its incorruptibility... to illustrate it, la Caricature shows sporadically portraits that will be long remembered because they are as accurate as it is possible to make them from the top of the rostrum where they have placed the journalists. These portraits will help our nephews understand the intelligence of the epoch: the laws of our times are in perfect rapport with the heads of the legislators. Take a look! 307

This 1833 announcement differed from Philipon’s first description of 1832. The lithographic portrait-caricatures made from the sculpted series of the *Célébrités du Juste-Milieu* were now advertised as done directly from life. The second announcement coincided with the publication of the majority of Daumier’s lithographs, which he based from his busts. This radical change was likely made out of fear of judicial prosecution. In fact, an artistic disjunction is evident in Daumier’s lithographs made from the busts instead of portraits made from life. In the bust series, Daumier gives as much importance to the modeling of physiognomies as to the costumes and represents herm busts, Florentine shapes or *à la française* curved shapes. However, when Daumier represents the busts in two dimensions, he invariably ends them with unfinished dark contour lines to imply continuity to the lower torso. As a result, Daumier’s lithographs of the sculpted caricatural-portraits do not appear to be made from sculptures, despite their distinctive three-dimensional qualities. Instead, the drawings seem to be made from life, as Daumier would have witnessed the deputies during a session at the Chamber. His technique follows the conventional lithographic portraiture. However, it is probable that Daumier used this method to disguise the fact that the two-dimensional caricatures were, in fact, based on three-dimension busts made for his own reference purposes.

Philipon was subjected to multiple fines and condemnations on a regular basis from the censorship office. He was also privy to occasional judicial visits at the publishing house. It is, thus, unlikely that he kept the series at La Maison Aubert. Just as Dantan-Jeune remained secretive on his caricatural busts of *Charles X*, which were nonetheless printed in lithographic form, Philipon likely followed a similar cautious path. Clearly, Philipon kept the series hidden from the authorities and from the general public,
as no contemporaries mentioned their existence. Philipon purchased Daumier’s busts once he did not need them as reference. The mention of the Célébrités du Juste-Milieu is only referred in passing in the Goncourt brothers’ Mémoires Littéraires, which were published twenty years later.\textsuperscript{308} Despite a series of photographs taken of a small number of Daumier’s busts in 1861, the series remained unknown to most artists and the general public until his first retrospective in 1878.

\textsuperscript{308} In 1861, the series was in the possession of Charles Philipon’s adoptive son who photographed thirty-four busts divided in six sheets. For more information, see Édouard Papet. Les Célébrités du Juste milieu: 1832-1835. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2005, 25-29. The exhibition was, by all accounts, a failure both financially and with the public. For an insightful analysis on the “constructed” reputation of Daumier and information regarding the 1878 exhibition, see Michel Melot. “Daumier and Art History.” Oxford Art Journal. 11.1. 1988, 3-20.
CHAPTER 5: PHRENOLOGY AND PHYSIOGNOMY IN SCULPTED PORTRAITURE AND CARICATURE

A. The “pseudo-sciences” of phrenology and physiognomy for modern sculpture

Which sculptor will fail to understand that with phrenology he becomes capable of grasping with one glance the nature of one’s character? Would his tool carve the forehead of Apollo onto Hercules’s: with benevolence instead of malevolence? …phrenology acknowledges an intimate tie between the typical demeanors of individuals and their predominant faculties and proclivities…As such, all of the arts that are made to revive man in the eyes of another man need phrenology, and from now on cannot do without. 309

The theory of phrenology was laid out by German physicians Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828) and Johann Gaspar Spurzheim (1776–1832), who posited a correspondence between the external form of the human skull and the shape of the brain, which housed the “organ of the soul” where all moral and intellectual faculties, as well as sentiments and moods, originate.310 Dr. Gall introduced phrenology – which he described as “an

310 For an in-depth treatment of phrenology, see Marc Renneville, Le Langage des crânes: Une Histoire de la phrénologie (Paris: Sanofi-Synthélabo, Collection les empêcheurs de penser en rond,
instrument of happiness and well-being for society” – to Parisian circles in 1808. It became an accepted science in 1830, amid the more liberal environment that accompanied the onset of Louis-Philippe’s reforms. The following year saw the opening of the Société Phrénologique de Paris. While its membership was initially composed largely of prominent physicians, the Society soon expanded to include politicians, scientists, and artists. In 1831, founders of the Phrenology Society promoted their field as an essential artistic tool, alongside its other cultural and social benefits, in a widely distributed pamphlet. In this pamphlet, the Society argued that the accurate representation of a subject’s external characteristics allowed the viewer to understand the inner nature of the subject, which, in turn, made a work of art more accessible.

Phrenology was described as especially important for sculptors, as their three-dimensional medium would enable them to arrive at the most comprehensive, and therefore, most accurate reading of a sitter’s internal nature. The Society’s founders also described phrenology as an important tool for painters who wished to study the correlation between inner character and physical makeup; they even went so far as to question the works of artists who did not apply phrenology to their subjects. Daumier, David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune and Préault were known to have used either of the two “sciences” that claimed that a person’s nature could be discerned from his/her physical makeup and outward appearance: phrenology from the shape of a person’s skull, physiognomy from his/her facial expressions and demeanor.


311 Prior to that point, phrenology was considered a pseudo-science. It is regarded as such today.
Physiognomy is a much older science than phrenology. Unlike phrenology, physiognomy had been part of the training at the French Royal Academy and the École des Beaux-Arts since the seventeenth century. Academic artists followed the physiognomic theories formulated by Charles Le Brun, who classified men into types according to facial and bodily expressions, which he concluded were external marks left by their passions. Like Aristotle before him, Le Brun based his physiognomic theories on the concordances between animal and human characteristics, which were visible in the external features of the human face. By the nineteenth century, the physiognomic theories of the Swiss theologist and physiognomist Johann Caspar Lavater (1741–1801) had replaced those of Le Brun. Lavater explained:

Taken in its most extensive sense, I use the word physiognomy to signify the exterior, or surfaces of man, in motion or at rest, whether viewed in the original or by portrait. Physiognomy is the science or knowledge of the correspondence between the external and internal man, what is on the surface and the invisible contents. Physiognomy may be divided into the various parts, or views under which man may be considered; that is to say, into the animal, the moral, and the intellectual.\(^{312}\)

Unlike Lebrun, Lavater studied man in a state of motion and rest instead of in intense emotional states. Whereas Le Brun believed that a person was born with unique facial features which were external marks of his/her nature, Lavater argued that repeated

\(^{312}\) Man was thus constituted of three interconnected parts, which were visible in the facial and physical features of every individual. Even though humans incorporated all three elements, they differed from the lower realm of animals because they could stand erect, because of the multiple motions they were able to perform, and because of their moral and intellectual properties, which left external marks on their physiological (or animal) parts. Lavater believed that only the noblest qualities found in the animal kingdom, such as strength, should be compared to human characteristics, effectively subjugating brutish instincts, which in turn elevated the dignity of men. Johann Caspar Lavater, *Essays on Physiognomy: For the Promotion of the Knowledge and the Love of Mankind*, vol. I. trans. Thomas Holcroft. London: C. Whittingham, 1804, 19 and 13.
expressions left indelible marks on a person’s face, which in time became external signs of his/her temperament.

B. Daumier: physiognomy and phrenology in the *Célébrités du Juste-Milieu*

Daumier used phrenology and physiognomy to fashion the series of sculpted caricatural busts of the *Célébrités du Juste Milieu* and their lithographic counterparts. These pseudo-sciences were a means to convey the moral, intellectual, and animal-like characteristics of his models to the readers of *La Caricature* and *Le Charivari*. The caricature of André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin (called Dupin aîné; 1783-1865; fig. 5.1) exemplifies both phrenology and physiognomy to reveal his brutish manner and ill-tempered personality. Dupin was a lawyer of the court and president of the Chamber of Deputies where he was reputed as the most influential man. He was known for his cynical self-preservation instincts, which led Victor Du Bled to characterize him as “cet homme kaleidoscope” (this kaleidoscope-man) who refused to be associated with any political party, despite his well-known allegiance to Louis-Philippe. Du Bled observed:

M. Dupin never wished to be associated with any political party…
One must admit that he was ill-suited to govern, being too blunt and rough, hardly malleable, sometimes even ruder for effect than in his actual personality… He could never resist the pleasure of uttering a witty remark, and his infamous cutting wit made him a multitude of enemies…He was the true embodiment of the French bourgeoisie…

---

Dupin was also famous for both his eloquence and, even more so, for his sarcastic comments and acute sense of repartee, which made him enemies both within and outside of the Chamber. Daumier most likely witnessed Dupin pontificating to the Chamber’s assembly, with his impatient gestures and callous expressions, from an area set aside for journalists. A contemporary, Gustave Claudin (1823-1896), described Dupin in following terms:

Mr. Dupin was ugly. He wore his white hair pulled back at the temples. He wore silver-rimmed spectacles. His bulbous nose resembled a truffle. His flatterers pretended that bumps beneath his skin were signs of intelligence and thinking process ... Those were parts of his ridicule; yet, he was a scholar, a jurist of the first order, a talented lawyer who defended famous cases, a tireless worker, and a member of the French Academy.314

Daumier sculpted Dupin's bust before he went to jail for the defamation of Louis Philippe. In the caricatural bust, the artist represents the lawyer in the act of speechifying. The head is made of chunks of clay that Daumier has added to a sturdy Florentine-shaped bust covered by a lawyer’s robe that Dupin wore in Court and at the Chamber. Daumier

lack of political integrity was well-known among journalists of the time. He refused to sign his name to the Protestant des journalistes, written on July 27, 1830, in response to King Charles X’s reinstatement of press censorship. The ordinances of 1830 were written on the order of King Charles X. They stipulated: “La liberté de la presse est suspendue... En conséquence, nul journal et écrit périodique ou semi-périodique, établi ou à établir, sans distinction des matières qui y seront traitées, ne pourra paraître, soit a Paris, soit dans les départements, qu’en vertu de l’autorisation qu’en auront obtenue de nous séparément les auteurs et imprimeurs.” The written protestation of journalists from the Globe, Constitutionnel, and Figaro, among many others, engendered the three days of Revolution that toppled the reign of Charles X. Armand Dayot. Journées révolutionnaires, 1830–1848. Paris: Ernest Flammarion, 1897, 102 and 106.

caricatured *Dupin* with a long nose that ends in a square, yet does not include the smallpox marks that made it resemble a truffle. Indeed, he neglects to portray the marks that covered *Dupin’s* face, and focuses on the lawyer’s cranial and facial structures. From a frontal view, the head is shaped in the form of a rhombus that results in the appearance of a narrow forehead and chin, and wide cheekbones that blend with large ears. The caved-in cheeks accentuate the oval gap of *Dupin’s* opened mouth, which echoes deeply carved sockets that form strong shadows on two sunken beady eyes. *Dupin’s* physiognomy is made of protruding areas from thick facial bones, which contrast with hollow parts that are sculpted in deep crevices by his nose and lower cheeks, and in-between his thick lower lip and chin. The forehead forms a concave shape between projecting eyebrows that end in two abrupt cuts at the temporal bones. Daumier has not defined the modeling of the ears, which appear as two protruding oval shapes that blend with the wide cheeks. In the center of the ears, he has rudimentarily carved out the clay to represent deep and uneven holes. His short dark hair is combed forward and is flattened upon the head except for a small tuft that flares and darkens the hollow part of his forehead. Daumier does not include the thick sideburns that ended on *Dupin’s* lower cheeks. This omission results in a focus on the scale of his deformed cheeks and ears.

From the side, the caricature resembles a combination of different facets made of bumps, holes, grooves, and protuberances. *Dupin’s* physiognomic discordance is especially visible in the lithograph that Daumier made of the sculpted bust (fig. 5.2). He has used strong contrasts of dark and light areas to emphasize specific areas of *Dupin’s* facial structure. The temples, lower cheeks and prominent jaw are highlighted as a space between his eyebrows that give *Dupin* a foreboding look. Daumier uses the darkest tones
under the eyes and near the orbits to convey the hollow shape of a skull. Other dark shades amplify *Dupin’s* deep and large nostrils, the gaping hole in his huge mouth, and his sideburns and hair. The contrast between extreme white and black areas is in stark contrast to the use of conventional crosshatching drawing which emphasized a smooth and continuous blending. As a result, the lithograph has the sculptural quality of the bust. Daumier has nonetheless made aesthetic changes. Instead of faithfully copying *Dupin’s* bust, he adds the silver framed glasses that Dupin wore. The lenses reflect the light and conceal his eyes. Instead, Daumier shifts the attention to his dark eyebrows, which in physiognomy indicates a choleric temperament. He also adds thick sideburns and draws the ears with more refinement. In both depictions, Daumier shows his interest in phrenology and physiognomy, though the two-dimensional lithograph gives richer details.

Daumier’s two distinct versions of *Dupin* reveal the subject's moral character through the use of both pseudo-sciences. Dupin had *loupes*, interpreted as signs of his learned nature and deep thinking process, even though they were just small cystic tumors that played no part in an individual’s intelligence. Physiognomists and phrenologists concurred that the shape of the forehead was the central feature in revealing the intelligence of a person. A large and convex forehead revealed an acute degree of reasoning and introspection. Instead, Daumier's *Dupin* has a concave and smaller forehead than average. Physician and phrenologist Isidore Bourdon noted that the shape of the forehead separated humans from animals:

> The lower part of the brain, which corresponds to the forehead, does not exist or is barely developed in animals: here are the organs of elevated intellectual faculties, an exclusive ability of man; so animals do not have foreheads. In some monkeys,
however, it begins to appear... Without the forehead, the human face would be without its reflective character and its majesty. Regardless of the shape and facial expression, if the forehead is wide and high, man always has an intelligent physiognomy... A narrow forehead, low and receding, announces a man without imagination, without the capacity to judge, almost always incapable of high thoughts and great deeds...we can say with much accuracy that these men are narrow-minded, ungrateful, and short-sighted.315

Daumier’s caricatures of Dupin conveyed his lack of intelligence and likened him to an ape, a comparison that Gustave Geffroy (1855-1926) made when describing the bust of Dupin as a gorilla, “He is all mouth, an enormous beefy and gaping mouth that came forward, a heavy chin crowned by a low forehead, a pointed skull garnished by two huge ears... the terrifying and horrible Dupin, just like a gorilla dressed up in the guise of a magistrate”.316 In addition, Daumier’s portrayals of Dupin also featured the physiognomic characteristics of a choleric and bilious temperament, which Bourdon

315 “La partie antérieure du cerveau, celle qui correspond au front, n’existe pas ou est à peine développée chez les animaux: c’est là que sont les organes des hautes facultés intellectuelles, exclusive apanage de l’homme; aussi les animaux n’ont-ils pas de fronts. Chez quelques singes, cependant, il commence à paraître…Sans le front, la face humaine serait destituée de son caractère de réflexion et de majesté. Quelques que soient, d’ailleurs, la forme et l’expression du visage; si le front est large, s’il est élevé, l’homme ainsi fait aura toujours une physionomie intelligente…Un front étroit, bas, et fuyant en arrière, annonce un homme sans imagination, sans jugement, incapable presque toujours de hautes pensées et de grandes actions…on peut dire avec une grande justesse que ce sont des esprits étroits, ingrats, et à vue courte.” For more information, see Isidore Bourdon, La Physiognomonie et la phrénologie ou connaissance des hommes d’après les traits du visage et les reliefs du crane. Paris: Librairie de Charles Gosselin, 1842, 189-191.

316 “tout en bouche, une énorme bouche qui s’avance charmue et béante, un bas de visage lourd surmonté d’un front bas, d’un crâne pointu accolé de vastes oreilles…l’éffrayant et horrible Dupin, pareil à un gorille déguisé en magistrat.” Gustave Geffroy. “Daumier sculpteur.” L’Art et les artistes. Vol. I. (April–September 1905), 105 and 108. Dup…was published in La Caricature. (June 14, 1832). Politician and historian Louis Blanc (1811-1882) noted, “De ces hommes le plus influent était M. Dupin aîné… la majorité de la Chambre aimait dans M. Dupin aîné un geste impatient, des mouvements brusques, une rusticité pleine de rancor, une figure expressive et dure, une éloquence dont rien ne modérait l’aprétem.” (Of all of these men, the most influential was M. Dupin the Elder... The majority of the Chamber appreciated M. Dupin’s impatient and sudden gestures, his rusticity filled with rancor, his expressive and tough physiognomy, and the harshness of his eloquence that nothing could tame.) Louis Blanc. Histoire de dix ans, 1830–1840, vol. II. Paris: Pagnerre, Editeur, 1844, 298.
associated with the physical traits of hardened features, razor-sharp eyes, and a lower lip protruding over the upper lip – signs he associated with disdain and pride.  

Dupin was in his early fifties when he was portrayed by Daumier for La Caricature. The virulence with which Daumier caricatured his prey certainly makes the bust one of the most successful of the Celebrities of the Juste Milieu series. It includes Romantic elements, such as quick and rough modeling, contemporary clothing, and the exaggeration of facial features, which result in the representation of ugliness, giving it a grotesque quality. Clearly, Daumier was already pointing the way towards the expressivity seen in his art later in the century. He represented his models as he observed them, portraying and exaggerating their imperfections, weaknesses, and various flaws.

Daumier’s sculpted bust and lithograph of Dupin were unlike any other painting and portrait busts of the lawyer-politician. They embodied the frighteningly dark side of Dupin’s moral failures through his physical flaws and exhibited what Daumier and his friends saw as the true nature of Dupin, whom even King Louis-Philippe feared. Yet, Daumier’s caricature of Dupin is a closer resemblance to the lawyer than other artists who minimized his ugliness. In the late 1850s, André Adolphe Eugène Disderi (1819-1889) photographed Dupin in two portraits (Figs. 5.3 and 5.4) that share similarities with

---

317 “Les traits du bilieux sont prononcés et durs, ses yeux vifs, son regard assuré, sa lèvre inférieure souvent plus avancée que la supérieure: et tout cela exprime du dédain et de la fierté... Presque jamais, parmi les hommes de ce tempérament, vous n’observerez de physionomie gracieuse et calme, rarement un visage ouvert et prévenant ; l’expression la plus ordinaire de leur figure est l’assurance et la fermeté, quelquefois aussi la rudesse et la violence.” (The physical traits of the choleric type are deeply pronounced and rough, his eyes sharp, his gaze self-confident; a protruding lower lip that is often more pronounced than the upper: All of this expresses a disdainful and proud nature... Rarely among these men will you ever observe a graceful and calm physiognomy, a welcoming and caring face; their most typical characteristics are self-confidence and resoluteness, and from time to time, crudeness and violence.) For more information on the bilious nature, see Isidore Bourdon, La Physiognomonie et la phrénologie ou connaissance des hommes d'après les traits du visage et les reliefs du crane. Paris: Librairie de Charles Gosselin, 1842, 93.
Daumier’s caricatures. The close-up photograph captures Dupin in a defiant stare as he looks from the side with cunning eyes. The commonalities between Daumier’s caricatures and Disderi’s portrait are stunning. The crevices, bumps, deep-set eyes, protruding chin, and deep groove under the lower lip that Daumier already observed in 1832 have become pronounced with time. Daumier shared with the readers of *La Caricature* an early preview of Dupin’s facial features. A quarter century later, the caricature appeared as a resembling portrayal of Dupin. It is no wonder that Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) praised Daumier as both a portraitist and a physiognomist: “The artist displayed a wonderful understanding of portraiture…Daumier had, at one and the same time, the suppleness of an artist and the accuracy of a Lavater.”

C. David d’Angers: physiognomy at the service of beautification

There are two ways to augment the strength of a human face. The first consists of exaggerating flaws: caricature is then born, which the Greeks repudiated with so much passion. The second is based on the accentuation of significant aspects of the moral greatness of the model. In that case, it is befitting to soften flaws; it does not mean that form is changed but that there is an interpretation of nature. It remains in the same range, but the notes that correspond to the distinguished traits of the face are forcefully expressed,

---

318 For an illustration of Disderi’s photography drawn by Étienne Bocourt’s (b. 1821) and for a concise, yet revealing, biography on Dupin, see Anonymous. “Chronique du mois. M. Dupin.” *Musée des familles: lectures du soir*. Vol.33. (January 1866). Paris: Bureaux de l’Administration, 1865-1866, 94-96. The full-length photograph shows Dupin from afar. His features are discernibly ugly and harsh, yet, he has an imposing presence as he sits cross-legged on an overly regal chair with his right hand placed on an ornate desk.

while the defective details are veiled by the hand of the sculptor.

David d’Angers was a proponent of the theories of Lavater and became a member of the Société Phrénologique de Paris in 1831. He did not want to exaggerate his sitters’ flaws because doing so would give them caricatural features. Instead he used his knowledge of physiognomy and phrenology to emphasize the moral traits of his sitters. Between 1827 and 1828, David d’Angers portrayed Dupin three times. In 1827, he received a commission for low-reliefs commemorating the political highlights of a stern proponent of democracy, General Maximillien Foy (1775-1825). Two reliefs included Dupin in profile. In Le Général Foy à la chambre des députés (General Foy at the Deputy Chamber; fig. 5.5), the artist represents key political figures including Dupin who looks

____________________________________________________________________________________

320 “Il y a deux moyens d’accroître la puissance du visage humain. Le premier consiste à outrer les défauts ; alors nait la caricature, que les Grecs répudiaient avec tant d’énergie. Le second repose sur l’accentuation des formes significatives de la grandeur morale du sujet. Il convient dans ce cas d’adoucir les défauts ; la forme n’est pas changée pour cela mais il y a interprétation de la nature. C’est toujours la même gamme, mais les notes qui correspondent aux traits distingués de la face sont données avec force, tandis que les points défectueux sont voilés par le doigté du statuaire.” Henry Jouin. David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains. Vol. II. Paris : E. Plon et Cie, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1878, 85.

321 During the Restoration, a royalist questioned General Foy’s view on aristocracy. He answered to the Deputy: “Nous appelons aristocratie au XIXème siècle la ligue et coalition des hommes qui veulent consommer sans produire, vivre sans travailler, tout savoir sans avoir rien appris, envahir tous les honneurs sans les avoir mérités, occuper toutes les places sans être en état d’en remplir aucune. Voilà l’aristocratie!” Quoted in André Dupin. Constitution de la République française. Paris: Videcoq Fils Ainé, Éditeur, 1849, 25. A national subscription was opened to make a funerary monument for the tomb of General Foy at the cemetery of Père-Lachaise. In 1826, architect Léon Vaudoyer the younger (1803-1872) won the commission and David d’Angers was selected to make low-reliefs for the monument as well as a standing statue of General Foy to be placed on the monument. David d’Angers made the sculpture in larger dimensions than originally commissioned, leading Vaudoyer’s father to complain about David d’Angers’ practice. He wrote, “C’est la manie de tous les statuaires, et David en convient. M. Lebas me dit que par ce despotisme colossal, MM. les sculpteurs tuent notre architecture...” (It is the obsession of all sculptors, including David. Mr. Lebas tells me that with this colossal despotism, sculptors are killing our architecture.) Charles Blanc. Les artistes de mon temps. Paris: Librairie Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1876, 228. For a detailed analysis of the Monument to Général Foy, see Jacques de Caso. David d’Angers. Sculptural Communication in the Age of Romanticism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988, 95-112.
directly at the General. D’Angers portrayed Dupin in profile with a sharp contour on his nose that shows an unbroken diagonal and conveys nobility with his head facing up. His gaze is intensified by a deep shadow from the prominent bone structure of the eyebrow and his hair flows on top of his large forehead. His closed mouth curves downward, yet he appears to be listening to General Foy with a faint smile.

In the second low-relief, Les Funérailles du Général Foy (The Funerals of General Foy; fig. 5.6), David d’Angers represents Dupin at the head of a procession of friends, colleagues, and family members. Unlike other mourners, Dupin holds his head up high to show his stern nature. Distinct from Dupin, David d’Angers has represented himself as one of the pall-bearers. His subordination and admiration for the lawyer-deputy is unequivocal: David d’Angers is looking up at Dupin. He represents Dupin with different features than in the previous low-relief, choosing not to idealize his facial features. Instead, the subject's forehead recedes, his nose has a pronounced curve, and his nostrils are flaring. His high cheekbones are fuller and lower jaw protrudes drastically. It is as if the two different sides of Dupin belong to two different men. Perhaps, David d’Angers' more realistic depiction of Dupin at the funeral is made to suggest his humanity at the loss of a close friend.

David d’Angers never made a portrait-bust of Dupin, who was considered too ugly by some, for sculptural commemoration. However, Rude made a Buste de M. Dupin that he showed at the Salon of 1838 (fig. 5.7).322 Similarly to his Buste de Louis David, Rude sculpted Dupin in a realistic style. The bust was not a commission but the result of

a dare: Rude was with sculptors, one of whom stated: "There are faces....that a sculptor who loves his art would refuse at any cost...Would you accept, for example, to sculpt the bust of Dupin aîné?" The sculptor took the dare, as he believed that no one was too ugly to be represented in a sculpted bust. Rude draped Dupin in a large overcoat of sheared lamb and an opened shirt that shows a thick neck. His head is turned to the side and he looks with a piercing gaze under thick and brow lines that form deep furrows on a long, round nose. *Dupin* has a protruding square jaw that supports his large mouth and his full lips are partly opened as if ready for a rebuttal at the tribune. Long parallel lines on his forehead mark his intensity and alert nature. Rude has successfully portrayed a notoriously ugly sitter as a man whose physiognomy seems to disappear because of his imposing stature. Dupin’s ugliness recalls that of the frequently portrayed Mirabeau. It was said that Mirabeau’s ugliness disappeared as soon as he spoke. Dupin had the same ability. A nemesis of his conceded this gift and described Dupin, "His face is scarred, spotted, cut, wrinkled, but when this physiognomy is moving, when passion animates it, when pleading contracts it, it lacks neither elevation nor nobility. His hollow eyes spark with fire and they shine in the depth of their sockets like two small diamonds, and truly, I do not call that an ugly man."

David d’Angers made a medallion of *Dupin* in 1828 (fig. 5.8). That year, the sculptor received a commission for a *Buste de Jean Rouvet*, a native of Dupin’s province.

---


In the sixteenth century, Rouvet invented a method for transporting timber via waterways. Ever since 1822, Dupin had wanted to commemorate the inventor. In 1828, Dupin took full initiative for the subscription, which he gave to David d’Angers. The sculptor lacked physiognomic references to portray Rouvet and in addition, the subscription was poorly funded. To resolve these problems, David d’Angers and Dupin chose a herm bust of Napoléon 1er that the sculptor had in his atelier. The bust was unveiled as that of Rouvet despite the fact that it represented Napoleon.325 Perhaps David d’Angers made Dupin’s medallion to recognize his help in securing the commission.

The medallion of Dupin is directly based on the profile that David d’Angers made for the low-relief of General Foy at the Chamber of Deputy.326 This decision indicates that David d’Angers wanted to propagate an idealized version of Dupin instead of the second version, which would have resulted in a more realistic, yet far less attractive portrayal. David d’Angers added creases on Dupin’s forehead to emphasize his thinking process, and thus manipulated the image that he wanted to spread with the help of physiognomy. In 1843, Édouard Hocquart (b. 1795) analyzed the facial characteristics of Dupin. The physiognomist wrote, "Here is a harsh and severe physiognomy...There is something abrupt in the shape of the nose and in the eyebrows, which are aligned with

---


326 In 1820, Dupin had already been the subject of a commemorative medal. François-Augustin Caunois (1787-1829) represented him in a left side profile. The medal was made to honor Dupin for his services in the defense of political dissidents. He is represented with the robe that he wore in court. A second medal made by Galle in 1839. It is based on the Buste de André Dupin that Rude exhibited at the Salon of 1838. Houzelot made a third medal to commemorate the election of Dupin. For more information, see Georges de Soultrait (Comte). Essai sur la numismatique nivernaise. Paris: Rollin, rue Vivienne, 1854, 210-212.
the mouth and the eyes...This well rounded forehead announces memory, a methodical mind, wise and sound, rather than a vast mind animated by a brilliant imagination." 327 Hocquard’s manual interpreted the physiognomy of Dupin based on his reputation. Indeed, when facing a contradiction to Dupin’s supposed moral rectitude, Hocquart skewed the meaning of his facial flaws, turning them into qualities more fitting of Dupin’s public image. Experts and artists alike interpreted the “science” of physiognomy according to their purposes. Clearly, caricaturists interpreted the temperament of their sitters with greater truth than formal counterparts with the help of physiognomy and phrenology.

D. Phrenology and David d’Angers’ Romantic portraiture

David d’Angers was a member of the Société Phrénologique de Paris since its inception. He believed that phrenology was an indispensable tool for sculptors to express the inner nature that resulted in physiognomic characteristics on a model’s face. Phrenology completed the older theories of physiognomy solely based on observation. In addition, it was a useful “science” for modern sculpture because artists could attempt to extract the inner nature of sitters for the education of the audience. David d’Angers noted:

327 “Voici une physionomie rude et sévère...il y a quelque chose d’abrupte dans la forme de ce nez et de ces sourcils avec lesquels s’harmonisent la bouche et les yeux...Ce front bien vouté annonce de la mémoire, un esprit méthodique, sage et judicieux, plutôt qu’un esprit vaste et animé par une brillante imagination.” Édouard Hocquart. Physionomies des hommes politiques du jour: jugés d’après le système de Lavater. Paris: A. Royer, Éditeur, 1843, 154.
Phrenology is a science indispensable to the artist. Phrenology allows us to observe on the skull the distinctive qualities of an individual, which are reflected on that individual's the facial features. The face is the mirror of the faculty of man. It is important that [the sculptor] make salient the monumental structure of a human being in order to help the viewer create an impression of who he sees. Once done, the sculptor will express the almost imperceptible nuances that are like the prism of passions and which give a physiognomy a je ne sais quoi of mystery that only the souls of artists can feel. Here is a tremendous task that modern art is meant to discover.328

Members of the Société Phrénologique de Paris promoted Dr. Gall’s discovery for a better understanding of human nature. The crowning achievement of the Society was its museum. Inaugurated in early 1836, Le Musée de la Société Phrénologique de Paris included a collection of over four hundred skulls and reference books available to men “who had a noble enthusiasm and respect for the truth, which led into the mysterious roads of the interpretation of man’s moral and intellectual nature.”329 Conferences were offered for learned men, among them religious figures considered “moralists”, philanthropists, writers, and artists. Demonstrations of phrenology were offered to others who “had studied the science but were unable to apply its methods successfully, despite having studied the books by Gall and Spurzheim.”330

328 “La phrénologie est une science indispensable à l’artiste. C’est la phrénologie qui permet de discerner sur le crâne de l’individu les qualités distinctive dont les traits de la face sont la résultante. La face est le miroir de la faculté de l’homme. Il est important de rendre saillante la structure monumentale de l’être, afin de faire penser le spectateur en l’impressionnant fortement. Cela fait, le statuaire exprimera les nuances presque insaisissables qui sont comme le prisme des passions et répandent sur une physionomie je ne sais quoi de mystérieux que seules les âmes d’artistes peuvent sentir. C’est là une carrière immense que l’art moderne est appelé à découvrir.” Pierre-Jean David d’Angers. David d’Angers, sa vie, son œuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains. Vol. I. Paris: E. Plon et cie, 1878, 234


330 “Pour ceux qui ont étudié les éléments de la phrénологии mais qui ne peuvent en faire des applications exactes parce qu’ils n’ont pu être dirigé jusqu’à présent dans leurs études, et qu’ils n’ont pu trouver dans les livres de Gall et de Spurzheim les règles de la pratique et les moyens
In 1831, David d’Angers made a plaster Buste de Niccolò Paganini, which exemplified his dedication to the use of phrenology in the art of sculpted portraiture (fig. 5.9). That year, Royal Opera Director Véron invited the Italian violinist to perform for a series of concerts where, "The elite of the aristocracy, the flower of dilettantism, all the artists, all the dandies, all the foreigners of distinction had planned to meet". Paganini was already known to the Parisian elite, who had followed his musical exploits for years. He traveled through Europe for concerts and his exceptional abilities often resulted in calumnies because listeners were unable to explain his musical virtuosity. Tales of murder and a pact with the Devil preceded Paganini’s arrival in Paris. Paganini was believed to have murdered his mistress in a fit of jealousy, and spent eight years in jail where he was allowed to keep his violin. All but one string wore out and guards refused to replace them. As a result, Paganini could play with one string. The bizarre sounds that he was able to produce were explained by his allegiance to diabolical forces.

Prior to the violinist's sojourn, musical critic François-Joseph Fétis (1784-1871) belied the rumors when writing, "The marvelous and the bizarre is always mingled with
what is published on the lives of great artists and geniuses”. Fétis was, thus, anticipating the public’s incomprehension when confronted with exceptional talent. Paganini’s sublime gift provoked both an irrational fear and delight in the general audience. Paganini’s first concert was, by all accounts, wondrous. Fétis reviewed the première in *La Revue de Paris*, where he describes Paganini’s music as awe inspiring and supernatural. Despite Fétis’ logical explanation of Paganini’s prowess as a result of hard work and constant practice, rumors continued to spread. Fétis described the human side of Paganini, yet he also expressed bafflement toward his extraordinary musical prowess. Paganini’s unusual physiognomy and his taciturnity added to the mystery surrounding him. The rumors enhanced public interest, yet sealed his reputation as an out-of-the-ordinary creature.

Gustave Planche reviewed the Salon of 1831, where portraits were exhibited *ad nauseam*. He regretted that David d’Angers did not show his *Buste de Paganini*, which he had admired in his atelier. Planche noted, “The Bust of Goethe has been shipped to Weimar; the marble bust of Paganini has not yet been started: we would have liked to see at least the plaster model”. In 1833, Planche reiterated his wish in his review of the

---


333 In following with the Burkian concept of the “Sublime” as an response of awe and terror when confronted - from a safe distance- to an object (or subject) that can cause pain or pauses a danger, Paganini embodied a combination of the sublime and the ugly because he combined qualities that repulsed and generated a “strong terror” on the audience who was placed far enough from the stage to feel directly threatened by the violinist. 226. Edmund Burke. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1759, 58-60 and 226.

Salon: "We feel that we must publicly invite him to send his statues at the Louvre...and the multiple busts in his atelier: Paganini, Boulay de la Meurthe, George Cuvier, etc." 335 David d’Angers finished the bust of *Paganini* after the official opening, but new regulations and the jury rejected the late submission.

David d’Angers was unable to show the bust – supposedly in marble – in 1833 due to a new regulation that forbade late entries for artistic equity. Consequently, David d’Angers had to wait until the Salon of 1834 to show the bust to the public. Between 1831 and 1833, David d’Angers decided to make the bust of *Paganini* in bronze instead of marble (fig.5.10). The difference between the two mediums is significant. Romantic sculptors preferred the dark tonality of bronze to the lightness of marble. Indeed, bronze accentuates deep shadows in crevices and highlights sharp ruptures that enliven portraits through the interaction of contrasting shades of dark and light. White marble and plaster, with their ability to show the clarity of clean contours, are better suited for a finished and smooth appearance. A block of marble free of natural veins was then considered preferable to accidental – yet natural – marks that disrupted the continuity of unbroken contours, and were a visual clue of moral purity and timelessness. Marble is an ideal material to convey the softness, transparency and pliancy of human skin, as reflected upon its polished surface. David d’Angers favored the use of French marble from the Pyrenees area, which had different veins and colorings than its Italian counterpart. His choice was not only artistic, but based on patriotic values: he wanted to support French

As with Planche’s 1831 Salon review, Jal also commented on David d’Angers’ missing bust of *Paganini* as the antidote for mediocre portraits of the violinist. After criticizing Édouard Henri Théophile Pingret’s (1788-1875) *Portrait de Paganini*, Jal concluded: “Mais M. Da vid, le statuaire habile, fait un buste de Paganini: ce grand musicien aura donc un portrait digne de lui!” David d’Angers was working on the *Buste de Paganini*, a work that equaled the artistic boldness of the *Buste de Goëthe* as a quintessential example of Romantic sculpted portraiture. Prior to the Salon of 1834, David d’Angers exhibited the majority of his works in plaster and, when possible, in marble. In fact, he compared the white color of marble to purity and the celestial, and noted that black was “une chose infernale” (an infernal thing) because it cancelled out light. However, he still produced a series of medallions in bronze, a choice likely based on practicality: medallions were to be handled or in prominent view. Consequently, they required a strong material, such as bronze, which was also simple to produce in large quantities. In addition, David d’Angers considered his medallions to be unfinished sketches, and thus did not require the polished surface of marble.

---

336 Under Louis XIV, Colbert protected and encouraged the development of French marble to concurrence Italian marbles that held the monopoly. However, the French Crown reserved exclusively the Pyrenean marble for its own use. At the beginning of the Restoration, developers asked for the protection of Louis XVIII and the desire to open a depot in Paris that would be available for sculptors working in official commissions. Ten years later, developers were still asking for the help of Charles X to promote and protect French marble. See letters, “Demande pour un dépôt à Paris des marbres français” (Mars 1818) and the petition signed by the Deputies of la Haute-Garonne (March 1828). Archives Nationales de Paris.


When the bust of Paganini was finally exhibited, art critic Sazerac questioned the
sanity of David d’Angers who had radically changed his style:

Where does Mr. David want to go? What evil spirit haunts him?
From what period is he? Of which period does he want to belong?
To which class does he belong or pretends to belong? His works
are a confusion of techniques, or rather he appears to have
forgotten all of them; those that science approves, that nature
orders ... You are falling into the absurd, you are touching a
complete decadence...to fit with the romantic school, you have
exaggerated all of its faults, to make them more palpable, more
ridiculous... Your Paganini is in bronze, in iron, in lead. Ah! you
never got us used to such disappointments...give up such
dangerous attempts, become once again what you were, what is
only up to you to still be!339

David d’Angers’ choice of medium for Paganini was thus clearly noted as a change in
his artistic direction. According to Sazerac, David d’Angers’ works contained idealism
based on Academic principles that were unleashed and produced incomprehensible
results that did not fit any artistic category. Yet, David d’Angers’ bust of Paganini is
truly Romantic through its choice of material, its expressivity and instability, its sketchy
and discordant contours, and its depiction of a melancholic sitter. In addition, David
d’Angers showed his contemporaneity through his dependence on the tenets of
physiognomy and, especially, phrenology.

339 “Où veut aller M. David? quel malin esprit l’obsède? de quel temps est-il? de quel temps veut-
il être? à quelle classe appartient-il ou prétend-il appartenir? Ses ouvrages sont la confusion de
tous les genres ou plutôt présentent l’oubli de tous; de ceux que la science approuve, de ceux que
la nature commande...Vous tombez dans l’absurde, vous touchez à une décadence complète...pour faire pièce à l’école romantique, vous avez exagéré tous ses défauts, afin de les
rendre plus palpables, plus ridicules...Votre Paganini est de bronze, est de fer, est de plomb. Ah!
Vous ne nous aviez pas habitués à de telles déceptions...renoncez à des essais si dangereux,
redevenez ce que vous avez été, ce qui ne tient qu’à vous d’être encore! “ Hilaire Léon Sazerac.
_Lettres sur le salon de 1834_. Paris: Chez Delaunay, Libraire, 1834, 351-353. For David d’Angers’
discussion on the two antithetic colors, see David d’Angers. _Les Carnets de David d’Angers_.Vol. I.
The bronze bust of Paganini is cut directly under the neck, as is Goethe’s bust. The thick lower base implies that it is made to be placed on a full-length statue. However, the busts differ at the base because David d’Angers included a small part of the violinist's upper torso. The piece is nonetheless made in a cylindrical shape and the frontal view gives an impression of stability. Paganini’s neck is elongated and strained, yet powerful and proportionate in relation to the face. The sculpted bust is made of large masses and deep crevices, resulting in a harmonious whole, despite the broken lines facing opposite directions on his face, long hair and neck. The difference between the bust of Paganini in plaster and the bronze version is striking. The agitation that contemporaries observed when Paganini played disappears in the white of plaster but is accentuated with the dark shade of bronze. David d’Angers represents Paganini with a manifestly large forehead on which deep creases parallel the shape of his eyebrows. In-between the eyes, he carves deep lines above a long deviated nose which leaves a dark shadow on his thin mouth. The lower lip is larger, and creates a shaded area on the small tuft of facial hair that Paganini wore right under the lip. His pointy chin is completely bare, yet a collar beard originates underneath it and covers the top part of his neck. His pose accentuates the tension of the neck, where veins and muscles expand on each side of a large Adam’s apple. On both sides of his face, curling sideburns and short strands of hair partially cover large ears and blend into the long cascading locks of hair that reach his shoulders. David d’Angers has sculpted short strands of hair on the top of his head, which enhances the height of the already larger-than-life portrait. Dark shadows from holes that David d’Angers carved in-between waves of hair allow the viewer to see through parts of the bust. Paganini’s hair does not cast shadows on the large forehead, which instead appears highlighted and acts
as a contrast to the hollowed-out temples on which the sculptor has molded bulging, zigzagging veins.

David d’Angers emphasized Paganini’s sunken features, with their bony structures made of depressions and phrenologic bumps. In an early essay on phrenology and the arts, Théophile Thoré observed, "on this wonderful artist's head of Paganini, there is a real and very prominent bump just above the external orbital angle: it is the organ of music." Indeed, David d’Angers has clearly delineated an elongated bump above Paganini’s eyebrow. In addition, he accentuates the area of “constructiveness”, which originates below the bump of music and forms a concave groove in the shape of a large teardrop. Paganini’s protruding eyebrow bones keep the light from reaching his almond-shaped eyes, which have an impenetrable gaze that appear to be turned slightly to the side. Indeed, Paganini appears engrossed by his music. David d’Angers does not need to represent the violin; instead he conveys his idea by lowering Paganini’s face on the left shoulder that typically held the instrument.

The tilted pose selected by that David d’Angers likely played a decisive part in his choice of bronze as a medium. From a side view, the bust of Paganini lacks the stability required for the use of marble. Although David d’Angers had sculpted the colossal marble bust of Goëthe with his head tilting down, and with an enormous forehead and head of hair, he nonetheless counterbalanced its instability with a thick chunk at the base of the neck that came forward and served as a heavy weight. In fact, Goëthe’s profile does not exceed the length of the base. In contrast, Paganini’s profile has a drastically

smaller lower neck than the upper part of the bust. Due to the weight of marble, the bust of Paganini would have likely toppled over.

David d’Angers carved the date “1830” on the base of Paganini’s bust even though the violinist did not come to Paris until 1831. In fact, David d’Angers appears to have met Paganini for the first time through composer Giacomo Meyerbeer (1791-1864). The latter invited him to a soirée that Paganini attended soon after his arrival. Meyerbeer wrote: "Such a great artist as yourself certainly must be an admirer of Paganini and have the desire to look closely at this extraordinary genius. In this case, I can offer you this opportunity..."341 The difference in dates indicates that David d’Angers wanted to show that he knew Paganini before the majority of Parisian society who had to wait until he performed at the Opéra. David d’Angers was misleading the public of the Salon, likely in order to publicize his connections.

Soon after Meyerbeer’s invitation, David d’Angers visited Paganini to prepare the three-dimensional sketch for the portrait-bust and share his desire to portray him in a moment of absorption as he played the violin. Most portraits of Paganini depicted him in the evening costume that he invariably wore while performing. However, David d’Angers represents him without clothing, which set his bust apart from other artists. It gave him the opportunity to convey that Paganini was indeed playing because of the tension of the muscles while holding the violin. The absence of clothing also implies that Paganini is above mere mortals and deserves to be represented in the nude. In effect,

despite the round base that David d’Angers used instead of a typical herm bust, he portrays his subject in the traditional method of colossal statues. David d’Angers likely based the upper torso on a model other than Paganini. The violinist was plagued by health problems that left him feeble and cold, and he always traveled with Francesco Bennati, his personal physician. Bennati wrote a physiological treatise on Paganini published in *La Revue Musicale* in 1831:

> Paganini is pale and thin and of average size. Although he is only forty-seven years old, his thinness and lack of teeth, make his mouth go in and his chin appears more prominent, giving his face an impression of older age. His large head held up by a long and thin neck, creates on first impression, a discrepancy between it and his slender limbs; a high forehead, broad and square, an aquiline nose strongly characterized, eyebrows arched in a perfect manner, a mouth full of wit and mischief is reminiscent of Voltaire's; large, salient and protruding ears, long black hair falling in disarray on his shoulders, and contrasting with his pale skin, give Paganini an out-of-the-ordinary physiognomy, and to some extent represent the originality of this genius.342

David d’Angers took artistic license by sculpting his own impression of *Paganini*, who remains, nonetheless, recognizable. He sculpted a powerful neck and large collar bones, which contradicted Bennati’s observations. He also enlarged *Paganini’s* width and height to enhance broad shoulders, which make him appear taller than in reality. In addition,

342 “Paganini est pâle et maigre et d’une taille moyenne. Quoiqu’il ne soit âgé que de quarante-sept ans, sa maigreur et le manque de dents, en faisant rentrer sa bouche et rendant son menton plus saillant, donne à sa physionomie l’expression d’un âge plus avancé. Sa tête volumineuse, soutenue sur un col long et maigre, offre au premier aperçu une disproportion assez forte avec ses membres grêles; un front haut, large et carré, un nez aquilin fortement caractérisé, des sourcils arqués d’une manière parfaite, une bouche pleine d’esprit et de malice rappelant un peu celle de Voltaire; des oreilles amples, saillantes et détachées, des cheveux noirs et longs retombant en désordre sur ses épaules, et contrastant avec un teint pâle, donnent à Paganini une physionomie qui n’est pas ordinaire, et qui représente jusqu’à certain point l’originalité de ce génie.” Francesco Bennati. “Extraits d’une notice physiologique sur le célèbre violoniste Nicolo Paganini, par M. le docteur Bennati.” *Revue musicale, publiée par M. Fétis.* Fifth year. N. 15. (14 May 1831), 113. For an account on the travels of Paganini and Bennati, see Marie et Léon Escudier. *Vie et aventures des cantatrices françaises; précédées des Musiciens de l’Empire; et suivies de la vie anecdotique de Paganini.* Paris: E. Dentu, Libraire-Éditeur, 1856, 309.
Paganini’s head appears larger than his sickly body, yet David d’Angers implies that he is well-proportioned by sculpting an equally wide upper torso. Bennati described in great detail Paganini’s facial features but never mentioned his eyes. However, David d’Angers noted that his eyes were *louches*, an observation that few contemporaries mentioned.  

Most two-dimensional portraits of Paganini represented him in three-quarter view, looking to the side, yet Ingres made a notable exception in 1819 with the graphite drawing *Niccolò Paganini*, which shows Paganini’s face turned directly to the viewer (fig. 5.11). It is possible to see the violinist's strabismus, which resulted in his right eye looking down and to the side and his left eye that looked straight forward. David d’Angers made the portrait-bust more than ten years after Ingres’ depiction, a time span that likely accentuated the uneven gaze of the violinist.

Paganini appeared older because of the many teeth that were missing from his mouth. After having a tooth extracted, he caught an infection that was poorly treated. Over time, he lost most of his bottom teeth. David d’Angers saw Paganini shortly after he had multiple teeth from his upper jaw purposely removed:

I shall remember for a long time the expression of Paganini, one day when he had teeth extracted. Dr. Bennati enters and says: “What have you done?” - "I just had some teeth pulled out and I want to have them all removed." He spoke with one of those frightening expressions that he often shows, which resulted in something powerfully savage on his face. “But," asked Bennati, “You are crazy! Why have you done that?” - “I am telling you that

---


344 The drawing is held in the Département des Arts graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Ref. RF 4381.
I want to become a good looking guy, that I want to have new teeth put in, anyway, I want it.\textsuperscript{345}

As a result, David d’Angers had to reworked the lower part of Paganini’s facial features after the incident. Paganini believed that his toothless mouth accentuated his already discordant physiognomy, and he wanted to improve his physical appearance.\textsuperscript{346} David d’Angers had the opportunity to observe Paganini in public and in private. While on stage, Paganini appeared possessed by the sounds from his violin that he played at a prodigious speed. When at rest in the intimacy of his apartment, his gestures were uncoordinated and slow. Despite Paganini’s fantastically dark and introspective reputation, Bennati noted that Paganini was generally of a pleasant humor and laughed often. Multiple witnesses mention the sardonic smile that he held when the public lauded him after a performance.

Paganini was a combination of two distinct aspects: the public image, which he originally nursed with bizarre tales in order to spark interest and give him an edge over other performers, and his private side, which included humorous interludes between violin practice and the fact that he cared for his young son. This dichotomy was known only to his small entourage, which included David d’Angers while he was working on the


\textsuperscript{346} For a different reading on Paganini, see Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer. “Blemished Physiologies: Delacroix, Paganini and the Cholera Epidemic of 1832.” \textit{The Art Bulletin}. Vol. 83. (Dec., 2001), pp. 686-710. Kallmyer quotes David d’Angers but leaves out the part that Paganini wanted to enhance his physical appearance. Instead, she emphasizes the notion that Paganini had his teeth removed for the pleasure of self-mutilation.
on the bust. The sculptor was privy to a side unknown to most people and appears to have enhanced *Paganini’s* physiognomic flaws by being able to convey both his physical strength and his inner nature. David d’Angers’ bust hardly resembles Bennati’s physiognomic description; instead, the physician focused on *Paganini’s* fiery and tortured soul when playing. Indeed, the violinist was able to extract sounds that the public had never heard before and his instrument was described in terms fitting for a human being:

Paganini's violin alternatively laughs, sighs, threatens, blasphemes, and prays. It expresses all the emotions of the heart, all the sounds of nature, all the accidents of life...It was beauty and purity that escaped from the violin of Paganini...And that is not all; this man is a show in himself, he wears talent written on his face, in the features of incomparable originality.347

Therefore, David d’Angers accentuated facial elements while ignoring others, in order to indirectly convey the beauty of the sounds that Paganini produced, instead of only representing physiognomic truth. According to a critic, David d’Angers failed to capture *Paganini’s* actual facial traits and the lack of realism resulted in a bust that did not resemble him.348 However, David d’Angers created his own idealized version of *Paganini*: instead of beautifying him to the point of false idealization, David d’Angers was able to ennable an ugly and feeble sitter by focusing on what he believed to be his interior life and talent. In sum, he conveyed his inner beauty.

347 “Le violon de Paganini rit, soupire, menace, blasphème, et prie tour à tour il exprime toutes les émotions du coeur, tous les bruits de la nature, tous les accidents de la vie...c’était la beauté et la pureté des sons qui échappaient de l’instrument de Paganini...Et puis, ce n’est pas tout; cet homme est encore un spectacle, il porte le talent écrit sur sa figure, dans les traits d’une incomparable originalité.” Marie et Léon Escudier. *Vie et aventures des cantatrices françaises; précédées des Musiciens de l’Empire; et suivies de la vie anecdotique de Paganini*. Paris: E. Dentu, Libraire-éditeur, 1856, 334-336.

The beauty and purity of sounds that Paganini created through his music contrasted with his physical ugliness. This disjunction contradicted the academic concept that external beauty was representative of inner beauty. Conservative artists and art critics alike rejected the notion that Beauty could be multifaceted, which meant that it could not be found in the physical representation of ugliness. Paganini was, thus, an anomaly because of the obvious contradiction between his inner talent, an analogue of beauty and his physical ugliness. His decision to have his teeth removed in order to become un beau garçon was connected to his desire to improve his physiognomy, and perhaps to close the gap between the two extremes. In addition, frightening visions of sorcery and a Faustian pact with the Devil continued to follow him everywhere he played. Print sellers regularly produced derogatory illustrations and caricatures that represented Paganini with the Devil – or as the Devil himself. The rumors were so rampant that Paganini published an open letter in the Revue Musicale:

In Vienna, a rumor even more ridiculous tested the credulity of some enthusiasts. I had played variations that are titled Le Streghe (The Witches), and they had produced some effect. A gentleman that has been described with a pale skin, a melancholic figure, with inspired eyes, asserted that he found nothing surprising in my technique because he clearly saw, as I executed my variations, the devil beside me, guiding my arm and holding my bow. His striking resemblance to my face showed my origins; he was dressed in red, had horns on his head and a tail between his legs.349

---

349 “A Vienne, un bruit plus ridicule encore mit à l’épreuve la crédulité de quelques enthousiastes. J’y avais joué les variations qui ont pour titre Le Streghe (Les Sorcières), et elles avaient produit quelque effet. Un Monsieur que l’on m’a dépeint au teint pâle, à l’air mélancolique, à l’œil inspiré, affirma qu’il ne trouvait rien qui l’étonnât dans mon jeu, car il avait vu distinctement, pendant que j’exécutais mes variations, le diable près de moi, guidant mon bras et conduisant mon archet. Sa ressemblance frappante avec mes traits démontrait assez mon origine; il était vêtu de rouge, avec des cornes sur la tête et la queue entre les jambes.” Niccolò Paganini. “A Monsieur Fétis, Directeur de la Revue Musicale.” Revue Musicale. (21 April 1831) : 95-96.
Romantic artists had already exhibited works that represented the Devil; however, those were typically based on literary novels and understood to reflect fantastical beings, instead of embodying a living contemporary. In this sense, the depiction of Paganini as an evil creature differed from other Romantic representations. The popularity of diverse subjects was a direct rejection of Neo-Classical rationalism that lost its relevance among a new generation of young artists. Instead, they turned for inspiration to novels, architecture, and the art of the Middle-Ages, which they believed offered a greater relevance than Greco-Roman principles. The medieval subjects of Hugo’s *Notre-Dame de Paris*, Lord Byron’s *Quentin Durward* and Goethe’s *Faust* inspired artists who exhibited dark subjects at the Salon. In 1827, Delacroix had shown prints of *Mephistopheles* whom he represented through traditional iconography (fig. 5.12). The painter's *Mephistopheles* – the embodiment of the Devil’s temptation among men – has pointed ears, a long hook nose, a protruding chin and a pointed beard, an ironic smile on his thin lips, cunning eyes and bushy eyebrows, and long hair falling on his shoulders. In fact, Paganini’s physiognomy shared physical traits often associated with malevolence and wickedness. He had very large ears, a crooked, aquiline nose, and a chin that protruded due to his lack of teeth. His eyes were dark and his gaze uneven. He wore his black hair to his shoulders along with a bushy beard. In addition, he always wore a black costume when coming on the stage, and appeared ghostly with his emaciated body.

Despite Paganini’s attempt to enhance his physiognomy, and his desire to control the diffusion of prints, the public continued to compare him to malevolent forces, which resulted in a general obsession. David d’Angers’ *Paganini*, the creature of sublime feelings, was finally in view at the Salon. The bust of *Paganini* was equally criticized by
proponents of the École du Beau and the École du Laid. Academician Sazerac outright
denounced the dangerous path that David d’Angers undertook and criticized the bulk of
his works, stating that they were not even examples of a hybrid style and they just had no
direction. According to Sazerac, the sculptor exhibited Greco-Roman, Gothic, and
Contemporary sculptures, which all lacked artistic merit and, as a member of the
Academy, he was setting a bad example, instead of respecting established rules of
decorum. David d’Angers’ perceived artistic deficiency was interpreted as a result of his
connection to Paganini. Indeed, Sazerac questioned David d’Angers’ mental state when
he wondered if a *malin esprit* possessed him. The term *malin esprit* was used to refer to
the Devil, without having to name him, because it was believed it had the force to make
him appear. Consequently, malevolent forces had played a bad trick on David d’Angers.
He turned his back on the École du Beau for an absurd artistic style based on an irrational
system. Sazerac criticized David d’Angers for contributing to the decadence of formal
sculpture.

In an ironic twist, Laviron – foremost defender of the École du Laid – also
condemned David d’Angers’ *Paganini*. Laviron wanted sculpture to be monumental and
focus on the overall ensemble instead of emphasizing inconsequential physiognomic
details. David d’Angers sculpted his bust of *Paganini* with exaggerated deformities,
which resulted in a caricature, instead of the portrait-bust of a remarkable artist:

What we notice first in the busts of David is the unfortunate
concern for external deformities, which prevent him from showing
the physiognomy and character of the model... But he never pushed
this mania as far as in his portrait of *Paganini*... He has
exaggerated the physical appearance to the point of a caricature,
and he completely ignored moral strength... under the pretext that
men of genius usually have well developed foreheads, he has
thought that it was enough to characterize busts by giving them a
forehead out of proportion with the rest of the head and, when seen jointly with insignificant and insipid features, give them the appearance of stupid cretins from Valais who are not geniuses, despite having skulls to create despair in David by overturning his theories. 350

According to Laviron, David d’Angers’ servile adherence to phrenology resulted in a grotesque representation. To convey his genius, he overly exaggerated Paganini’s forehead and distorted his facial features. If phrenology was a tool to help sculptors exteriorize the sitter’s inner character, David d’Angers failed. Laviron was clearly deriding of David d’Angers’ overuse of phrenology when he urged him to look at “idiots from Valais” who had large foreheads. 351

---

350 “Ce qu’on remarque d’abord dans les bustes de M. David, c’est la préoccupation malheureuse des difformités extérieures, qui l’empêche de rendre la physionomie et le caractère du modèle... Mais jamais il n’avait poussé cette manie aussi loin que dans son portrait de Paganini... Il a exagéré l’apparence physique au point d’en faire une caricature, et il a complètement négligé la puissance morale... sous prétexte que les hommes de génie ont ordinairement le front très développé, il a cru suffisant de caractériser leur buste en leur donnant un front hors de proportion avec le reste de la tête, et qui, joint à une physionomie nulle et sans caractère, leur donne l’apparence stupide des crétins du Valais, qui ne sont pas de grands génies, bien qu’ils aient des crânes à désespérer M. David, en bouleversant ses théories.” Gabriel Laviron. *Le Salon de 1834*. Paris: A la librairie de Louis Janet, 1834, 265-267

351 “Les crétins du Valais” referred to a large number of deformed and idiot inhabitants who lived in an unhealthy area in the Alps. Doctors and scientists tried to find a cause for the condition that was considered hereditary for centuries. For more information on the area of Valais and a drawing of a cretin, see Édouard Charton. *Magasin Pittoresque*. Year 8. Paris: Aux Bureaux d’abonnement et de vente, 1840, 119-121; Esquirol notes that the majority of the cretins have small forehead; however, others have very large skulls, some of them hydrocephals. For more information see Étienne Esquirol. *Des maladies mentales considérées sous les rapports medical, hygiénique et medico-légal*. Vol. 2. Paris: Chez J.B. Baillière, 1838, 112-116. Not all criticism of David d’Anger’s Paganini was negative. On March 6, 1834, *Le Charivari* singled out David d’Angers’ busts as the best portraits at the Salon because of their phrenological accuracy: “La sculpture toujours moins riche en produits que la peinture, ne s’est pas même élevée en 1834 à la proportion accoutumée. Il faut cependant excepter deux têtes: Cuvier et Paganini et un médaillon de Casimir Périer, trois ouvrages d’un grand maître, David (d’Angers) et qui affectent principalement d’attirer l’attention sur les bosses et les saillies frontales – propos des théories de Dr. Gall sur la révélation des facultés de l’individu par l’examen des bosses du crâne et du front...” For the full quotation, see Jean Cherpin. *Daumier et la sculpture*. Marseilles: Chez Jean Cherpin, 1979, 69
David d’Angers emphasized *Paganini’s* forehead, yet its volume is not a gross exaggeration. The size of the forehead flows with the rest of the facial features and with the long mane of hair. It allowed David d’Angers to incorporate the multiple creases, veins, and wrinkles that enliven the bust. The contours, curves, diagonals, depressions, bumps, and other lines used by David d’Angers result in a portrait that truly embodies Paganini’s pathos, and convey the physical pain that left marks on his physiognomy. Laviron’s criticism appears to have been addressed to David d’Angers instead of the actual bust he made. The previous year, he criticized the sculptor’s *genre hybride* as betraying a lack of artistic conviction. However, the bust of *Paganini* is an example of Romantic portraiture that Laviron could not deny. Instead, he attacked David d’Angers for his adherence to the already contested pseudo-sciences. This criticism shows that art critics took distinct sides based on the artists they championed. They devalued the works of artists whom they abhorred for personal reasons instead of judging their works with impartiality. Consequently, one ought to be aware of the prejudice contained in the Salon reviews, which are nonetheless valuable for the understanding of the problems that artists faced with the reception of their works. A bad critic could destroy the artistic validity of a sculptor among the public due to the large circulation of the printed press. However, David d’Angers was a very successful sculptor and had the luxury of ignoring negative criticism.
E. Dantan-Jeune: physiognomy and phrenology in formal portraiture and caricature

David d’Angers’ bust of Paganini was supposed to be exhibited in 1833, at the same Salon where Dantan-Jeune showed his Buste de Paganini (fig. 5.13). The connection between the two remains a mystery, even though Dantan-Jeune likely met Paganini in a Parisian salon they both frequented. 352 Dantan-Jeune made five sculptures of Paganini: a formal bust, a “half-caricature”, a caricatural bust, a caricatural statuette, and a grotesque mask. In 1832, two of the caricatures were for sale at the elegant Susse store, one of which was a full-length statuette of Paganini, which was an artistic tour de force (fig. 5.14). The formal portrait of Paganini was bound to be compared to the statuette. Laviron wrote:

Everyone knows a gallery of grotesques, available to curious walkers who pass by the store of Susse, including the Paganini which is unquestionably the best. But the well executed and easily understood Paganini in caricature form is lost on the head exhibited at the Louvre, with its Italian finesse. It is curious that Mr. Dantan gives softness to his caricatures and does not know how to conserve it in his formal busts. 353

---

352 Unlike David d’Angers who kept a multiple notes in a sort of journal, Dantan-Jeune did not leave any personal information on his relation with Paganini. Dantan-Jeune did keep a thick notebook filled with clippings of reviews from the press. The notebook, which includes articles of the death of Dantan-Jeune, was likely completed by his young widow. Although a great resource, the notebook is biased, as it only include positive reviews of his sculptures. In addition, the majority of the clippings are related to his caricatures instead of his formal works, which proves his success as a caricaturist instead of a formal portraitist. The album Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune is held at the Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.

353 “Tout le monde connaît a galerie de grotesques, offerte aux curieux promeneurs devant la boutique de Susse, parmi lesquels Paganini est sans contredit le meilleur. Mais le Paganini si délié, si flexible, si bien rendu par la caricature, a perdu, sur la tête qui est exposée au Louvre, toute la finesse de sa face italienne. Il est singulier que M. Dantan donne du moelleux à ses charges, et ne sache pas le conserver sur ses figures sérieuses.” Gabriel Laviron and Bruno Galbacio. Le Salon de 1833. Paris: A la Librairie d’Aël Ledoux, 1833, 208.
When Dantan-Jeune showed the formal bust of *Paganini* at the Salon, it was poorly received. Art critics denigrated his static technique, the sitter’s expression, and the color that Dantan-Jeune used on the plaster. Dantan-Jeune represented *Paganini* with an open collar shirt and a thick scarf that forms a loose bow on his chest. He looks down and his long cascading hair frames uneven facial features. A faint smile appears on one side of his thin lips, framed by two creases echoing deep diagonal lines at the base of his aquiline nose. His prominent chin is bare except for a small tuft of beard worn directly under his lower lip and a collared-beard, in a wave pattern, covering only the lower part of his chin and his neck. The angles of his cheekbones are visible, yet they do not convey a sickly or emaciated physiognomy. *Paganini*’s eyebrows are shaped in a horizontal line which is broken by two deep lines above the ridge of his nose. Wisps of short hair fall in small curves on the upper part of the forehead and on the temples, and he wears his hair to the shoulders. Two averted, almond-shaped eyes are dwarfed by the long and deviated nose. *Paganini*’s head tilts down, a pose that accentuates his large forehead, which is highlighted by the slight tilt of the bust. Despite the physiognomic and phrenologic accuracy, Augustin Jal’s criticism encompassed the general feeling of conservatives:

Look at this *Bust of Paganini*, by Dantan-Jeune, with the greenish tone that the sculptor has applied; it looks like one of those old fragments of a plaster wall that moisture has attacked... Mr. Dantan wanted to be witty. I do not doubt it because he is a man interested in completing his ideas with accessories that resemble caricatures. He wanted to give the green complexion of the Devil to *Paganini*, whose jerking face has something demonic; it is a vulgar thought, a
His portrayal of Paganini was compared to the caricatures that were always compared to, and competed with, his formal works. Dantan-Jeune added color to the plaster bust, a technique that was usually reserved for the plaster caricatures sold to resemble bronze or costly materials, allowing caricatures to be sold at a lower price. Dantan-Jeune likely added color to the plaster to make the bust more original than his other formal busts and to accentuate the bizarre physiognomy of Paganini. Critics interpreted his coloring as a failed attempt to connect the violinist with the Devil, a tale that stuck to Paganini until his death.

Jal’s criticism of Dantan-Jeune’s Paganini reveals an inconsistent and prejudiced view based on his previous knowledge of the sculptor’s work. At the same Salon, Jal lauded Francisque Joseph Duret’s (1804-1865) use of color in Jeune pêcheur dansant la tarentelle (Young Fisherman Dancing the Tarantella; fig. 5.15). Duret darkened the teeth, the loin cloth and the iris of the statue made in bronze instead of marble. Jal noted, "The teeth, a little lighter, have a color close to that of men who smoke or chew tobacco. This is very good, and is where coloring in sculpture should end." Duret was a Rome Prize winner, a successful

354 “Voyez là-bas ce Buste de Paganini, de M. Dantan-Jeune, avec la teinte verdâtre qu’y a appliqué le sculpteur; il a l’air d’un de ces vieux débris de muraille plâtrée que l’humidité attaque…M. Dantan a voulu faire de l’esprit. Je n’en doute point, parce que c’est un homme appliqué à compléter ses idées par des accessoires qui vont à la charge. Il a voulu donner le teint du diable vert à Paganini, dont la figure cahotée a quelque chose de démoniaque; c’est une pensée vulgaire, une pensée de caricaturiste. Le buste, au surplus, est médiocre, comme presque tous les ouvrages sérieux du même auteur. Son lot est la charge, il y excelle.” Augustin Jal. Salon de 1833. Causeries du Louvre. Paris : Charles Gosselin, Libraire-éditeur, 1833, 417-418.
355 “les dents, plus claires, ont à peu près la couleur de celle des hommes habitués à fumer ou à macher du tabac. Cela est très-bien, et là doit s’arrêter le coloriage permis à la statuaire.” Augustin
sculptor who received multiple official commissions and was patronized by the Royal family. Jal only saw Dantan-Jeune as a caricaturist despite the fact that he was the first sculptor to exhibit a life-size portrait-bust of *Paganini* at the Salon. The greenish color that Dantan-Jeune applied to the plaster was likely a way to show his modernism.\(^{356}\) Dantan-Jeune did not represent *Paganini* as a ghostly figure, and even added more flesh under his skin than did David d’Angers in his bust of the same artist. However, the reputation of *Paganini* as a demonic creature upstaged Dantan-Jeune’s innovation.

There are no records of Dantan-Jeune having been a member of the Parisian Phrenology Society, but he clearly was interested in the pseudo-science. Georges Combe reproduced Dantan-Jeune’s bust of *Paganini* in his *Nouveau manuel de phrénologie*.\(^{357}\) The realistic features were made with accurate details

---

\(^{356}\) At the same Salon, Duseigneur exhibited *Une larme pour une goutte d’eau* (A Tear for a Drop of Water), based on Hugo’s *Notre-Dame de Paris* and added gold accents on the dress, the bracelets, and the hair of La Esmeralda, and on the horns and hooves of her pet goat. Those were described as childish additions. Augustin Jal. *Salon de 1833. Causeries du Louvre.* Paris: Charles Gosselin, Libraire-éditeur, 1833, 436.

directly based on his knowledge of physiognomy and phrenology. In fact, Dantan-Jeune’s bust was admired by a supporter for its close physical resemblance and its success at conveying the taciturn nature of the violinist. The critic wrote in *La France Musicale*:

> Dantan, our spiritual and prolific sculptor, has just enriched his gallery of portraits... what to say about the bust of Paganini? Dantan, after the wonderful caricature that we all know made amends to the great virtuoso, by creating Paganini's bust, as we hoped, with his flexible and intelligent sculptor's tool. We do not believe that it is possible to copy with greater likeness the austerity and sickly melancholia in this face emaciated by constant studying and suffering.\(^\text{358}\)

The writer referred to Dantan-Jeune’s 1832 caricatural statuette of *Paganini* made prior to the formal bust but does not mention the “half-caricature” that the sculptor made at the same time as the statuette (fig. 5.16). It is, in fact, puzzling that Dantan-Jeune referred to his small bust of *Paganini* as a hybrid between a formal portrait and a caricature. The “half-caricature” hardly resembles others in which he grossly exaggerated physiognomic and phrenologic elements for comic effect. The small bust represents *Paganini* with his head down, holding his violin under his chin. His features are caved in. His mouth is distorted. The crevices on his temples are apparent. Two strands of hair fall on his left eyebrow to the side of his large forehead. Dantan-Jeune successfully realized *Paganini’s*

\(^{358}\) « Dantan, notre spiritual et fécond statuaire, vient d’enrichir sa galerie de portraits...que dire du buste de Paganini? Dantan, après l’admirable charge que nous connaissons tous, devait au grand virtuose une réparation, et il la lui faite, comme nous l’espérons de son ciseau si flexible et si intelligent. Nous ne croyons pas qu’il soit possible de copier avec plus de vérité tout ce qu’il y a d’austère et de maladive mélancholie dans l’ensemble de cette figure amaigrie par l’étude et la souffrance. » *La France Musicale*. (31 January 1839). *Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune*. Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.
melancholy, which resulted in a portrait infused with Romantic aestheticism. His “half-caricature” shares similarities with the expressive qualities of David d’Angers’ *Bust of Paganini*. In fact, David d’Angers likely borrowed elements from Dantan-Jeune’s “half caricature” for his own portrait-bust of *Paganini*. He made a drawing of *Paganini* that is a direct copy of Dantan-Jeune’s small bust (fig. 5.17).\(^{359}\) Clearly, Dantan-Jeune wanted to keep his two distinct careers apart despite his ability to combine both styles, which would have resulted in Romantic formal portraits. This early decision likely resulted from the constant comparison of his formal busts to his caricatures. In addition, it allowed him to receive multiple private commissions from sitters who when patronizing his atelier expected a portrait-bust that was a likeness.

CHAPTER 6: THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF SCULPTED PORTRAITURE

A. Plethora of sculpted portraiture at the Salons

The most striking thing when entering the Salon is the size of the brochure... countless portraits, where mediocrity, the bad, the absurd, are the majority... big, small, bizarre, tasteless, beautiful, ugly, portraits of all kinds... we cannot raise or lower the eyes, turn right or left without saluting a portrait... In our time, portraiture seems to be the life of the artist; with the portrait one makes a living. With the portrait you pay your upholsterer, your doctor, your tailor, your watchmaker, your publisher, your laundress, your color merchant, your grocer...360

During the July Monarchy, the art of portraiture became the principal way most sculptors made a living. Until then, renowned sculptors were protected by the Royal Court, who commissioned statues and busts for monuments to glorify the country. The aristocracy also patronized the arts and commissioned sculpted busts to honor family members with illustrious lineages. The new government reduced the financial reserves for the protection and purchase of the arts. Instead,  

360 “Ce qui frappe le plus en entrant au salon c’est le volume du livret ...des portraits innombrables, où la médiocrité, le mauvais, l’absurde, sont la majorité...Grands, petits, bizarres, insipides, beaux, laids, portraits de tous genres... on ne peut ni lever ni baisser les yeux, tourner à droite ou à gauche sans saluer un portrait... Au temps où nous sommes, le portrait semble être la vie de l’artiste ; avec le portrait on bat monnaie. Avec le portrait on paie son tapisser, son médecin, son tailleur, son horloger, son libraire, sa lingère, son marchand de couleurs, son épicier...” Hilaire Léon Sazerac. Lettres sur le salon de 1834. Paris: Chez Delaunay, Libraire, 1834, 12.
funds were spent on social improvements. Projects considered for the common good of the country took precedence, and those considered to be important were regularly given to members of the Academy. Sculptors who were not members of the Academy were selected through professional affiliations or their association to government officials.

David d’Angers received official commissions prior to, and during, the 1830s. These gave him financial security, allowing him to pursue his Galerie des Grands Hommes and des Contemporains, and that financial freedom permitted him to sculpt persons whom he felt deserved to be immortalized. The difference between the number of busts that he showed at the Salons of the Restoration and the July Monarchy is staggering. In 1827, he exhibited fourteen sculptures, ten of which were portrait-busts. In 1831, he showed only the colossal bust of Goethe – and for only one week.\(^{361}\) During those four years, he had established a reputation and no longer needed the exposure of the Salon to reach patrons. Instead, a select clientele came directly to his atelier. Friends, many of whom were art critics, also frequented his studio and wrote about the art that he either showed at the Salons or that were in view in his atelier. His absence from the Salon was also a statement of his disapproval about the Jury selection and its blatant injustices.

The fine arts went through a short transitional period in which its focus was concentrated on industrialism, as art was seen as an unnecessary luxury at a time when the country needed to focus on utility and services. At the same time, industrialism created the opportunity for upward mobility for the growing bourgeois class. Their financial gains allowed them to quickly replace the old aristocracy and thereby supplant

the status of aristocratic birth. The bourgeoisie comprised economic classes ranging from a low middle to high middle classes. Capitalism resulted in a powerful bourgeoisie that yearned for and was prepared to pay for recognition as the new social elite. The affluent bourgeoisie could afford to have their portraits made. Having a portrait exhibited at the Salon became a status symbol, as it reflected on the sitter’s social standing. Just as members of this new class frequented the Salons, they also wanted to be seen at the Académie Royale de Musique that had previously been reserved for the aristocracy. The new director, Louis-Désiré Véron (1798-1867), anticipated such changes when recounting in his Mémoires:

In the aftermath of a revolution, I had first rejected the responsibility of a burden as heavy as the Opera, then abandoned by the public ... but upon reflection, I told myself: "The July Revolution is the triumph of the bourgeoisie: the victorious bourgeoisie will desire to be enthroned, to have fun, the Opera will become its Versailles, it rushed in crowds to take the place of the nobles and the exiled from the Court.” The prospect of making the opera at once brilliant and popular seemed to have the greatest chance of success after the July Revolution. 362

Until then, the government managed the Royal Academy at a financial loss. The Opéra was synonymous with regal festivities and lavish representations for a selective audience who often had reserved seating at no cost. Under Véron’s management, it exemplified the capitalist _laisser-faire_ of the new government, as much a financial move as a political maneuver. For Véron, it became a financial

---

362 “J’avais d’abord refusé de me charger, au lendemain d’une révolution, d’un aussi lourd fardeau que celui de l’Opéra, alors abandonné du public...mais après réflexion, je m’étais dit: “La révolution de juillet est le triomphe de la bourgeoisie: cette bourgeoisie victorieuse tiendra à trôner, à s’amuser; l’Opéra deviendra son Versailles, elle y accourra en foule prendre la place des grands seigneurs et de la cour exilés.” Ce projet de rendre l’Opéra tout à la fois brillant et populaire me paraissait avoir de grandes chances de succès après la révolution de juillet. Le Docteur L. Véron. Mémoires d’un bourgeois de Paris. Vol. III. Bruxelles: Imprimerie de A. Labroue et Cie, 1854, 140.
opportunity. The government wanted the Opera to succeed to show that Paris was still a place for pleasure, especially after social unrest kept foreigners from visiting the Capital.

The Opéra became a neutral ground where political opponents shared the same space. A contemporary noted, “The Opera brought together notables from all parties, the elegance of all ranks. Ministers, politicians, deputies, diplomats, publishers, artists, gentlemen of the aristocracy, leading industrialists, wealthy merchants…” This new democratic desire for public recognition paralleled their desire to have their portraits exhibited at the Salon as visual testaments to their social validity.

Portraiture is the painter’s meal ticket; it is with portraits that he makes money; it is the entire life and that of his family; it is the only means to save for his old age. It will result in the portrait being much better made than in the past…The Jury did not want to be inhumane…Admission is a title of capability for which vanity is clearly shown… We see established bourgeois who wait for the Salon to know if the portrait that they commissioned is accepted…The Jury is well aware of it and compromises for the meal ticket of the artist…So, the love for art, the state of the arts, the need and the vanity, here are the four major classifications of portraiture.


The reputation and connections of an artist were essential to his new clientele because it opened the doors of the Salon. However, numerous artists unable to find substantial work turned to portraiture, creating a massive overflow of portraits and thereby diminishing their value. Art critics believed that the vogue for portraiture had a negative impact on art; through its sheer volume, the art itself was thought to have become repetitive and dull – mediocre at best. Commissioned portraiture meant a lack of artistic freedom. It represented models who made no contribution to society – the kind of men who did not deserve to be depicted in sculpted busts. Even when their artistic stance differed, art critics agreed that the State needed to give sculptors work in monumental projects to free them from having to make portraits. An art critic of the time stated:

After the name and the address of the manufacturer who has sharpened your image in a block of marble or laid it on a thick canvas, we read in the booklet the myriad of your titles with your initials from A to Z, our gravity becomes confusion…Does it matter to us that you are Duke, Marquis, or Earl if no brilliant action, no sublime virtue, no service to the country has brought us the sound of your name…However, if models were to have acquired, through their high political position, through their writings, their talents, their virtues, a deserved celebrity, it would be just to write their names on the booklet to inform the masses, often only have this means to know them. 365

365 "Lorsqu’à la suite du nom et de l’adresse de l’industriel qui vous a tirés d’un bloc de marbre ou étendus sur la toile empâtée, nous lisons dans le livret la kyrielle de vos titres avec vos initiales de A à Z, notre gravité est déconcertée…que nous importe que vous soyez Duc, Marquis, ou Comte si d’ailleurs aucune action d’éclat, aucune vertu sublime, aucun service rendu au pays n’a porté jusqu’à nous le bruit de votre nom…Toutefois, lorsque les modèles auraient acquis, par leur haute position politique, par leurs écrits, leurs talents, leurs vertus, une célébrité méritée, il serait juste d’inscrire leur nom au livret pour les signaler au peuple, qui souvent n’a que ce moyen de faire connaissance avec eux." Hilaire Léon Sazerac. Lettres sur le salon de 1834. Paris: Chez Delaunay, Libraire, 1834, 171-173.
Sazerac’s disdain highlights the artistic divide that resulted from a lack of official patronage. Artists, and the art that was ultimately produced, suffered not only because of the absence of state supported projects, but because many portraits of self-aggrandizing sitters who were often listed only by their initials. Dantan-Jeune regularly kept his sitters' identity anonymous, presumably at the sitter’s request. Further analysis shows this artist was a cunning businessman who took advantage of the nouveau riche’s wish for notoriety and approval. He was a successful portraitist. When representing Parisian celebrities he included their full names, but listed other busts in the Salon catalogue by their initials. In this way, Dantan-Jeune simultaneously profited from the vanity of the bourgeoisie while generating curiosity and admiration from the public for his art.  

As an independent artist, however, Dantan-Jeune had to submit his works to the Salon jury and, with time, the multiple busts with generic titles that he showed resulted in a general lack of interest from art critics and the general public.

Unlike the ridicule, both painted and sculpted portraiture endured during the July Monarchy. Ingres’ Portrait de Louis-François-Bertin (1766-1841; fig. 6.1), who was the owner of the Journal des Débats, was a success. This painting became a cornerstone of the depiction of the power of the bourgeoisie. Ingres exhibited the painting at the Salon of 1833, but it was also on view in his atelier for le tout Paris to see in 1832.  

Ingres represented Bertin in a realistic method that did not idealize the sitter. He includes details that include a growth on Bertin’s eye, a contemporary

---

costume that is creased from his corpulence, large hands that grasp his knees, a straightforward, piercing gaze, and unkempt gray hair – all of which resulted in a physiognomic portrayal that is highly expressive and rarely found in portraits shown at the Salon. Its success led the opposition journalist, Philipon, to publish a caricature of the painting, titled *Mr. Bêtin-Le-Veau* (fig. 6.2). Bertin sits in the same position and the caricature emphasizes his obesity, his wrinkled costume, and his thick flexed fingers. His direct gaze has the same intensity as the painting, yet the anonymous caricaturist artist has added excessive rolls of skin that hang on his cheeks and chin, turning Bertin into a grotesque figure. The caricature is nonetheless recognizable, as it exaggerates Bertin’s physiognomy without losing resemblance. Philipon believed that the caricature allowed a more accurate portrayal of the opportunist that Bertin really was.

Philipon stated that the caricature ought to be perceived as the “original” and, in doing so, highlighted the similarities between both artistic mediums. For Philipon, a caricature was a truer depiction of a commissioned portrait, just in exaggerated form. Ingres depicted the power of the sitter through clarity and realism, and a highly finished quality made the painting worthy of admiration. In addition, Bertin’s aggressively forward pose and physiognomic intensity were visual cues of his secure stand in society. In contrast, Philipon focused on the

---

unknown side of Bertin, that of the entrepreneur who changed the name of his newspaper and his political views depending on the government in charge. The narrative of the caricature also differed from Ingres’ portrait; instead of depicting a Greek design on the base of the wall, the caricature includes a drawing of Louis-Philippe as the pear, and references of Bertin’s honor and virtue did not follow.

In Bertin’s *Journal des Débats*, a theater critic reviews a vaudeville play that parodied portraitists of the Salon of 1833. The “Genius of the art of painting” is a pastry chef who produces paintings of all kinds at prodigious speed. Landscapes, historic and genre scenes, and portraits come out of the oven until an allegory of Nature appears to scorn the Genius for all the *croûtes* (the bad paintings) exhibited. The critic wrote: “The portraits at the Louvre this year are a shame, especially when you see a few portraits of the elite, and you relax with a stupefied admiration in front of the two masterpieces of M. Ingres, so striking, so truthful, so alive!”  

Ingres’ portrait was thus considered the epitome of truth and expression, artistic values essential for painted portraiture. However, the critic was vociferous about the mediocrity of portraitists who were allowed to exhibit. He added:

> Have you been to the Salon of 1833? Look up, if you please, and throughout the Salon, along the gallery, everywhere, on ledges, on the doorways, the doors, you will see portraits. And what portraits, good God! One big, a fat one, the other gray, the other short; noses and mouths, and shoulders and heads, and hands, and hair, and skulls. You would not think that this is the human race ... go to the Louvre and you really will have the idea, with the appearance of

---

these grotesque portraits, that we live in a true Eden...You said that there was no longer an aristocracy! Well go to the Salon! They are all white, and pink and puffy; and well fed, and fresh, and milky, healthy, and smiling...we are all happy bourgeois! 370

The portraits made for the Salon were falsified and did not embody reality. Many artists, at the bequest of sitters, embellished their paintings with false clues, such as regal background decorations or accessories that elevated the sitter’s social status. Bertin’s portrait represents his rightful place in society. He was unsightly, yet was empowered by his social position, which in turn, diminished his physiognomic flaws. Capitalism allowed realistic bourgeois portrayals because financial wealth trumped the ugliness of sitters. 371

B. Le bon goût and le mauvais goût in sculpted portraiture

The only purpose sculpture can claim is to strike the imagination by the beauty of the human form and by the character, to speak in the language of artists. Here you are condemned to seek the form through the changing styles of modern costume, which tends to disguise rather than enhance, or you need to follow Greek models, if you would rather represent the nude and antique


371 This concept would be analyzed ten years later by Karl Marx (1818-1883) who explained: “The extent of the power of money is the extent of my power...I am ugly, but I can buy the most beautiful of women. Therefore, I am not ugly, for the effect of ugliness – its deterrent power – is nullified by money...I am bad, unscrupulous, stupid; but money is honoured, and hence its possessor. Money is the supreme good. Therefore its possessor is good...Does not all my money therefore transform all my incapacities into their contraries?” Karl Marx. Economic and Philosopifc Manuscripts of 1844. Trans. Martin Milligan. New York: International Publishers, 1964, 167.
Therefore, I conclude that sculpture is a classic art, bound to continue to follow Greek models, and one must accept it as such, rather than depict the quirks of modern costume... of all our French fashions, or – where would we stop?  

Artistic conservatism demanded a creative revival in response to the liberties that Romantic artists showed. Military costumes were considered acceptable because of the obvious merits of the service rendered to the nation. In contrast, bourgeois costumes were considered undeserving of commemoration because they adorned sitters who did not deserve to be immortalized. The debate over the depiction of contemporary costumes had been a problem since the turn of the century but reemerged as a topic of discussion with the change of Regime and the supposed freedom of artists. In 1830, conservative critic Guyot de Fère noted his concern, “Drastic actions are urgently needed because modern painters or so-called Romantic painters are going to seize this wonderful Revolution of three days. Their taste for the hideous, for rags...will make uglier instead of beautifying these noble popular deeds.” His criticism was addressed to painters, as Romantic sculpture had always trailed behind painting. However, at the Salon of 1833, the debate revolved around sculpture. The artist was supposed to have the kind of artistic sensitivity

---

372 “Le seul but à laquelle la sculpture puisse prétendre, c’est de frapper l’imagination par la beauté de la forme et par le caractère, comme parlent les artistes. Vous voila donc condamnés à chercher la forme à travers les formes changeantes de ce costume moderne, qu’il tend plutôt à la déguiser qu’à la faire valoir, ou bien il faut vous ranger à la suite des Grecs, si vous préférez traduire le nu et la large draperie de l’antique...J’en conclus que la sculpture est un art exclusivement classique; qu’elle est réduite à continuer les Grecs, et qu’il faut en prendre son parti plutôt que de lutter contre les caprices du costume moderne...de toutes nos modes françaises, à laquelle nous arrêterions-nous?” André Le Go. “Le Salon de 1833. Deuxième article.” La revue de Paris. Vol.50. Paris: Au bureau de la revue de Paris, 1833, 50-51.

373 “Les mesures à prendre sont urgentes, car les peintres modernes, les peintres soi-disant romantiques vont s’emparer de cette merveilleuse révolution de trois jours. Leur goût pour le hideux, pour les haillons... enlaidiront ces hauts faits populaires, au lieu de les embellir.” Guyot de Fère was in favor for a new Salon Jury to regulate artists' demands for reforms. Guyot de Fère. Journal des artistes et des amateurs. Fourth year. No. VII. Vol. 2. (15 August 1830), 111.
that allowed him to recognize and represent *le bon goût* (good taste) instead of *le vulgaire* (bad taste).\(^{374}\) Préault worked wholeheartedly against the very nature of *bon goût*, which the middle and upper class public hoped to find when frequenting official Salons. *Le bon goût* was a social demarcation between the higher and lower classes, with the bourgeoisie aspiring to replace the aristocracy by showing refinement and good taste, sensitivities that were considered innate among the aristocratic milieu. The bourgeoisie relied on the conservative art critics to help them separate good taste from the vulgar. The depiction of modern costume in sculpture was seen as the epitome of bad taste, even though it slowly became the norm. Gautier even criticized Ingres’ portrait of Louis-François-Bertin because of his depiction of contemporary costume. He reported, “…Indeed, our wretched physiognomies and our miserable rags are unworthy for such a great painter to immortalize.”\(^{375}\)

Romantic sculptors were breaking grounds by representing contemporary costume in sculpted portraiture. It was, however, acceptable for the depiction of female sitters, even as it remained in bad taste for representations of male models. At the Salon of 1833, Romantic sculptor Antonin Moine (1796-1849) showed a *Buste de la Reine* (Bust of the Queen; fig.6.3), which included a large feather hat, ruffles and ribbons on a regal dress. The delicacy and care in the depiction of the garment was reminiscent of Renaissance busts, which raised the bust to a level of good taste. Moine’s bust nonetheless resulted in discussions on *le bon goût* and set him apart from other Romantic sculptors. Gustave Planche wrote: “The Bust of the Queen of M. Antonin Moine will solve a paramount


issue in the history of modern sculpture…No one will deny the propriety of our costume, in the execution of a female bust.”\footnote{“Le buste de la reine, par M. Antonin Moine, résoudra une grande question dans l’histoire de la sculpture moderne…personne ne voudra plus nier la convenance de notre costume, dans l’exécution d’un buste de femme.” Gustave Planche. “Salon de 1833.” \textit{Revue des deux-mondes}. Vol. I. Paris: Au bureau de la revue des deux-mondes, 1833, 496.} Moine’s bust was a successful representation of modern costume primarily because the subject was a female sitter. Most critics lauded the bust as a beautiful depiction, with the exception of André Le Go, who condemned the use of modern costume even in a female bust. “M. Moine has made a portrait of the Queen, a head without relief in the middle of vermicelli of lace and ribbons as thinly sculpted as marble permits. Here is perhaps the future of the portrait bust of our time. In truth, I do not know why we should not hand over this task to Mr. Dantan-Jeune whose spiritual caricatures do not respect the divine Ms. Malibran or the dancer Perrot?”\footnote{“M. Moine a fait le portrait de la reine, une tête sans plans au milieu d’un vermicelle de dentelles et de rubans aussi légèrement figurés que peut le faire le marbre. Là est peut-être l’avenir du portrait en buste de notre temps. En vérité, je ne sais pourquoi on ne se confierait pas aussi bien à M. Dantan-jeune, dont les spirituelles charges ne respectent pas plus la divine Mme. Malibran que le danseur Perrot.” André Le Go. “Le Salon de 1833. Deuxième article.” \textit{Revue de Paris}. Vol.50. Paris: Au bureau de la revue de Paris, 1833, 55.} Contemporary clothing exemplified the lowering of standards in the supposed refinement of sculpted portraiture. It was popularizing a high art form and lowering it to the level of tasteless caricatures.

Carpeaux did not have to face attacks that earlier sculptors had to endure because they wanted to depict contemporary costumes in their portrait-busts to express modernism. In 1872, he started two pendant busts of \textit{M. and Mme. Chardon Lagache} (Figs. 6.4 and 6.5) in which he represents the dress of the sitter with great realism. She wears a simple dress that covers her large breast and the front is held with a simple row of buttons. The lower parts of her unadorned headdress are left untied and fall on her
shoulders. Carpeaux also sculpts the costume of M. *Chardon Lagache* with accuracy. His jacket is wide open and the buttons of his vest are not closed to the top, revealing a plain shirt. The busts were not finished, yet they attest to the acceptance of the depiction of contemporary costume in sculpted portraiture. The casualness of the sitters' outfits would have been unacceptable in formal portraiture during the July Monarchy. It would have been examples of Carpeaux's *mauvais goût*.

Already in 1806, Millin defined *goût* in the *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*:

... a facility to see at first glance, and to seize immediately the ingrained beauty in each subject. Taste is not definable because it is a feeling ... Seen as a faculty of the mind and a readiness to judge well, it is formed and strengthened through reflection, study and comparisons ... However, since the ideal is the most sublime part of art in general, we cannot deny that ancient Greeks have surpassed the moderns because the choice of their taste included all the perfection to which man can reach...Therefore, good taste is equally removed from all defects and bad taste is visible in all its extremes. 378

Millin’s dictionary was still a reference tool for students at the École des Beaux-Arts. They learned that le *bon goût* and le *mauvais goût* were synonymous with Ideal Beauty and Ugliness. Good taste was a continuation of the perfection of Greek artists who epitomized Ideal Beauty. Therefore, young artists who lacked the sensibility to choose the best elements to depict were thought to be lacking in taste and unworthy of working in the fine arts.

378 “...une facilité à voir d’un coup d’œil, et à saisir dans l’instant le point de beauté propre à chaque sujet. Le goût ne se définit point, parce qu’il est sentiment...Regardé comme faculté d’esprit et promptitude à bien juger, il se forme et s’affermit par la réflexion, l’étude et les comparaisons ... Cependant comme l’idéal est la partie la plus sublime de l’art en général, on ne peut nier que les anciens Grecs ont surpassé tous les modernes parce que le choix de leur goût renfermoit toute la perfection à laquelle l’homme peut atteindre...Le bon goût est donc celui qui est également éloigné de tous les défauts et le mauvais goût se trouve dans tous ses extrêmes.” Aubin Louis Millin. *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*. Vol.1. Paris: Chez Desray, Libraire, 1806, 723-725.
C. Préault and the portrayal of social outcasts

Gabriel Laviron expressed his views on bad taste in his *Salon de 1833*:

> M. Rude…is part of the small number of those who have formally denied academic rules that prescribed the Greek and Roman as a remedy for bad taste that is triumphing…We also know what we must understand by triumphant bad taste; it is work placed after the idea, genius before routine; those are the works of Barye and Moine, Préault, Daumas, and all the artists who disdain the diploma obtained through their submissiveness at the Beaux-Arts School.  

In contrast, André Le Go wrote that Préault’s sculptures were: “rough sketches showing *Begging, Gilbert Dying, Two Poor Women* in terracotta, and this plaster bust, wearing bear's ears! Such figures are libels against the whole human race.” Préault’s plaster bust was a portrait-bust of Gabriel Laviron. Most critics saw it as a joke played on the public, the Jury, the Institute, and the École des Beaux-Arts. A colleague and friend of Préault, Laviron was the most fervent contributor to the revolutionary newspaper, *La Liberté, journal des arts*. He promoted an artistic revolution through the annihilation of the Institute and the Jury of the Salon. Préault’s portrait-bust of Laviron was a subversive

---

379 “M. Rude…est du petit nombre de ceux qui ont donné démenti formel aux règles académiques prescrivant le grec et le romain comme remède au mauvais goût qui triomphe…On sait pareillement ce qu’il faut entendre par le mauvais goût qui triomphe; c’est le métier mis après la pensée, le génie avant la routine; ce sont les oeuvres de Barye et de Moine, de Préault, de Daumas, et de tous les artistes qui font mépris du brevet que le servilisme obtient à l’école.” Gabriel Laviron and Bruno Galbacio. *Le Salon de 1833*. Paris: À la Librairie d’Abel Ledoux, 1833, 342-343.

response that exemplified both his and Laviron’s disdain for the conservative establishment. Indeed, Préault was scheduled to exhibit a bust of Renaissance tyrant Galeas Sforza that the Jury accepted, but he instead substituted it before the opening with the bust of Laviron.381

According to Laviron, the bust was placed in an unfortunate location and the viewer had to look up instead of directly facing it, a standard viewpoint. Laviron wrote: “As for the plaster bust, another work by Préault, we will defer our judgment until it is placed in a better spot; it is placed too high and its base shows too much; we have had to refrain from an inaccurate analysis.”382 The poor placement of the bust was standard for young sculptors who were not protected by members of the Institute. In Préault’s case, however, it was likely placed away from the public because of the perceived ridiculous style and the method that the sculptor used to make it. In addition, Préault was already considered an artistic dissident who needed to be kept away from any type of influence that he could have on other artists or on the audience.

Of all the works he has exhibited this year, there are none that we prefer to his oval portrait, for its strength, the strength of its effect and the science of its drawing. The whole physiognomy is alive, calm and quiet, as befits a portrait; the flesh has all the flexibility...
of life, while the clothes, the beard and the hair, each have in their
own solidity and consistency in relation to real things. These
undeniable qualities, combined with a rare elevation of style, make
this portrait the most remarkable of the exhibition. 383

Gigoux’s painting Portrait de M. G. L. (fig.6.6) is a half-length representation of Laviron,
a handsome young man with harmonious and delicate features. Under thick eyebrows, he
looks to the side with an intense gaze. His demeanor is formal, absorbed, and conveys a
feeling of determination. His mouth is partly visible under a light brown mustache and he
possesses a beard which is cut in a squared shape worn close to the chin. A thick strand
of hair covers most of his forehead in a large diagonal sweep. Laviron wears a dark
overcoat which is buttoned only at the top and underneath. A white shirt covers his neck
and enlivens the sitter, who is placed against a bare background. Gigoux’s portrait of his
close friend is typical of Romantic depictions of young men who were as intense as they
were melancholic.

Gigoux submitted his portrait as Portrait de M.G.L. instead of giving Laviron’s
full name. In contrast to the bourgeois who remained anonymous through false modesty,
Gigoux likely kept the identity of Laviron hidden to be able to exhibit the portrait.
Indeed, Laviron wrote forcefully against the Academic institution, which he believed
suffocated the creativity of young artists. In fact, he continued to do so when writing

383 “De tous les ouvrages qu’il a exposé cette année, il n’est point que nous préférimos à
son portrait de forme ovale, pour la puissance, la largeur d’effet et la science du dessin.
Toute la physionomie est vivante, calme et tranquille, comme il convient à un portrait; les
chairs ont toute la souplesse de la vie, en même temps que les habits, la barbe et les
cheveux, ont chacun dans leur nature la solidité et la consistance relative des choses
réelles. Ces qualités incontestables, jointes à une rare élévation de style, font de cette
peinture le portrait le plus remarquable de l’exposition.” Gabriel Laviron. Le Salon de
1834. Paris: L. Janet, 1834, 224. The Portrait de Gabriel Laviron is held in the Collection of
the Musée des Beaux-Arts et Archéologie, Besançon, France. Ref. 860-II-I ; MJ 90-484. For
information on the friendship between Gigoux and Laviron, see Henri Jouin. Jean Gigoux.
about Gigoux and the portraits that he exhibited. Laviron advocated for an artistic rejuvenation. He wrote:

... He has shown how well he understands and reproduces the individuality of each sitter; especially in his portraits, the uniqueness of each of the heads is expressed as a whole and the representation leaves us wanting nothing; quite a difference from the many other portraits by artists whose conventional paintings reproduce constantly identical figures, with the same type of head, the same complexion, the same physiognomy, the same banal smile invariably strapped on all their faces, without the slightest attention to differences in age, sex, temperament and character. 384

A generic type of portraiture had thus invaded the Salon. Préault’s bust of Laviron stood out from other sculpted portraits because of its uniqueness. It had an unfinished quality; a bizarre outfit emphasized the subject's individualism. Art critics rarely described the bust, other than to refer to it with scathing remarks for its irreverence vis-à-vis sculpted portraiture. The art critic Lenormant only noted that Préault made a “bust with a head dressed as a white bear” while Augustin Jal described it in more detail:

The work that he has done with the most care is the portrait of M. Laviron, artist-critic. You see it there on the shelf with its fur cap with its sides strangely turned up; he is wearing the costume that immediately preceded, in 1792, the Carmagnole of typical revolutionaries. He has a bushy beard like the one worn by a turnkey from the Temple. Do not take that for a mockery: let me assure you that it is grave; today, one plays with costumes, without

384 “…il a montré combien il sait comprendre et reproduire l’individualité de chacun des personnages; dans ses portraits surtout, le caractère particulier de chacune de ses têtes est exprimé d’une façon entière et complète, qui sous le rapport ne laisse rien à désirer; bien différent en cela du grand nombre de nos portraitistes, dont la peinture de convention reproduit sans cesse des figures identiques, avec le même air de tête, le même teint, la même physionomie, le même sourire banal invariablement stéréotypé sur toutes leurs figures, sans faire la moindre attention aux différences d’âge, de sexe, de tempérament et de caractère.” Gabriel Laviron. Le Salon de 1834. Paris: L. Janet, 1834, 223.
much humor or irony, and without suspecting that one is strange.\textsuperscript{385}

The strangeness of the outfit was a reference to the bust's social and political nature. During the French Revolution, the lower classes wore jackets called the 

*Carmagnole.* It was also the title of a revolutionary song that patriots typically sang after victories, including that of 1792 when a Parisian mob attacked the Tuileries Palace and massacred the Swiss guards of Louis XVI.

After the July Revolution, the Royal family moved into the Tuileries Palace. Préault’s bust of Laviron, decked out as a revolutionary, could then be interpreted as a political message against Louis-Philippe and his Chamber who had not kept their Republican promises. In addition, the beard of Laviron was left unkempt in the style of workers in the periphery of the *Boulevard du Temple*, also known as the *Boulevard du Crime*, due to the plethora of melodramas played in popular theaters. Jal was thus acknowledging the rogue nature of Laviron and, by extension, of Préault’s association with the lower classes who were not considered worthy of depiction, especially in portrait sculpture. Finally, the exhibition of the bust was the visual embodiment of their challenge against the Institute, which they both wanted to eradicate. Laviron promoted Préault as a true innovator who understood the mission of contemporary art that ought to have a social message. According to Laviron, "Mr. Préault takes a distinguished place among

sculptors who understand art in its true goal; his first step promises him a successful career: let him continue.” 386

Préault also showed four more sculptures that are now lost. The low relief La Mendicité (Begging) represented a family of emaciated children who surrounded their father begging to a crowd of unmoved passersby. The sculptor also exhibited Misère, also called Deux pauvres femmes, (Two Poor Women or Misery; fig. 6.7), depicting a young girl dying in the arms of her suffering mother. In addition, he showed Gilbert mourant (Gilbert Dying), a low relief representing poet Nicholas Joseph Florent Gilbert (1750-1780) who suffocated from swallowing a key in a bout of folly. Gilbert failed to get the support of Encyclopedists and wrote a satire against their supposed mission for progrès. He denounced it as counterproductive. 387 Eventually, his alienation resulted in his suicide. The tragic life of Gilbert had parallels to problems faced by young Romantic artists. Gilbert embodied the misunderstood poet to the young generation of Romantic artists and Préault likely identified with him when facing the unforgiving Jury for the Salon.

Art critics ignored the political and social implications of Préault’s subjects. They focused on his technical failures which they believed were visible in the “sketches” that were unfinished, the excessive high reliefs that resulted in exaggerated masses and voids, and the overall "ugliness" of his style. His sitters were also ridiculed. Jal mocked the bust, “Oh, indeed! This bust of M. Laviron is truly funny! It is more pleasant than the statuettes

386 “M. Préault prend rang distingué parmi les sculpteurs qui comprennent l’art dans son but véritable; son premier pas lui promet une belle carrière d’artiste: qu’il continue.” Gabriel Laviron and Bruno Galbacio. Le Salon de 1833. Paris: A la Librairie d’Abel Ledoux, 1833, 43.
387 In 1776, Gilbert published Diatribe, Au Sujet des Prix Académiques that criticized the Academy after failing to win a literature prize. For more information, see Nicholas Toussaint Lemoyne Desessarts. Oeuvres complètes de Gilbert. Paris: L.N.M. Desessarts, Libraire-Editeur, 1806.
of Dantan – although less astute and less spiritual.”

Jal’s comparison between Laviron’s bust and the caricatures of Dantan-Jeune was also noted in Le Cabinet de lecture. Maximilien Raoul wrote: “It is a caricature as an artwork and in its likeness”. Gustave Planche concurred when stating: “I am forced to protest with all my might against the encouragements given to MM. Préault and Duseigneur. The first one takes for sculpture ugly grimaces varied to boundless end, and does not even care to finish the caricatures that he creates…I have nothing to say about it other than that art and the critic have nothing in common with this puerile wantonness.”

The comparison between the exaggerations and expressiveness of Préault’s sculptures to caricatures devalued his art as a popular style. The derogatory comments reveal the general outrage and ridicule from when Préault introduced a new type of sculpture at his first Salon. His method resembled that of Romantic painters who used impasto, left large areas emptied, and chose contemporary or non-Academic subjects. Préault’s sculptures were conceived as commentaries of the social failures that the new government had promised to address.

Laviron criticized Academic sculpture that lacked *but social* (social purpose). His comment contrasts greatly with the social mission that sculpture had been meant to fulfill: the supposed elevation of the lower classes’ moral values by emulating men

---


remembered for their great deeds. David d’Angers believed in the utility of sculpture for social progress. He chose his models according to their level of commitment to bettering mankind. Academic sculpture had a utilitarian mission, which did not fit within Laviron’s vision for a new type of social sculpture. Préault fulfilled that role by showing the suffering of the lower classes. In 1836, Guyot de Fère reminded his readers that Préault’s preferred subjects were unworthy of the walls of the Louvre, "What is this, M. Préault?...it is simply the author of a group of Two Beggars, and low-reliefs of Begging, a Dying Gilbert, and a Massacre…" 391 These episodes symbolized the social inequalities that worsened because of the capitalism of the July Monarchy. The Industrial revolution presented a major problem to French society; it resulted in social discontent, as large enterprises ruined small ones, machines replaced workers, and foreign competition destabilized national production. 392 These economic changes, perceived by many as "progress", had disastrous effects on the lower class that fell deeper into poverty, debauchery, crime and oppression.


392 As early as 1831, a civil war took place in Lyon between silk factory workers and manufacturers. Foreign competition led to a drastic lowering of wages, which pushed workers to instate a minimum tariff as a way to secure a minimum daily wage. Their demands were not met, which led massive strikes followed by bloody confrontations. Manufactures thought that workers had accustomed themselves to “artificial wants”, and could live on a pittance. The foreign competition had serious impact on their salaries. From a daily wage of four francs, their salary diminished to twenty-five sous, making it impossible to live on such a meager income. Although the drawing of a set tariff was established, many employers refused to follow it. A manufacturer answered to the tariff by announcing, “If they have no bread in their bellies, we will fill them with bayonets.” Louis Blanc. The History of Ten Years 1830-1840. Vol. I. [1845]. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, Publishers, 1969, 530 and 545.
D. Préault and the rejection of traditionalism in commemorative portraiture

After 1837, Préault changed his subject matter in order to maintain his livelihood. He stopped making sculptures with social themes of poverty, misery, and injustice, which he conveyed through "ugly" and plebian physiognomies. His artistic style, however, remained true to his belief in expressivity, sketchy surfaces and individualism. Since showing Tuerie, Préault was shunned from exhibiting at the Salon; he became a cause célèbre as the personification of the Jury’s injustice. In 1835, Hugo pleaded to David d’Angers, "I am overwhelmed with work, my dear David, but I wanted to see you to recommend Mr. Préault's sculptures that are going to go through your Jury...He is a talented man who focuses on significant and well-thought out studies. Do the best that you can do for him." 393 His five submissions were rejected and the Jury regularly banned him from exhibiting until the end of the July Monarchy. The following year, Préault contacted David d’Angers to let him know that he lost a commission because of his

rejection from the Salon. From then on, he survived on rare commissions for funerary sculpture and public monuments that he secured with the help of David d’Angers, Eugène Delacroix, and other influential artists.

In early 1838, Préault wrote to David d’Angers, "It is me again who comes to bother you and to ask for your high and powerful protection. I do not pray, I implore, you to do the most for the reception at the Salon of two busts, Achille Allier and Dupuytren, and some medallions..." David d’Angers was no longer taking part in the Jury committee, which he compared to a court trial against murderers who were bound for the death penalty. He was unable to help Préault, whose sculptures were all rejected. The Jury deliberately fortified its resistance to “Romantic" artists. Liberal and conservative art critics denounced the Jury as biased and scandalous. Guyot de Fère wrote:

…Nothing has changed this year in the administrative arrangements for the Salon. As before, there were works submitted for early screening to the Academy of Fine Arts, who performed with their usual carelessness, with their irrational rigor, and without any revision, without the presence of the authors of the rejected works present to hear or learn the reasons of the rejections, without anyone to whom they could address their grievances or complaints...  

---


395 “…Rien n’a été changé cette année dans les dispositions administratives relatives au Salon. Comme précédemment il y a eu des ouvrages présentés, un examen préalable confié à l’Académie des Beaux-Arts, qui a procédé avec son incurie ordinaire, avec sa rigueur irrationnelle, et sans aucun contrôle ni révision, sans que les auteurs des morceaux refusés pussent être ni entendus ni instruits des causes de refus, sans qu’il y ait personne à qui ils pussent adresser leurs réclamations ou leurs plaintes…” Guyot de Fère. “Salon de 1838. 1er article.” Journal des Beaux-Arts et de la littérature. N.6. (2 March 1838): 82. Two weeks later, the author gave the list of Academicians who took part in the deliberations and noted, “Ont refusé de prendre part aux délibérations: MM. David
In 1837, Préault finally received a public commission for a commemorative bust of the artist, archeologist, and historian Achille Allier (1807-1836). Allier worked on an encyclopedic project, *l’Ancien Bourbonnais*, which was planned to promote to promote medieval architecture and its preservation. Allier studied law in Paris but soon returned to his province, moving to Bourbon-l’Archambault, a village with a partially ruined Bourbon castle. In 1832, the castle was to be sold at auction, in response to which Allier published an open letter explaining that he planned to purchase in order to avoid the planned demolition. Allier would later carve on its wall, "Château des ducs de Bourbon, sold to Achille Allier, bourgeois and artist, by Monseigneur le Duc d’Aumale, légataire universel du duc de Bourbon."396 His letter and call for historical preservation reached Paris and became a cause embraced by many artistic and literary figures. Allier’s call to arms saved the castle and he continued to promote historical preservation. His sudden death kept him from finishing the massive literary and artistic project.397

---


397 Soon after the death of Allier, an author for the *Journal des beaux-arts* repudiated the public’s belief that Allier’s interest to preserve Bourbon patrimony was his own idea. The author argues that artist M. Dufour was the originator. In 1795, he was named *conservateur des objects d’arts* and was a proponent of architectural preservation. M. Dufour planned to write and illustrate a book on his research, which did not come to fruition. Instead, in 1832, he handed over his findings to Allier, who worked incessantly on the project. The author did not condemn Allier for his work, but for the misguided propagation of information by Allier’s friends, who elevate him as a genius. For more information, see “Nouvelles.” *Journal des beaux-arts et de la littérature*. Year 3. N: 24. (11 December 1836): 333-334; see “Nouvelles.” *Journal des beaux-arts et de la littérature*. Year 5. Vol. 1. N: 21. (7 January 1838): 332-33; see also “M. Dufour et M. Allier de Moulins.” *Journal des beaux-arts et de la littérature*. Year 6. Vol. 2. N: 6. (31 August 1839): 90-93.
Allier also edited a regional newspaper; to commemorate his services, the small
town proposed to elevate a monument in his memory. The monument was to include a
bust of Allier on top of a tall pyramidal base:

This monument will have…for its main ornament a bronze bust supported by a pillar of pyramidal shape. The execution of the bust has been entrusted to Mr. Préault, a young sculptor with a bright future, who has undertaken this work with a zeal and disinterest, which honor both the artist and the one that we want to commemorate. Mr. Préault has modeled his bust after a plaster mask made upon the face of Achille Allier a few hours after his death; therefore, we can count on the most accurate likeness.\(^{398}\)

Most of the Parisian press ignored Préault’s commission and the *Buste d’Achille Allier* (fig.6.8) that had been rejected at the Salon. In a lithograph, Allier has an oval face shape, a long bulbous nose, thin lips, and a cleft on the chin, uneven eyebrows, and puffy eyes. He wears his hair below the ears with curly strands on his forehead.\(^{399}\) Préault sculpted Allier in a bronze herm bust with a massive neck that is as wide as his face. It is unlikely that Préault based the face on the mortuary mask; he appears to have taken liberties because of the monumental scale. He represented *Allier* with deep set eyes and large pupils that face straight ahead. Préault has enlarged the size of *Allier’s* eyes, so they are not overpowered by two heavy eyelids and folds above his eyes. His large nose ends in a thick curve and shows two prominent large and round nostrils. The face is much wider, and his small mouth is fuller, than in the portrait lithograph of *Achille Allier* (fig.6.9).

\(^{398}\) “Ce monument aura…pour principal ornement un buste en bronze supporté par un cippe de forme pyramidale. L’exécution du buste a été confiée à M. Préault, jeune sculpteur plein d’avenir, qui s’est chargé de ce travail avec un zèle et désintéressement qui honorent également cet artiste et celui dont nous voulons consacrer la mémoire. M. Préault a modelé son buste d’après un masque en plâtre pris sur la figure même d’Achille Allier, quelques heures après sa mort; on pourra donc compter sur la plus exacte ressemblance. “ Anonymous. “Monument d’Achille Allier.” *L’Art en province*. 1837, 63.

\(^{399}\) For the illustration, see *Les Amis de Montluçon. Achille Allier (1807-1836) ou le romantisme en Province*. Montluçon : Société d’histoire et d’archéologie (June 2007), frontispiece.
Préault sculpted the hair in an asymmetrical page boy style, with one side falling to his ear and the other to the middle of his neck. On the right side, his hair is parted low, which results in a much fuller set of hair on the left. Préault lifted the strands above Allier’s forehead and cheek, and the deep and hollow space allows the contour of his face to show against the dark shadow.

Little is known about how Préault received the commission for the bust. Regional papers periodically wrote on the subscription and on the need for additional funds. It seems that Préault knew the size of the pyramidal base made of granite and bronze, and worked accordingly. The base is made of a succession of granite blocks of different heights and sizes. It ended in a large carved base on which a smaller block is placed to support Allier’s bust. Préault only included essential physiognomic details, aggrandized facial elements and hair to project from afar, and successfully integrated the bust to the base. Théophile Gautier appears to have been one of the few who saw the finished bust before it was shipped. He reported, "... a beautiful bronze bust of Auguste Préault representing Achille Allier, the clever editor of the monuments of Bourbonnais, was recently inaugurated at Moulins. It has been placed on the granite column dedicated to the memory of this young man who was taken too soon from literature and the arts. The bust that we have seen is both monumental and embodies a likeness of the man: a statue and a portrait, which is a rare quality; the bust lives and throbs, yet, it retains the monumental calmness necessary for a commemorative portrait." The hybridity

401 "...un très beau buste de bronze d’Auguste Préault, représentant Achille Allier, l’intelligent éditeur des monuments du Bourbonnais, vient d’être inauguré à Moulins sur la colonne de granit consacrée à la mémoire de ce jeune homme trop tôt enlevé aux lettres et aux arts. Ce buste que nous avons vu, est à la fois monumental et ressemblant: statue et portrait, qualité rare; il vit et il
between the statue and the portrait is visible in the combination that Préault included in the bust. He used a Classical herm bust and nudity, yet included massive features that were not typical of Academic commemorative portraiture. The asymmetry of the hairstyle also serves as a disjunctive element that enlivened the expected statis of a herm bust. Préault sculpted the commemorative bust of Allier as he envisioned monumental sculpture: imposing yet expressive.

A commentary in *L’Artiste* for the unveiling of the monument is telling of Préault’s reputation. A contributor wrote, "Mr. Préault has sculpted the bronze bust of Achille Allier. We have not seen this bust by Mr. Préault, but we sincerely hope that the young artist has somewhat moderated his usual outbursts and spirit when making the bust of this young and honest man." The statement implied that hiring Préault for a monumental bust was a gamble. His reputation played against him; this sculptor who continued to be ostracized for important projects.

E. Dantan-Jeune: damaging and lasting power of sculpted caricatures

In 1835, Dantan-Jeune made two caricatures of Honoré de Balzac without commission. Both men frequented the same salons, where the sculptor observed models
that he caricatured. Friends and foes described Balzac’s appearance in terms that concur with Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures. Balzac was rather short, fat, and wore outfits that did not fit him well. He had a jovial nature, laughed easily, talked often and loudly, and disappeared for months to write before reappearing again. His manners were coarse, he ate and drank in gargantuan proportions, yet his sense of humor and his good nature made him a favorite guest. Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869) shared his first impressions when meeting him in the literary salon of Delphine de Girardin:

He was fat, thick, square at the base of his neck and shoulders; the neck, chest, body, thighs, and extremities were powerful; resembling the magnitude of Mirabeau, but no heaviness…His legs on which he swaggered a bit, carried his chest with ease; his thick and fatty hands waved widely when expressing his thoughts…The hair fell in large curls on his neck, the dark eyes pierced like arrows blunted by benevolence…the nose well shaped, although a bit long; the lips defined with grace, yet large, turned up at the corners; the teeth were uneven, chipped, blackened…The dominant feature of the face, was even more than intelligence, a communicative kindness.403

Prior to Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures, Balzac had already complained to his lover, Madame Hanska, that Parisian society made fun of his weight. He wrote, “…I am so fat that the newspapers make fun of me, the wretches!...They laugh at my “abdomen.” So be it. They have nothing else to say… Philipon of “La Caricature” said to me: “Be happy. All who do

403 “Il était gros, épais, carré par la base et les épaules; le cou, la poitrine, le corps, les cuisses, les membres puissants; beaucoup de l'ampleur de Mirabeau, mais nulle lourdeur…Ses jambes, sur lesquelles il se dandinait un peu, portaient le reste de son buste; ses mains grasses et larges exprimaient en s'agitant toute sa pensée…Les cheveux flottaient sur le cou en grandes boucles, les yeux noirs perçaient comme des dards émoussés par la bienveillance…le nez bien modelé, quoique un peu long; les lèvres découpées avec grâce, mais amples, relevées par les coins; les dents inégales, ébréchées, noircies…Le trait dominant du visage, était, plus même que l'intelligence, la bonté communicative.” Alphonse de Lamartine quoted in André Bellessort. *Balzac et son œuvre.* Paris : Librairie académique Perrin, 1946, 101.
Not live by writing admire your character as much as your works."404 According to Balzac, his weight gain was the result of draconian writing method. He stayed enclosed for months at a time to write without disruption and did not move from his study. He had to adopt this technique after making advance sales of his novels and short stories. He needed to finish them under strict deadlines that were difficult to meet because he spent the proceeds carelessly on extravagant outfits and accessories, and luxurious bibelots to enhance his living spaces. His spending led to continuous legal problems with editors and creditors alike. However, when Balzac reappeared in society, his corpulence contrasted with the elegance of his accoutrements, resulting in derisory comments and jokes about the jovial overweight dandy. His various hairstyles were also notorious. He changed his appearance by wearing his hair long or cutting it short. When letting it grow, it appeared as thick and dark tufts that stood up in all directions.

Dantan-Jeune’s first caricature of Honoré de Balzac is a full-length statuette of the writer stuffed in a costume that creases at the waist, with two rows of buttons ready to burst (fig. 6.10).405 He is stocky; yet two triangle-shaped legs carry his weight with ease. He was known to have a strut in his walk. His face is completely round and, despite a large double chin, his massive neck is visible. Because the writer is gregariously laughing, his eyebrows curve above eyes that are partly shut. Two full cheeks frame a small nose and his short mustache is dwarfed by his bloated features. Dantan-Jeune represents Balzac clearly missing a tooth in an uneven set of upper teeth. This does not

---


405 Balzac ordered a blue evening outfit that was closed by solid gold buttons, which are likely the ones included in the caricature. He also wore discombobulated outfits when walking around Paris in search of new characters for his novels. Théophile Gautier. *Honoré de Balzac*. Paris: Poulet-Malassit et de Broise, Libraires-Éditeurs, 1859, 81.
faze the writer, who sports a wide smile. On one side, a long mop of hair reaches the top of his large collar. The other side is shaved. This contrast was a result of his sudden, often abrupt, changes in hairstyles. Dantan-Jeune represents Balzac holding the *musard* hat worn by men of leisure.\(^{406}\) The hat rests on his wide hip. In his other hand, Balzac grips a walking cane with difficulty. The cane reaches his lower shoulders, which give the impression that the subject of the sculpture is extremely short. On the top part of the cane, Dantan-Jeune has depicted a large sun that shines with bright rays. He has also added chains that end in a pompom. The rectangular base barely fits Balzac’s large frame and cane. On it, he replicates attributes that were associated with the writer. Instead of carving Balzac’s name, Dantan-Jeune depicts it in relief, placed diagonally because there is little room for its enormous size. He has also included his hat and scissors next to a long hair wig.

A journalist described Dantan-Jeune’s caricature as soon as it was for sale at the *Susse* store:

> M. Balzac has just reached immortality…With these figures of such pleasant likeness, posterity will have a fair and accurate idea of the physiognomy of many great men who would have been absent without this skillful and ingenious art form…First, it is M. Balzac standing on his two feet, M. Balzac as you can see him at the Opera, chubby, laughing, well wrapped, reddish, winking, smiling from ear to ear … Dantan has sprinkled with his mocking mind the head of M. Balzac, this head where the hair grows at will, the hair that sometimes trickles in torrents, or stands up like a brush … The second plaster by Dantan represents the cane of M. Balzac. After the hair, of M. Balzac, nothing is more illustrious than his cane.\(^{407}\)

\(^{406}\) For a description of the “musard”, see Louis Huart. *Physiologie du flaneur*. Paris: Aubert et Cie, 1841, 32-38. The musard differs from the flâneur because he wastes too much time in unconsequential distractions. Thus, he holds a place between the flâneur and the gawker.

\(^{407}\) “L’immortalité vient d’être acquise par M. Balzac…Grâce à ces figurines d’une si plaisante ressemblance, la postérité aura une juste et précise idée de la physionomie de bien des grands hommes qu’elle aurait ignorés sans cet art habile et
The cane of Balzac was as famous as its owner because it differed from the usual thin fashionable walking sticks. It was a solid, costly accessory made of bulrush with a handle of gold covered with flowers in turquoise and fine pearls. The knob opened to reveal a secret cache where Balzac kept a strand of hair and a miniature portrait of Madame Hanska, his mistress. Balzac’s cane was so extravagant that it became a symbol the public recognized. Balzac wrote to his lover: “Though my turquoise-covered cane has made me notorious as a new Aboulcasem, I have nothing but debts...I am taken seriously; so much so that Dantan has caricatured me.” Balzac seemed to enjoy his popularity and was aware that Parisian dandies envied his notoriety. Despite their fastidious care for their appearance, they did not receive as much attention as Balzac, based in part on Dantan-Jeune’s caricature, but also because of his eccentric accessory.

Dantan-Jeune’s caricature of Balzac as a Cane is a witty tour-de-force. The cane is a conical stub thicker at the top and slimmer at the base (figs. 6.11 and 6.12). On its center, an ornate ring separates top and bottom. On the top, Dantan-Jeune has sculpted a long flowing wig that falls on the sides and back. Balzac’s hat is placed on the back of

---

the wig. Instead of caricaturing the writer’s physiognomy on the cane, he has added a low-relief of his face borrowed from the first caricature. His round face appears in the form of a sun with large rays emanating to become ornamental arabesques. The lower part of the cane is set on a square base where Dantan-Jeune has sculpted a three-dimensional landscape with a cottage house, a small figure climbing a ladder, and another one holding on to the center ring. Both figures are unable to reach the top. Perhaps this symbolizes the provincial figures of Balzac’s novels, whose characters’ primary aim was to climb the social ladder. It can also refer to writers who imitated Balzac’s style but did not have his creativity. In fact, Dantan-Jeune is clearly acknowledging Balzac’s genius by representing him as a monument, albeit in the form of a cane. The caricatural statuettes were visual testimonies to Balzac’s immense talent. Indeed, Dantan-Jeune did not caricature just anybody. He chose his subjects carefully. Balzac was well aware of his physical flaws and might have used his cane, the incongruous canne-monstre, as an accessory that diverted attention from his physical appearance. When first caricatured, Balzac was flattered to be the subject of Dantan-Jeune. In his letter to Madame Hanska, he reported that Dantan had caricatured all the great men.409 Within the year, however, Balzac complained that “a horrible lithograph” based on the sculptor’s “bad caricature” had been published without his consent.410 Only four years earlier, when Balzac was

writing for Philipon’s, *La Silhouette*, he had mentioned caricaturists as being artists of superior minds.

In an attempt to change his image among the public, Balzac commissioned Romantic painter Louis Boulanger (1806-1867) to make a full-length portrait to show him as he wanted to be seen. The portrait, made for Madame Hanska, was shown at the Salon of 1837. For Balzac, this was an opportunity for the public to see his actual features, rather than Dantan-Jeune’s exaggerated caricatures of him. Balzac’s painting was submitted as *Portrait de M. de B…*, which was reviewed by some only with its initials (fig. 6.13). In contrast, Théophile Gautier, colleague and friend of Balzac, wrote a long critic of Boulanger’s painting under the title *Portrait de M. Balzac*. Gautier noted,

One does not know any other portrait of M. Balzac than the caricature by Dantan; neither the man nor the cane are resembling; it is a very spiritual caricature, but false; the cane and man are not as fat… M. Balzac is not exactly beautiful. His features are irregular, he is short and fat. Here is a summary that hardly seems to lend itself to painting but it is just one side of the coin.412

Boulanger represented *Balzac* in three-quarter length, standing with his arms crossed on his chest. He wears a long white robe that he always wore when writing. It resembles the robe of a monk. It is tied at the waist by a rope partly hidden by large sleeves. The robe is

---

411 Boulanger exhibited five portraits and Planche reviews three of them: *M. A. D…* (M. Achille Devéria), *M. de B…* (M. Balzac), and *M. le baron de B….* See Gustave Planche. *Études sur l’école française (1831-1852), peinture et sculpture*. Vol. II. Paris: Michel Lévy frères, 1855, 93.

412 “On ne connaît pas d’autre portrait de M. Balzac que la charge de Dantan; ni l’homme, ni la canne ne lui ressemblent; c’est une charge très spirituelle, mais à côté; la canne et l’homme sont moins gros…M. Balzac n’est pas précisément beau. Ses traits sont irréguliers, il est gros et court. Voilà un sommaire qui ne paraît guère prêter à la peinture mais ce n’est que le revers de la médaille.” Théophile Gautier. *“Le Salon de 1837.” La Presse.* (18 March 1837), quoted in Vicomte de Spoelberch de Lovenjoul. *Autour de Honoré Balzac*. Paris: Calmann Lévy, Éditeur, 1899, 225-226.
loosely held with buttons and opens on the shoulders to reveal a powerful neck that holds Balzac’s face straight up. Turned in a three-quarter view, Balzac’s gaze does not reach the viewer; instead, he looks to the side and above the viewer. His hair is short and full, and stands out in all directions. Balzac’s expression is serious. He poses in front of a dark ochre wall that contrasts with a diagonal light source that highlights his face, hands, and robe. To his side, a book on a dark red table hints at Balzac’s literary importance. The table is below his thigh to give him the appearance of being tall. In addition, Boulanger has left a void above the writer’s head, a technique that adds to the impression of height in a sitter. Consequently, Balzac appears thinner. His monk robe hides his wide corpulence. The decision to portray Balzac in the white monastic robe differs from Boulanger’s other portraits of sitters represented in contemporary costumes. Even though the writer always wore that outfit, it gives an impression of asceticism, which results in a portrait of a serious writer. The monastic accoutrement had rarely been used since the Middle Ages, a period favored by Romantic artists, which placed Boulanger and Balzac at the forefront of modern aestheticism.

The monastic robe was a stark contrast to the mockery with which Dantan-Jeune represented Balzac in the statuette. It was an outfit that was ridiculed by other caricaturists. In 1840, caricaturist Amédée de Noé (called Cham; 1818-1879) made a lithograph for Le Charivari that is directly based on Boulanger's composition. Cham represents Balzac in a similar pose, but instead of rendering the solemnity of the portrait, he caricatures the writer laughing, which reveals some of his rotten teeth. Balzac wears his monk robe but his corpulence and short stature are exaggerated. In fact, instead of only caricaturing the half-length-portrait, Cham represents Balzac in full-length,
obliterating the effort that Boulanger made in aggrandizing Balzac. In a complete stroke of irreverence for the portrait, Cham also includes long and stringy dark hair on *Balzac* and, thus, follows Dantan-Jeune's lead in ridiculing the different hairstyles that he wore.

That a *Portrait of M. Balzac* had to be commissioned in order to reverse the damage caused by that Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures, alludes to the lasting power that sculpted caricatures exerted over the public at large. In fact, Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricatures had a greater impact on the public than formal portraiture because they entertained the public and were affordable to those who might not have been able to afford a bigger and more prestigious work of art. Once Dantan-Jeune had created the basic mold, they were easily reproduced in large quantities by assistants. These caricatures were to be short-lived works enjoyed for as long as the celebrities were au courant. However, their three-dimensional format and durability resulted in the public impression that sculpted caricatures were true representations of a sitter, albeit in an exaggerated depiction. Sculpted caricatures can be considered the flip side of formal portraiture. They emphasized and ridiculed unattractive features, rather than hiding those flaws, as typically happen in conventional portraiture. Despite the need for exaggeration, sculpted caricatures were considered to be more “truthful” than their formal counterparts. Henri Bergson explained: « The art of the caricaturist is to capture this imperceptible movement and to divulge it to the eyes of everyone through exaggeration. He represents his sitters as if they showed their uttermost grimaces. ”

In his review, Gautier noted that a faithful likeness did not make a great portrait. Boulanger’s paintings resembled the sitter while enhancing physiognomy through artistic creativity. Gautier explained: “the most perfect likeness, not however this flawed resemblance, which consists in copying the warts, the marks of the skin, and placing exactly the number of eyelashes and hair of the posing model.” Boulanger’s portrait was his interpretation of Balzac. His beauté particulière (particular beauty) was in his character, not in his appearance. Boulanger beautified Balzac’s physiognomy and idealized his portrait, which was not an authentic representation, even though if it appeared to be a realistic portrayal of the writer. Gautier insisted that a realistic depiction in a portrait was as easily produced as making a caricature because it did not require any talent. Absent in both was the Idea, the creativity of the artist in interpreting and projecting the inner qualities of a sitter. Gautier’s statement appears contradictory. He first described Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures as spirituelles, but later noted that little talent was necessary to make them. At the same time, Realist artists were on the same level as caricaturists. Gautier’s criticism reflects his conflict over Realistic and Romantic portraiture. His statement also suggests a shift in the use of the term “caricature” to one that is not exclusively applied to describe physiognomic exaggerations. It had become a derogatory term for realistic portraiture that includes every detail of a sitter’s physiognomy, orchestrated without artistic imagination and talent. His comment was

directed at artists who made portraits based on *la nature vraie* (realistic nature). As such, the formal portraits that Dantan-Jeune showed at the Salons were perceived as being caricatural because they were only faithful resemblances of the models and thus, trivialized. They did exhibit artistic failings, unlike his caricatures made impulsively and with much imagination.

Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures of *Balzac* nonetheless fell under Gautier’s theory of *Art for Art’s sake*. There was no need whatsoever for his caricatures – unlike other portraits-busts – to enhance men’s moral values. In 1835, Gautier published the novel *Mademoiselle de Maupin* in which he wrote in his preface:

> Nothing that is beautiful in life is indispensable…Why have music? Why have painting? Who would be crazy enough to prefer Mozart to Mr. Carrel and Michelangelo to the inventor of white mustard? There is nothing truly beautiful than that which has no use whatsoever; everything that is useful is ugly because it shows some need or other, and those of men are hideous and disgusting…The most useful place in homes are the toilets. As for me, even if it displeases these gentlemen, I am of those who believe that the superfluous is a necessity.\(^{416}\)

At their very core, the sculpted caricatures that Dantan-Jeune created were superfluous. Gautier believed that they were humorous and spiritual, qualities that were not necessary for basic needs. Consequently, Gautier acknowledged Dantan-Jeune’s qualities, while at the same time differentiating them from Boulanger’s portrait, to redeem the impact of the caricatures on *Balzac*.

---

\(^{416}\) “Rien de ce qui est beau est indispensable à la vie…A quoi bon la musique? A quoi bon la peinture? Qui aurait la folie de préférer Mozart à M. Carrel, et Michel-Ange à l’inventeur de la moutarde blanche? Il n’y a de vraiment beau que ce qui ne peu servir à rien; tout ce qui est utile est laid, car c’est l’expression de quelque besoin, et ceux de l’homme sont ignobles et dégoûtants….L’endroit le plus utile d’une maison, ce sont les latrines. Moi, n’en déplaise à ces messieurs, je suis de ceux pour qui le superflu est nécessaire.” Théophile Gautier. *Mademoiselle de Maupin*. Paris: Charpentier, Libraire-Éditeur, 1854, 22.
Gustave Planche also wrote about Boulanger’s *Portrait de M. Balzac*. He writes: “The portrait of M. de B…can appear as one of the finest works of the French school…The physiognomy that is represented breathes intelligence, willpower, focus, self-contentment, and sensuality.” Planche marveled at Boulanger’s ability to portray Balzac’s likeness without having to resort to a realistic depiction. Planche’s and Gautier’s statements show a rift in the art of portraiture in the July Monarchy: the best artists expressed their Ideas by creating portraits that resembled the sitter while avoiding the depiction of vulgar physical flaws. The success of a portrait was directly dependent on the artist’s interpretation and his talent for extracting the model’s inner and external characteristics.

Planche and Gautier’s glowing reviews of Boulanger’s portrait were written to help Balzac regain public credibility. Their well-planned orchestration failed. Six months later, Dantan-Jeune published the album *Musée Dantan, Galerie des charges et croquis des célébrités de l’époque* (Museum Dantan, Gallery of the Caricatures and Sketches of Contemporary Celebrities) with enormous success. It includes one-hundred lithographs of his most popular caricatures, one of which is a profile view of Balzac’s first caricature as the fat and jovial dandy (fig. 6.14). Balzac’s physical appearance and his exuberance contrasted with the physiognomic theory that elevated minds reflected on external beauty. The discordance between Balzac’s inner beauty and his physical ugliness was discussed by Louis Adrien Huart (1813-1865), a regular contributor to *Le Charivari*, who wrote the captions and short biographies for Dantan-Jeune’s album:

M. Balzac guessed the effect that his less than pleasing physique would have on all his charmed female readers; so he never allowed his portrait to be published: We are quite surprised that he did not take M. Dantan to court. Indeed, by a singular whim, M. Balzac threatens a lawsuit against anyone who wants to publish his portrait: he claims that his head is his alone, and he wants to have the sole right to exploit it in engraving, lithography, copper, plaster, bronze, and marble.418

Balzac had not yet experienced the negative effects of being caricatured by Dantan-Jeune. At the time, Balzac was interested in the concept of le génie, which separated a creator from a common artist. In La Silhouette, Balzac published the essay “Des Artistes,” in which he wrote at length on the state of the arts in France. He concluded that the artistic decay was multifold, due to a lack of official patronage, of the bourgeoisie’s dislike of artists whom they perceived as lazy, the incomprehension of the general public for new artistic directions, the power of art critics who shaped public opinion through the printed press, and Academicians and the State, which shunned innovation in artists. Balzac compared the common artist to the artist de génie. The latter were misunderstood and reviled because of their idealism. He explains:

A man who creates from his mind is a sovereign. Kings command nations during a given time; the artist commands whole centuries; he changes the face of things, he starts a revolution with his casts and molds; he influences the world and shapes it… in a century as

418 “M. Balzac devinait l’effet que produirait son physique peu vaporeux sur toutes ses charmantes lectrices; aussi jamais n’avait-il permis que son portrait fût publié: - Nous sommes même fort étonné qu’il n’ait pas fait de procès à Dantan; car, par une singuli ère fantaisie, M. Balzac menace d’un procès quiconque veut publier son portrait: il prétend que sa tête n’appartient qu’à lui seul, et qu’il veut avoir seul le droit de l’exploiter en gravure, lithographie, cuivre, plâtre, bronze et marbre.” Jean-Pierre Dantan. Musée Dantan, Galerie des charges et croquis des célébrités de l’époque, avec texte explicative et biographique. Textes by Louis Huart and engravings by Théodore Maurisset. Paris: Chez H. Delloye, Libraire, Éditeur, 1839, 8. In 1838, Dantan-Jeune published his caricatures in small installments, one of which includes Balzac in the shape of his cane. However, he only published the second caricature in the 1839 album. For more information, see Philippe Sorel. Dantan-Jeune : caricatures et portraits de la société romantique. Paris : Collections du Musée Carnavalet pour la Maison Balzac, 1989, 89 and 149.
enlightened as ours seems to be, where does such disdain for artists, poets, painters, musicians, sculptors, architects derive?...Do we forget that, from frescoes to sculpture, living history, expression of our time, language of the people, even caricature, every art form deserves recognition, as each has its own unique power?\textsuperscript{419}

By including caricaturists, Balzac publicly acknowledged the superiority of the art. It can then be said that the creative force leading to \textit{génie} is applicable to Dantan-Jeune. His caricatures resulted from a superior mind, embodying the concept of the Idea and creativity. Balzac’s analysis may be a factor as to why he did not seek legal action against Dantan-Jeune. In addition, the writer collaborated with Philipon. These ties likely played a role in foregoing a defamatory lawsuit. Indeed, caricature required the same artistic impulse as a painting and a sculpture, and great sculptors and painters shared the qualities present in great writers.

\textbf{F. David d’Angers: edification of a man to a genius through sculpted portraiture}

In 1843, David d’Angers requested that Balzac pose for a medallion, which he refused to do. The previous year, the sculptor had sculpted one that was based on the

\textsuperscript{419} “Un homme qui dispense de la pensée est un souverain. Les rois commandent aux nations pendant un temps donné; l’artiste commande à des siècles entiers; il change la face des choses, il jette une révolution en moule; il pèse sur le globe, il le façonne...D’où vient donc, en un siècle aussi éclairé que le nôtre parait l’être, le dédain avec lequel on traite les artistes, poètes, peintres, musiciens, sculpteurs, architectes...Oublie-t-on que, depuis la fresque et la sculpture, histoire vivante, expression d’un temps, langage des peuples, jusqu’à la caricature, pour ne parler que d’un art, cet art est une puissance?” The essay was published in three installments between February and April 1830. Honoré Balzac. \textit{Oeuvres complètes de H. Balzac. Oeuvres diverses.} Vol.22. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, Éditeurs, 1872, 143-145.
portrait by Boulanger. David d’Angers faithfully followed the three-quarter view of *Balzac* and included the top part of the monk robe (fig. 6.15). His medallions of contemporaries were typically profile views. David d’Angers portrayed historical sitters frontally or in three-quarter views that were based on paintings or portrait busts. By 1837, David d’Angers had approached Balzac three times but the writer continually declined. David d’Angers finally convinced him to pose at a meeting arranged by Victor Hugo.

Balzac, who held himself in high esteem, proudly wrote to Madame Hanska:

Great news! I dined at Victor Hugo’s who warned me that the dinner was to connect me with our illustrious sculptor David who wants to make my colossal marble bust to join those of Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Goethe, Cooper, and that, dear countess, comforts (my) multiple difficulties, because David, even for a hundred thousand francs would not make the bust of a bourgeois-minister such as Cunin-Gridaine, Martin, and others. He has refused three times…to sculpt the bust of Louis-Philippe.  

Balzac sat for a profile medallion before posing for the bust. David d’Angers has represented the writer with defined lines that contrasts from the original unfinished contours of the first medallion (fig. 6.17). He has ennobled *Balzac’s* physiognomy. His forehead forms a graceful curve, his straight nose ends in a sharp point; his short mustache covers part of the upper lip and under the mouth a small tuff of hair covers part of his round chin. David d’Angers represents *Balzac’s* double chin and fatty neck but

---

420 “Grande nouvelle! J’ai dîné chez Victor Hugo, qui me prévenait que le dîner était pour m’aboucher avec notre illustre sculpteur David, qui veut faire mon buste colossal en marbre pour le joindre à ceux de Chateaubriand, de Victor Hugo, de Lamartine, de Goethe, de Cooper, et cela, chère comtesse, console de bien des misères, car David, pour cent mille francs, ne ferait pas le buste d’un épicier-ministre comme les Cunin-Gridaine, Martin, et autres. Il a trois fois refusé…de faire le buste de Louis-Philippe.” In his letter, Balzac included a request from sculptor and painter Antoine Etex (1808-1888) who also requested to make a bust of the writer. However, Balzac explained that David had already convinced him to pose for him. Honoré Balzac. *Oeuvres posthumes. Lettres à l’étrangère* (1842-1845). Vol.2. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, Éditeurs, 1906, 84.
lessens his size by carving a groove in the center of cheek. The resulting dark shadow gives Balzac a thinner appearance. The sculptor also portrays him with a carefully combed sideburn and hair tucked behind his ear that falls in smooth curve at the base of the neck.

Balzac was reputed as having an extraordinary gaze and beautiful, dark eyes. Gautier recalled, “As for the eyes, there never were any others like them. They had a life, light, and an inconceivable magnetism. Despite staying awake each night, the sclera was pure, clear, bluish, like that of a child or a virgin, and enshrined two black diamonds highlighted from time to time by rich golden gleams: they were eyes to lower the gaze of eagles, to read through walls and the chests of men, to strike down a furious beast, eyes of a king, of a clairvoyant, of an animal tamer.” 421 An ink study for the medallion shows that David d’Angers conveyed his subject’s intensity (fig. 6.17). He drew his eyes with long straight lashes, forming a shadow on a very dark pupil that contrasts with the white of the eye. In the medallion, he emphasized the depth of the eyelid to cast a shadow on the upper part of the eye. However, David d’Angers did not emphasize the dark iris. Instead, he accentuated its convex shape, a method used in sculptural technique to elevate the gaze of the sitter. 422 Balzac noted the difference between the paper study and the medallion: “A reduced copy of the masterpiece that David has offered to my sister accompanies my letter. Since he did not care for the eye, the eye is absent; it never exists


422 The early edition of the medallion did not include the iris; a later edition gives the appearance of the iris, a difference that was likely added by the new founder.
in sculpture, and the copyist, who is also an artist, gave me an angelic look, which I must admit, I completely lack.”

David d’Angers typically represented the iris of his models when making medallions of contemporaries. His omission proves that the sculptor had a greater vision for Balzac. In the paper sketch David d’Angers included the collar of the monk robe; however he represented Balzac with a bare neck and without pupils, a style reserved for immortal figures. It anticipates David d’Angers’ bust of the writer as a model worthy of his Panthéon des grands hommes, who were depicted in the nude on Classical herm busts. The ink study does not have the clarity of contour found in the medallion. Instead, it shows changes that David d’Angers made to the profile. He first represented Balzac with a rounded nose but later added over it a square contour that he chose for the medallion. The latter was closer to the real shape of Balzac’s nose; it also disrupted the otherwise rounded facial features of the writer. In fact, Balzac was quite proud of his nose. When sitting for the sculptor, he announced, “Be careful with my nose – My nose is a world in itself!”

Indeed, David d’Angers appears to have taken great care to delineate its exact shape. In the medallion, he carved a horizontal ridge above a flared nostril, and the interplay of dark and light on the surface broke the pattern of the fleshy profile. David


d’Angers has also balanced Balzac’s double chin with the curved shape of the writer’s page boy hairstyle, which resulted in an ennobled physiognomy. Through a careful process of elimination, addition, and selection, David d’Angers beautified his sitter who was, by all accounts, considered disheveled and ugly by his contemporaries.

In December 1843, Balzac wrote to Madame Hanska:

“It took ten sessions of one day each for David, and today, my dear [nette]. I give [him] the last session ... I will not tell you a thing about this great work that David and others believe to be what he has done best, given the beauty of the original in respect to the expression and the purely symptomatic qualities of the writer, words you will not likely challenge ... My sister said when seeing the fifteen or sixteen busts of the great men made by David: “Well, I see that Honoré is not the worst”. And indeed, you will be amazed at seeing the Olympian head that David has been able to extract from my big face of bulldog.”

The Buste de Honoré Balzac portrays the subject with a powerful neck that holds up a large head covered with heavy strands of hair. His neck appears to be of colossal proportions, and the “fat bulldog face” is non-existent (fig. 6.18). David d’Angers successfully turned Balzac’s physical flaws into a bust that conveys strength and power. Muscles are barely visible on the neck, yet it carries the large head with ease. David d’Angers elongates the neck and has removed most of the fatty double neck represented in the medallion, although the bust shares its other facial characteristics. Due to its size, the bust has an imposing presence accentuated by the base of herm bust, the frontal pose,

---

425 “Il a fallu dix séances d’un jour à David, et aujourd’hui, chère mi[nette], je [lui] donne la dernière séance...je ne vous dit rien de cette grande œuvre que David et quelques autres croient ce qu’il a fait de mieux, vu la beauté de l’original sous le rapport de l’expression et des qualités purement symptomatiques relatives à l’écrivain, termes que vous ne contesterez probablement pas...Ma sœur a dit, en voyant les quinze ou seize bustes des grands hommes fait par David: “Allons, je vois qu’Honoré n’est pas le plus mal.” Et, en effet, vous serez stupéfaite en voyant la tête olympienne que David a su tirer de ma grosse face de boule-dog.” Honoré Balzac. Œuvres posthumes. Lettres à l’étrangère: 1842-1844. Vol. II. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, Éditeurs, 1906, 219-220.
and the implied nudity. David d’Angers used these aesthetic elements for his Galerie des Grands Hommes. It is a visual testament to Balzac, who had reached immortality during his lifetime. David d’Angers portrays him in a bust twice as large as life-size. It serves two different purposes. Balzac has now become a timeless figure worthy of posterity. It has also allowed the sculptor to aggrandize the appearance of his features and create nobler proportions that have a better distribution than Balzac’s actual physiognomy.

David d’Angers’ bust is an amalgam of different styles resulting in an artistic hybridity that he reserved for the representation of exceptional contemporary models. He represents Balzac with an attractive smile which forms small indentations on his lower cheeks. On the upper lip, a short and well-kept mustache curves and forms shadows in the corners of the mouth. Under his lower lip, a tiny tuft of hair ends in a diagonal point to the left and forms a convex shape that highlights the dark area made by the curve of his lips. His nose is large and straight, and the square tip ends in two distinct sections enlarged by flaring nostrils. David d’Angers has painstakingly sculpted folds and creases of Balzac’s eyelids and fleshy pockets under his eyes. This method was used by Realist sculptors whose artistic aim was to represent la nature vraie. Yet, David d’Angers represents Balzac without pupils. The large eyes are deeply carved, which is an academic technique to add depth and cast shadows in the bare gaze to convey a feeling of timelessness. David d’Angers goes back and forth between Realism and Idealism. He depicts Balzac’s pageboy hairstyle with roots that stand straight out. The hair adds height on his forehead and temples, which lessens his double chin and thick features. The full set of hair is combed back and held behind his ears. On the back, David d’Angers added long strands that curve in a different direction than the otherwise tamed hair, which he
separated with deep grooves carved directly in the clay. Balzac’s eyebrows form two harmonious lines that curve toward deep creases on the sides of the eyes. These are not age wrinkles, but are physiognomic marks of frequent laughter, a result of his gregarious nature. In fact, the bust of Balzac conveys liveliness and energy.

David d’Angers did not exaggerate the physiognomy of Balzac to the point of gross distortion, as he had in the Buste de Goëthe, yet his interest in phrenology clearly remains. He accentuated the phrenology bumps of memory prominently carved at the base of the forehead. He added visual signs based on (pseudo) scientific discovery that reflected his interest in the fashionable trend of medical progress and its use in the modernism of sculpture. The combination of different techniques is typical of David d’Angers’ portrait busts of the 1830s. In fact, he directly answered the calls of his arch-enemies, the art critics, Laviron and Planche. They asked modern artists to borrow from different styles in order to create a new contemporary school that would bridge the divide separating Academic, Realist, and Romantic artists. Painters Horace Vernet and Hippolyte Delaroche (1797-1846) answered the call for a new style that reflected the supposed neutrality of the Juste-Milieu. Despite negative commentaries from art critics,

426 For example, Balzac wrote about the connection between one’s gait and social pedigree. In Théorie de la démarche (Theory of Walking), he believed, much like Lavater, that one’s walking style was as revealing as one’s physiognomy: “Lavater already said it before me… the gait is the body’s physiognomy… Slow movement is essentially imposing… If the slowness of the gait foretells a man who has the leisure to take his time, consequently, a wealthy man, a noble man, a thinker, or even a wise man will have to adjust details to fit this principle; his gestures will be slow and rare, which leads us to this other aphorism: All abrupt movement betrays a vice or a lack of education” (Cependant Lavater a bien dit, avant moi, que, tout étant homogène dans l’homme, sa démarche devait être au moins aussi éloquente que devait être sa physionomie; la démarche est la physionomie du corps. Mais c’était une déduction naturelle de sa première proposition: tout nous correspond à une cause interne. Le mouvement lent est essentiellement majestueux… Si la lenteur bien entendue de la démarche annonce un homme qui a du temps à lui, du loisir, conséquemment un riche, un noble, un penseur, un sage, les détails doivent nécessairement s’accorder avec le principe; alors les gestes seront peu fréquents et lents; de là cet autre aphorisme: Tout mouvement saccadé trahit un vice ou mauvaise éducation.) Honoré Balzac, Théorie de la démarche. Paris: Eugène Didier, Editeur, 1851, 12 and 56.
artists, and contemporaries, David d’Angers, reached this symbiosis at a time when it had not yet been recognized in sculpture.

In 1843, Balzac dedicated the new edition of his novel to David d’Angers, in homage to the sculptor who worked assiduously on a “colossal bust in marble for the Salon”. Balzac believed that the bust would be exhibited at the following Salon. But David d’Angers did not exhibit the bust. By 1840, he had ceased his participation in the Jury because of what he regarded as the unjust selection process. He also stopped teaching, due to the many official projects that he received on a regular basis. David d’Angers’ Buste de Honoré Balzac remained unknown to the general public because the principal venue for viewing the portraits of historical and contemporary luminaries was the Salon. Consequently, Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricatures of Balzac remained the point of reference for the public. In 1835, a journalist commented: “Dantan…has just elevated two statues for M. Balzac. Yes, statues; and this plaster…that will be a thousand times more durable than many sculptures in stone, marble, and bronze…With these statuettes …posterity will have a fair and accurate idea of the physiognomy of many great men.” The prophecy was true. Ten years later, the two statuettes were still listed for

427 In 1839, Le Curé du village was published in installments in La Presse and was published in one volume in 1841. For the dedication, see Henry Jouin. David d’Angers et ses relations littéraires. Paris : Librairie Plon, 1890, 230. In October 1844, he wrote to Madame Hanska : “On m’a dit que David a terminé le marbre [de mon buste], et que le marbre n’est pas moins beau que la terre; ce sera à la prochaine exposition, sans doute.” (I am told that David has finished the marble [of my bust], and that the marble is as beautiful as the model in clay. It will be, without doubt, in the next Exhibition.” Honoré Balzac. Œuvres posthumes. Lettres à l’étrangère, 1842-1844. Vol. II. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, Éditeurs, 1906, 443.
428 “Dantan…vient d’éléver deux statues à M. Balzac. Oui des statues; et ce plâtre…qui sera mille fois plus durable que bien des sculptures de pierre, de marbre et de bronze…Grâce à ces figurines…la postérité aura une juste et précise idée de la physionomie de bien des grands hommes….” “M. Balzac en plâtre.” Le Vert-Vert. (March 3, 1835). Album Dantan-Jeune. ANVP 128
sale in the catalogue of the Susse store. David d'Angers' bust was in the possession of Balzac. In an ironic twist, the public was left to imagine the “real” physiognomy of Balzac by taking the caricatures of Dantan-Jeune as models of reference.

G. Dantan-Jeune: sculpted caricature for the redemption of a tarnished reputation

As a keen interpreter of the growing power of the bourgeoisie of the July Monarchy, Honoré Balzac, novelist and social commentator, wielded financial and journalistic power. Before writing his series of novels of La Comédie Humaine (The Human Comedy), Balzac was a contributor for Philipon and wrote essays for La Silhouette, La Caricature and Le Charivari. In 1830 he wrote, “Des caricatures”, in which he expressed the dismal state of the arts in Paris and the popularity of caricatures over other artistic forms. Balzac noted: “– Paintings! Alas! Madame – who will buy them? Today everyone tightens his money and the most precious of rare objects have no value. – Well, my friend, make caricatures…– Yes, they will always be for sale, they will always be purchased; It is satire, it is the gossip of the day, and you know that in our happy country, we would rather bypass a meal than slander.”

429 For a list of Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures that were for sale in the catalogue of 1844, see Pierre Cadet. Susse frères. 150 Years of sculpture. Paris: Susse frères, 1992, 119-121.
430 “– Des tableaux! Hélas! Madame et qui les achètera? En ce moment chacun serre son argent et les objets d’art les plus précieux sont de nulle valeur. - Eh bien, mon ami, faites des caricatures… - Oui on en vendra toujours, on les achètera toujours; c’est la satire, c’est la médisance de l’époque, et vous savez qu’en notre bien heureux pays, on se passerait plus volontiers de manger que de
endless possible types who could be caricatured: aristocrats, politicians, lawyers, priests, bourgeois, military men, young men, and actresses. Aside from ridiculing women, caricaturists found their subjects in all the types that Balzac had enumerated.

Men had the luxury of being ugly, as long as they had a high social position. They were also supposed to be above vanity, since money replaced their lack of beauty. Balzac was a vain man and in 1838 decided to protect his image from unauthorized publication due to two caricatures that Dantan-Jeune made of him in 1835. In 1834, a writer already described Dantan-Jeune as a “dangerous thief of physiognomies, the creator of a “Pantheon a contrario”. Despite growing criticism against Dantan-Jeune, sitters nonetheless courted him because a caricature by him meant that they had succeeded and had become celebrities. Dantan-Jeune’s method was rather simple. He frequented literary and artistic salons, and assiduously attended theaters and all fashionable places. There, he met all types of celebrities. In addition, he was known to have an exceptional memory that allowed him to reproduce their physiognomies, which he then amplified to capture their most distinct traits. He also added attributes and a rebus to identify the models in statuettes that he quickly produced.

Dantan-Jeune was feared for his ability to ridicule, but he was equally adept at redeeming a tainted image. While in office, Prefect Auguste Romieu (1800-1855) had to deal with public ridicule. An invasion of beetles damaged regional crops and he offered to pay by the pound for all dead beetles that people brought to his office. In addition,
Romieu was a *bon vivant* and his excesses were legendary. One of the many gossips related a night on the town when, unable to carry his inebriated friend, he left the prefect on the side of the street and placed a lantern on his back to protect him from passing carriages. Romieu swayed back home.432 In 1835, Auguste Romieu enlisted Dantan-Jeune to make his caricature to counteract public ridicule. Writer Delphine de Girardin (1804-1855; born Delphine Gay) wrote:

The genius of Dantan is endless, here is yet another masterpiece in its own way; this time he had less merit to catch a wondrous likeness, the victim himself came to offer his traits to the chisel. Nothing is more charming than the caricature of the Prefect of Dordogne, made not by himself, but for himself. M. Romieu, in order to turn a joke in his favor, has taken the first step: it shows much cleverness. Ridicule is, of all assailants, the one lacking most courage…Accost it frankly and it becomes so timid that it reaches out to you and far from hurting you, it can even serve you at will.433

Dantan-Jeune caricatured *Auguste Romieu* with a head that resembled that of a conventional portrait, but he added two antennas on his forehead, and also gave him the body of a beetle (fig. 6.19). The wings rise and allow *Romieu*’s cross of the Legion of Honor a prominent view. *Romieu* is an anthropomorphic creature placed on a tall base in

432 Romieu also broke a leg when stepping out of a carriage after celebrating with Eugène Sue. Before becoming a writer, Sue had been a doctor and put a splint on Romieu’s leg. The latter was able to walk back home and discovered the following day that Sue had made a splint on the wrong leg. Robert Burnand. *La Vie quotidienne en France en 1830*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1943, 133.

433 “Le génie de Dantan est inépuisable, voici encore un nouveau chef-d’œuvre à sa façon; cette fois il a eu moins de mérite à attraper une merveilleuse ressemblance, la victime était venue elle-même s’offrir à son ciseau. Rien de plus charmant que la caricature de M. le préfet de la Dordogne, faite non par lui-même, mais pour lui-même. M. Romieu, pour qu’une bonne plaisanterie dirigée contre lui soit bonne, s’est chargé de la faire: c’est de l’adresse. Le ridicule est de tous les agresseurs celui qui a le moins de courage…abordez le franchement et il devient si timide qu’il vous tend la main, et que loin de vous nuire, il peut vous servir au besoin.” Le Vicomte de Launay (Delphine Gay). *Œuvres complètes de Mme Émile de Girardin, née Delphine Gay. Lettres parisiennes, 1836-1840*. Vol. IV. Paris: Henri Plon, 46.
the shape of a lantern. On the front, Dantan-Jeune has added a rebus in the shape of a bottle and an eye to phonetically sound like Romieu (rhum-yeux). Because Romieu did not wait to be caricatured, and turned the ridicule of caricature in his favor by showing that he could make fun of himself, his caricature was a success. A friend noted: “And what a caricature! Imagine a lamp with a cockchafer swimming across it; the antennae of the insect are advanced as though to protect it against the cracks of the Charivari, the Vert-Vert and other papers…”

Auguste Romieu could have had a formal bust made to redeem his image among the public. However, he chose to ridicule himself with the help of Dantan-Jeune. This stunning example attests to the power that Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricatures had over the public. It also attests that the audience was more likely to base their opinion of a person on a caricature than on a portrait that often conveyed an enhanced – and consequently – false representation of a subject. Consequently, a caricature was a medium that was interpreted as rendering a more truthful depiction of a sitter than a formal portrait.

**H. Dantan-Jeune: hybridity of formal busts and commercialism**

David d’Angers equated his series of medallions to sketches. The majority showed rough and unfinished qualities typical of Romantic sculpture. These were made

---

in the 1830s, and showed the modernist facets which drastically differed from his early prototypes made in Rome. One of them represents composer Louis-Joseph Ferdinand Hérold (1791-1833; fig. 6.20), a winner of the Rome Prize. David d’Angers shows Hérold with a smooth finish that highlights the clear contour of his profile, forming a pure and continuous line. Hérold was a sickly young man yet David d’Angers renders a sense of health by modeling his large aquiline nose, his small eyes, and short hair combed in smooth and refined style. Between Hérold’s signature on the back of his neck and David d’Angers’ under the base, the sculptor carved “Roma” as a memento of their friendship during their stay at the Villa Medici. The medallion is made with precision and exemplifies his early Academic training. David d’Angers made a notable exception by depicting Hérold without eyeglasses, which he wore throughout his life. This omission conforms to Academic sculpted portraiture that precluded the representation of accessories. Convention emphasized the importance of eliminating any accessory that obstructed the facial contour of a sitter. When represented in two dimensions, however, Hérold was traditionally shown with his eyeglasses. Louis Dupré’s lithograph of Ferdinand Hérold exemplifies a typical portrayal of the composer, shown in three-quarter length, looking directly at the viewer from under oval-shaped glasses (fig. 6.21).

---


Dantan-Jeune severed these traditional boundaries in his formal busts. In 1833, he sculpted a portrait bust of Ferdinand Hérold, a few months before his early death from tuberculosis. He included eyeglasses, a bold depiction that shows Dantan-Jeune’s contemporary approach. Although he did not show such busts at the Salon, he expressed a desire to represent sitters realistically and with a modern edge. Hérold did not sit for Dantan-Jeune, who is believed to have based his portrait on a death mask that he also used for another piece. At the Salon of 1833, Dantan-Jeune exhibited a second Buste de Louis-Joseph-Ferdinand Hérold, which did not include glasses. He is in the nude, configured as a herm bust. The facial features were made from a death mask modeled directly on Hérold’s face. A journalist noted that the bust achieved a perfect resemblance from Dantan’s use of the death mask and Dantan-Jeune’s own recollections of the model. The artist was complemented for successfully infusing liveliness into the bust, especially because Hérold’s illness had ravaged his thin frame and caved in his facial features. The Academic herm bust of Hérold that Dantan-Jeune exhibited is now lost, although it can be imagined by comparing other portrait busts that he made during the same period. Dantan-Jeune was known to depict sitters using a “one size fits all” herm busts, and adding portrait heads to the generic bust. Many heads were too large or too small for the size of the herm bust, yet this technique allowed Dantan-Jeune to produce an enormous number of formal busts at prodigious speed. They resulted in a disjunction in style between highly realistic physiognomies and the rudimentary busts in which they were placed, and were thus reduced to artistic failures.

437 The Portrait of Ferdinand Hérold is held in the Collection of the Musée Carnavalet, Paris. Ref. S. 1303.
Dantan was likely to have used this method of hybridity to produce the nude bust of *Hérold* in time for the Salon. *La nature vraie* was considered to exemplify modernism in contemporary portraiture; yet, despite its realistic physiognomy, the upper and lower parts of the bust were at odds with one another, and his work was ridiculed. Charles Lenormant noted, “when his models do not grimace, they either sleep or are bored. In his bust, Hérold appears deader than in his coffin.” The nude herm bust of *Hérold* was an artistic failure. Dantan-Jeune’s aim to show *la nature vraie* in busts that he could exhibit at the Salon was likely a wish to please conservatives and to be taken seriously by art critics and his peers. His formal busts exemplify his uncertainty and lack of direction, which resulted in a confusion of styles which betrayed a lack of artistic conviction.

An art critic noted the difference between Dantan-Jeune’s nude bust of *Hérold* and the clothed version, which he preferred:

This artist (Dantan-Jeune) is one of a small number of those who have opened a new artistic path, and has given perfection to the imitation of nature, an even more difficult task for the chisel than for the brush ... The likeness of the plaster of Hérold demanded that Mr. Dantan should have made it differently. Hérold had a certain delicacy and sweetness of features, but little nobility: his sickly thinness gave him a puny face, which fits poorly with the forms of an ancient bust; a modern costume and a tie would have better suited him than nudity. Has Mr. Dantan not dared to represent the same Hérold with glasses?


440 “Cet artiste (Dantan-Jeune) est du petit nombre de ceux qui ont ouvert à l’art une route nouvelle, et donné à l’imitation de la nature une perfection plus difficile encore pour le ciseau que pour la brosse...Le mérite de la ressemblance dans le plâtre d’Hérold aurait fait désirer que M. Dantan traitât cette tête d’une autre manière. Hérold avait dans les traits de la finesse et de la douceur mais peu de noblesse: la maigreur maladive donnait à sa figure quelque chose de chétif, qui s’accommode mal des formes du buste antique; l’habit moderne, la cravate, auraient mieux convenu que la nudité. M. Dantan n’a-t-il pas risqué, et avec succès, de représenter le même
The original bust of *Hérold* received greater and more positive attention. It represents *Hérold* in contemporary clothing and wearing eyeglasses, contradictions which show more creativity and contemporaneity.\(^{441}\) Dantan-Jeune has cut the bust right above shoulders which diminish toward the base. The high collar of his jacket frames his thin jaw line, and a neatly tied bow indicates that he has been depicted in evening wear. Although Dantan-Jeune appears to have added flesh to the emaciated face, his cheekbones form two hollow spaces beneath his eyeglasses. Dantan-Jeune has carefully sculpted realistic details, and has turned *Hérold*'s head to the side, a method often used to soften overbearing facial characteristics. Hérold had a deviated nose that overpowered his high cheekbones and hollowed cheeks. To counteract the nose's length, Dantan-Jeune sculpted the eye frames on top of the ridge. In addition, the sculptor enlivened the bust through *Hérold*'s direct gaze. Dantan-Jeune carved half-moon almond shapes, creating an illusion of transparency in *Hérold*'s eyewear.

Since antiquity, physiognomists considered the eyes to be the most important facial elements; they were considered to be external signs of a person's soul. They were an "essential part of beauty" and to modern physiognomists, eyes were the expression of

\(^{441}\) The “dressed” bust is possibly the first version that the sculptor made, which was not meant to be exhibited at the Salon. Instead, the “dressed” version was made for the Opéra-Comique where Hérold’s compositions were produced. Due to Hérold’s sudden death, Dantan-Jeune may have counted on the public of the Salon’s interest in a commemorative bust that depicted the composer in a style reserved for illustrious figures. *Le Charivari* published a lithograph of the commission that represents *Hérold* in contemporary clothing. For more information on the reception of the bust, see *Le Temps.* (25 February 1833) and *Courrier des Théâtres.* (31 March 1833). *Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune.* Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.
life in all its facets and divulged moral, intellectual, and instinctual characteristics. Sculpted portraiture required the precise representation of the eyes to convey elevated and moral qualities. However, the representation of transparency is impossible to achieve in the medium of sculpture. The depiction of eyeglasses was, thus, better suited for the art of painting than for sculpture. A notable example is visible in two portraits of Benjamin Franklin. In 1778, Houdon sculpted a realistic bust of Franklin which does not include the eyeglasses that he wore (fig. 6.22). The sculptor represents Franklin looking to the side, and takes utter care to carve the iris and the pupil in different thickness to enliven his gaze. In contrast, David Martin painted in 1766 the Portrait of Benjamin Franklin in which he is represented with his eyeglasses (fig. 6.23). The illusion of transparency is possible and does not shield the subject’s eyes, even though he is absorbed in his reading.

442 Théophile Thoré, Dictionnaire de phrénologie et de physiognomonie, à l’usage des artistes, des gens du monde, des instituteurs, des pères de famille, des jurés, etc. (Paris: Librairie usuelle, 1836), 316. In De Oratoris (book III), Cicero explained, “c’est l’âme en effet, qui anime toute l’action, et le miroir de l’âme c’est la physionomie, comme son truchement ce sont ses yeux” (It is, indeed, the soul that animates all action, and the mirror of the soul is physiognomy, just as the eyes are its interpreter). René Descartes, however, believed that a person could hide his or her inner nature even with the eyes. He explained, “Et généralement, toutes les actions, tant du visage que des yeux, peuvent être changées par l’âme lorsque, voulant cacher sa passion, elle en imagine fortement une contraire: en sorte qu’on s’en peut aussi bien servir à dissimuler ses passions qu’à les déclarer.” (And generally, all actions, both on the face and the eyes, can be altered by the soul when, wishing to conceal its passion, it imagines strongly the contrary: so we can use it as much to conceal as to reveal our passions.) Quoted in Lucie Desjardins. Le corps parlant: savoirs et représentations des passions au XVIIe siècle. Laval: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 2001, 18 and 106. Quoted in Aubin Louis Millin. Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts. Vol. II. Paris: De l’Imprimerie de Crapelet, 1806, 652. Statues that depicted eyewear were made during the middle Ages and the Renaissance. They often represented diabolical and grotesques creatures carved in wood and placed in Churches to convey a fearful message to the lower classes who when to Church. Concealing one’s eyesight was related to the concepts of Good and Evil, which artisans embodied in frightful effigies. They were of a lowly popular art form. For information on the representation of eyewear in art during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in sculpture, see Vincent Ilardi. Renaissance Vision from Spectacles to Telescopes. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007, 314-317. Ilardi notes art historians’ lack of interest toward the depiction of eyeglasses in sculpted portraiture. Unlike this writer, he hypothesizes that eyewear was rarely sculpted in marble and stone due to the difficulty of carving hard materials. Portraits made in wood were easier to carve and, consequently, resulted in larger depictions in wood than in any other material.
Despite its novelty, Hérold’s portrait shows Dantan-Jeune’s artistic ambivalence between progressive and traditional elements. The inclusion of eyeglasses in a formal bust demonstrates its modernism, although the artist chose a conventional herm bust despite the representation of a contemporary costume. Such a combination is a clear break from Academic portraiture. Yet, Dantan-Jeune shows artistic restraint with Hérold’s polished surface, an attention to details, a preference for the white color of plaster, and stability with the herm bust. Dantan-Jeune’s depiction of eyeglasses in the bust of Hérold attests to his desire to modernize the conventional approach to formal portraiture (fig.6.24). Indeed, Hérold’s eyeglasses appear to have been an unprecedented use in nineteenth-century formal sculpture. It was also the first time that Dantan-Jeune included eyeglasses in a formal bust, although he did use such elements in caricatural busts.

The constant comparisons between Dantan-Jeune’s formal and caricatural busts were well founded. Dantan-Jeune clearly wanted to represent individuals instead of types, a Romantic concept that broke from conservative sculptors who emphasized universality over individuality. Yet, Dantan-Jeune falls within the "Realist" category of sculptors.

443 From the hundreds of formal busts that he sculpted, only ten of them with eyeglasses are known to the public today. Dantan-Jeune represented in 1834, Antoine-Alexandre, Count of Auersperg (1806-1876; called Grün); in 1835, Léon Cognet (1794-1880) and Chief of War Fellmann; in 1836, François-Louis Crosnier (1800-1869); in 1839, Adolphe-Charles Adam (1803-1856); in 1840, Laurent Cunin (1778-1858; called Cunin-Gridaine) and N. de Froeberville; in 1846, Parisian Mayor Edmond Halphenin; in 1847, Joseph-Louis- Hippolyte Bellangé (1800-1866) ; in 1852, the posthumous bust of Baron Joseph-Charles-Etienne Richard (1761-1834); in 1837, he sculpted the bust of Monsieur de Sleio wearing a monocle and used a curved base à la française. This is the only example of such artistic treatment. In contrast, Dantan-Jeune represented composer Jacques-Fromental-Elie Lévy (1799-1862; called Halevy) in a 1832 caricature in which he included glasses; however, the 1839 formal bust of the same sitter is made without them. The following year, he also made a caricature of musician and critic, François-Henri-Joseph Blaze (1784-1857; called Castil-Blaze) with spectacles, while the 1835 formal bust does not include them. See Philippe Sorel. Dantan-Jeune : caricatures et portraits de la société romantique. Paris : Collections du Musée Carnavalet pour la Maison Balzac, 1989, 104 and 208 ; 108 and 192. See Philippe Sorel. Dantan-Jeune : caricatures et portraits de la société romantique. Paris : Collections du Musée Carnavalet pour la Maison Balzac, 1989.
because he recorded every detail: his formal portrait-busts were famous for showing a “guaranteed resemblance”.

His artistic values appear flawed because his busts were thought to show only superficial elements, not the inner characteristics of his sitters. To the discerning audience, he was an artist who copied instead of creating. Nineteenth century academic sculptors did not represent sitters with eyeglasses: models worthy of representation had to be physically flawless. The portrait of a sitter in a durable material implied that he was above all men. The depiction of eyeglasses, spectacles, or monocles came to exemplify the devaluation of sculpted portraiture because it reflected the artist's lack of taste in representing sitters unworthy of commemoration.

I. Hybridity of sculpted portraiture for two-dimensional commercialism

Artists working in two dimensions were not subjected to the same principles as portrait sculptors. Painters and lithographers included eyeglasses in self-portraits and showed models wearing or holding eyewear. These accessories played a part in the narrative; they showed men to be learned, men of leisure, or sitters whose profession required visual concentration. Sculpted portraits lacked a narrative, and their makers had to rely on other means to convey the social position of their model. They chose, with the help of the

---

patron, the shape of the bust, the costume, the hairstyle, decorations and medals, and they carved the sitter’s name on the base.

Dantan-Jeune’s portrait of Hérold is an early example of a formal bust that connects high and low popular art forms. This transitional period is seen in his entrepreneurship, as he edited a series of small busts of the composer that he sold to the public. A newspaper noted, "Mr. Dantan has also just released the bust of Hérold, reduced in small proportions. In our view, it is impossible to achieve a higher degree of resemblance and expression." This opportunism is also illustrated in the diffusion of lithographs of Hérold based on the bust (figs. 6.25). In fact, Dantan-Jeune’s business savvy parallels Philipon’s; the sculptor used similar methods to be at the cutting edge of consumerism. Philipon hired Traviès to make a two-dimensional reproduction of Dantan-Jeune’s Buste de Hérold and explained:

We owe to the kindness of Mr. Dantan to have shared one of the first examples of the bust of Hérold, which the talented sculptor has just finished for the Opéra-Comique Theater. We were in a hurry to have it carefully reproduced in a lithograph, and we are quite pleased to offer our subscribers the first portrait of the skillful composer whose death has taken him prematurely, while at the height of his career.

---


Traviès’ lithograph of Hérold lacks the three-dimensional effects that Daumier achieved when reproducing his sculpted series in two-dimensions. However, Philipon considered Traviès one of his best artists, and likely hired him because he worked quickly. Traviès took artistic license by changing the position of Hérold’s head, and adding the lower part of his costume, turning Dantan-Jeune’s bust into a three-quarter length portrait. Traviès only followed Hérold’s physiognomy up to a point, leaving a larger space between Hérold’s nose and mouth, which elongates his already thin face. Traviès also used contrasting tones in the eyes and pupils, now clearly visible through the eyeglasses. The image conveys an immediacy and connection with the viewer as if the portrait were made from life. As a result, Traviès’ portrait of Hérold conveyed far greater expressivity than Dantan-Jeune’s portrait bust.

In comparison to Daumier, Dantan-Jeune took surprising artistic liberties with his formal busts. Daumier’s caricatural bust series, Célébrités du Juste-Milieu, shows that he never included eyeglasses in the sculpted caricatures. Yet he routinely represented his sitters with eyeglasses in their two-dimensional counterparts. Despite coloring the sculpted busts and grossly exaggerating physiognomic flaws, Daumier showed a conservatism of sort by choosing to exclude eyeglasses from three-dimensional caricatures. Instead, he focused on their facial characteristics and costumes. Daumier’s busts series shows the importance that he placed on his sitter’s eyes and gaze. He sculpts eyes either shut or wide open, heavy eyelids, deeply set or bulging eyes, round, slanted and biddy shapes, and some of them with an eye larger than the other. These depictions are highly individualized and convey physiognomic characteristics of disdain, anger,

---

447 Nine lithographs of politicians directly based on the series of caricatural busts represent them with round or oval frames. Daumier included eyeglasses on Dupin, Jacot Lefèvre, Kératry, d’Argout, Odier, Lecomte, Harlé Père, Thiers, and Dubois.
stupidity, boredom, sadness, malice, senility, or defiance. As such, Daumier uses his keen sense of physiognomic understanding to convey the nature of his sitters.

Although Daumier appears to have reproduced the busts faithfully in the lithographs, he caricatures politicians with their eyeglasses, some worn on the tip of their nose, leaving the eyes visible. Daumier used this technique in his caricature of Deputy Antoine Odier (1766-1853; Figs. 6.26 and 6.27). Others wear the frames close to their eyes, which hide their gaze because of glare on the glasses, visible in his depiction of Deputy Jacques Lefebvre (1777-1856; figs. 6.28 and 6.29). Still in others, he clearly marks the shape of their eyes on the glasses, exemplified in Magistrate Alexandre Lecomte (b. 1778; figs. 6.30 and 6.31). The lithographs show Daumier’s originality in expressing the individuality of each sitter and the range of his imagination. He caricatures idiotic, frightful, intense, and disdainful glances that project the hidden nature of the sitters. Consequently, Daumier shows more depth and understanding of individuals than Dantan-Jeune, who often failed to convey the inner nature of his sitters. Dantan-Jeune’s formal portraiture lacked creativity and originality, which he mastered when making sculpted caricatures.

**J. David d’Angers: diffusion of printed medallions for social education**

David d’Angers set out to produce small medallions with an instructive agenda. Medallions were often viewed as a low art form, as it was believed that they required little artistic knowledge in comparison with other forms of sculpture. However, they were
the perfect format for the representation of exemplary men, because of their small size and low cost. They also represented simple messages made accessible to the uneducated class, who could then emulate the great men. Since his stay at the Villa Medici, David d’Angers had made medallions of colleagues. By the end of the 1820s, he envisioned a social utility to this perceived-as “lower” art form. Beginning in 1827, he depicted contemporary politicians, scientists, artists, art critics, and writers whom he believed were worthy of remembrance. His desire to spread moral messages originated while he was sojourning in Weimar, sculpting the bust of Goëthe. He offered the writer medallions of Victor Cousin, Prosper Mérimée, Eugène Delacroix, and Victor Hugo. Goethe asked, “Why not have your works engraved? Europe would then know them.” Upon his return to Paris, d’Angers continued to make sculpted portraits that could be divided into distinct categories. Depending on his view of the merit of the sitters, David d’Angers represented them in Greco-Roman busts, in Romantic and Realist portraits-busts, or in medallions. He did, however, depict his Grands Hommes in medallions as an inexpensive way to disseminate their images to the lower classes. However, he was aware that they were used for purposes in ordinary homes other than adorning the walls. In 1829, he explained to Victor Pavie:

He is not the only one, and I will quote, from my best friends, idiocies of the same sort. It is as such that when going up to the apartment of one of them, I was struck by a violent blow to the ankle. Above my head, an acute and loud laughter exploded. It was, will you believe it, my great men in bronze, which were rolling through the hallways as shuffleboards, and fell, at great speed, down the stairway to the delight of the young children. I have witnessed, elsewhere, a model housewife, who scraped sugar

with these unfortunate profiles, while choosing for this purpose the most crooked noses. ⁴⁴⁹

Nonetheless David d’Angers continued to add contemporary and historical figures to his *Galerie* from the 1820s until 1854. He made the medallions in bronze, which had a prohibitive cost and could be purchased only by few. Yet, he was uninterested in making a profit from his bronze medallions, and offered multiple medallions as gifts to friends and colleagues.⁴⁵⁰ As an artist who believed in the social utility of sculpture, he set out to have reproduction of medallions through the use of the printing press. The invention of the engineer and technician Achille Collas (1795-1859) proved helpful for David d’Angers’ intentions. In the late 1820s, Collas perfected an engraving machine that followed the contours and grooves of medallions, which resulted in low relief in an impression that retained their highlights and shadows. At the Salon of 1833, Collas submitted engravings of medallions by way of mechanical reproduction from his patented invention. Collas explained:

> I had the audacity to submit to the Salon Jury of 1833 some mechanical engravings and since the technique was new, they were surprised at the way they were made, and I was admitted. They had


⁴⁵⁰ David d’Angers regularly sent a bronze medallion to the Angers Museum and wrote: “Sous peu de jours vous recevrez une caisse contenant plusieurs cadres de médaillons en bronze...notre musée aura une collection qui pour le prix extrêmement élevé de la fonte en bronze ne peu être possédée que par peu de personnes.” (You will receive in a few days a crate containing several frames with bronze medallions...our museum will have a collection which, giving the extremely high cost of melting in bronze, can only be owned by very few.” Vivianne Huchard. “Les portraits de David: la nature et l’âme.” *Aux grands hommes, David d’Angers.* Saint-Rémy les Chevreuses: Fondation de Courbertin, 1990, 62.
placed my frame in the engraving gallery but it was placed too high, and due to the delicacy of the subjects, they could not be viewed properly, I then wrote to Sir Le Cailleux who had the kindness to answer my request and the frame was placed at eye level, which led to the interest of a large number of people and especially engravers. I reached my goal, I did not want to play the artist or upset anyone, I just wanted the insertion in the Salon booklet, which happened. 451

David d’Angers likely saw the engravings that Collas exhibited at the Salon of 1833. Within two years, he was in contact with Collas to produce a series of his medallions on paper, for albums to be published in installments. In 1835, David d’Angers made a medallion of Achille Collas as an homage to the inventor who was producing “les précieux petits médaillons” (the precious small medallions; fig. 6.32). 452 By 1838, David d’Angers’ medallions were advertised as albums de Collection de portraits des contemporains (Collection of Contemporary Portraits) made by the Collas machine. The advertisement stated: "This collection will include all the portrait-medallions made by M.

451 "J’eus la hardiesse de présenter au jury du Salon de 1833 des gravures mécaniques, comme c’était nouveau on s’est trouvé étonné de la manière dont c’était fait, je fus admis. On avait mis mon cadre dans la galerie des gravures mais on l’avait élevé trop haut, comme il y avait des sujets très délicats on ne pouvait pas voir ce que c’était, j’écrivis à Monsieur le Cailleux, il eut la complaisance de faire droit à ma demande et le cadre a été mis à la portée de l’œil ce qui a intrigué infinité de personnes et surtout de graveurs. Mon but a été rempli, je ne voulais pas jouer l’artiste ni indigner personne, je voulais insertion dans le livret du salon ce qui nécessairement a eu lieu." Note manuscrite d’Achille Collas, which he titled, “Note historique sur la vie industrielle de Achille Collas.” (Historical Note on the Life in Industry of Achille Collas). In the same document, Collas also gives precise details on the invention for reduction of sculptures that he patented prior to start a society with the foundry Barbedienne. Archives Nationales, Paris. Fonds Barbedienne. 368AP/1-8. p. 7. Between 1831 and 1836, Collas was employed by the French Government to engrave the numismatic collection of historical coins, Le Trésor de numismatique et de glyptique (The Treasure of Numismatic and Glyptic), which was the first album published of illustrations made with Collas’ mecanical machine. For information on Achille Collas see “Note historique sur la vie industrielle de Achille Collas.” Archives Nationales, Paris. Fonds Barbedienne. 368AP/1-8. pp. 1-11. The album of more than a thousand engravings was for sale in twenty volumes. For a description of the installments, see Ferdinand Hippolyte Delaunay de Fontenay. Moines et sibylles dans l’antiquité judéo-grecque. Paris: Didier et Cie, Libraires-Éditeurs, 1874, 35.

David d’Angers; it is published in installments, each including 12 portraits with a biographical text. An installment will be published every month.”

The reproductions were also sold as single sheets, which represented contemporary figures including politicians, scientists, writers, actors and artists. The latter included Horace Vernet and Eugène Delacroix, among many (Figs. 6.33 and 6.34).

In addition, d’Angers suggested a popular art form in the shape of printed medallions as a way to elevate the values of the lower class, which was becoming poorer and more prone to crime as a result of speculative climate of the July Monarchy. The following year, David d’Angers described an idea for the circulation of currency made as small medallions. He explained:

To be the interpreter of public gratitude, and to write, for the use of the lower class, the liveliest pages of history for those who deserve to remain alive… We engrave on our coins the effigy of the reigning king. What for? Would it not be better, at certain fixed times, to choose through legislation a set of illustrious men from past generations, and to use our currency to carry their effigies?… We would then place them at the disposal of the lower classes, a sort of circulating series of medals, who would have for them a complete history course. In a way, everyone would carry a Pantheon in the pocket.


David d’Angers’ desire to see eminent individuals on French coins did not come to be, although he continued to work at the publication of medallions made by the Collas method. The majority of medallions that David d’Angers published are made in a conventional style with clear contours and a smooth finish, even though he made the majority of his medallions with Romantic elements of expression and energy. He explained that his medallions were just sketches and his technique shows an unfinished and rough handling that differed from the ones that he chose to publish for didactic purpose. This dichotomy shows that David d’Angers controlled the distribution of his medallions. He wanted to disseminate effigies of sitters with high morals and virtuous lives instead of sitters who embodied Romantic sentiments that had no utilitarian purpose for the elevation of the lower classes. His venture appears to have been a commercial failure, given the lack of coverage in the printed press of the albums that Collas produced for him.

K. Dantan-Jeune: seriality and commercialization of sculpted and lithographic caricatures

David d’Angers despised Dantan-Jeune for profiting from the commerce of his caricatures, which were sold to an ever-increasing public in fashionable Parisian shops and in his gallery. He compared caricature to “the mud of society”, and caricaturists to
“the leprosy of the arts” who succeeded in attracting crowds who believed they were mocking others when, instead, they were laughing unknowingly at themselves.\textsuperscript{455} Dantan-Jeune was at the forefront of sculptors who saw the financial potential of reproducing his sculptures for mass consumption. To keep prices affordable, the caricatures were often made of plaster, which was painted to resemble bronze or other more costly materials. Dantan-Jeune's commercial venture exemplifies a time of radical change in the production of sculpture. Typically, Dantan-Jeune edited his statuettes in plaster, which was then covered to resemble bronze because of bronze’s prohibitive cost, or in terra-cotta. His production was mostly sold at the Susse store, which diffused his most popular formal and caricatural portraits. The brothers Susse owned its foundry for the reproduction of sculpture in bronze, while also making editions less costly materials.

The serialization of Dantan-Jeune's production made his small sculptures accessible to a much larger clientele than ever before. Conservatives blamed sculptors, as well as the public, for the vulgarization of sculpture and its transformation from an art made by and for the elite, into a popular art. In 1833, Dantan-Jeune was at the height of his popularity with a multitude of caricatures that were referred to as a \textit{Galerie des grotesques} or \textit{Musée grotesque}. The sculpted caricatures were produced at prodigious speed. They were regularly on view and for sale at the Susse store, where they attracted large crowds. By 1835, Dantan-Jeune was considered the inventor of a new artistic genre, \textit{la sculpture populaire}. A journalist reported:

\begin{quote}
Dantan, with his legion of uplifting statuettes, quickly found himself inducted as the Praxiteles and the Phidias of the crowd. Whomever had never dared to look once at a statue, a bust, a group, however beautiful they were, and precisely because they were beautiful, was surprised to stay for hours in front of these
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{455} Maurice Rheims. \textit{La Sculpture au XIXe siècle}. Paris : Arts et Métiers Graphiques, 1972, 79.
plasters so ugly that they seemed truer, more real than life! Indeed, it was in their ugliness so ingeniously exaggerated that their extreme interest rested. On principle, Greek sculpture and imitative sculpture had for principle to lessen the ordinary in order to reach as much as possible to ideal beauty: hence their coldness. Dantan reversed the rule, and approached ugliness with all his might to better find characteristics. \[456\]

Dantan-Jeune’s production of caricatures is a clear example of the mass-market popularization of sculpture which, during the years of the *Juste-milieu*, lost its value as a noble art form to become a form of entertainment for the masses. The masses clearly were intimidated by the formal and noble stature of Academic sculpture, and could not relate to the models and the subjects that they were supposed to emulate. The masses did not understand the principles of beauty, but were familiar with ugliness because of its perceived prevalence among the lower class; "ugliness", or at least unattractiveness, was routine for the lower classes who because of their income did not have the resources to maintain basic hygiene. Mocking contemporary celebrities and other sitters of social importance to some extent eliminated the need for artistic sensibility. The lower class was unable to purchase Dantan-Jeune’s plaster caricatures which were sold, depending on the size and the detailing, from five to twenty-five francs, at a time when an average

\[456\] “Dantan, avec sa légion de réjouissantes figurines, se vit rapidement intronisé le Praxitèle et le Phidias de la foule. Tel qui, de sa vie, n’avait osé regarder en face une statue, un buste, un groupe, quelque beaux qu’ils fussent, et justement parce qu’ils étaient beaux, se surprit à rester des heures entières devant ces plâtres si laids qu’ils paraissaient plus vrais, plus vivans [sic] que nature! En effet, à leur laideur, si ingénieusement outrée, tenait leur extrême intérêt…La sculpture grecque et la sculpture imitée avaient pour principe d’atténuer le caractéristique, afin de rapprocher du beau idéal le plus possible: de là leur froideur. Dantan renversa la règle, et se rapprocha du laid de toutes ses forces, pour mieux trouver le caractéristique.” La Gazette musicale de Paris. *Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune*. Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.
A worker made less than three francs a day.\textsuperscript{457} Even if the lower classes enjoyed Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures, the cost remained prohibitive. The growing bourgeois class could afford his editions.

To reach a larger market, he collaborated with a publisher named Neuhaus to produce \textit{Dantanorama}, an album of ten popular lithographs that sold for five francs, a fraction of the cost of the sculpted caricatures. On the frontispiece, Dantan-Jeune lithographed his caricatural \textit{Self-Portrait} that reveals his distorted features and smallpox marks (fig. 6.35).\textsuperscript{458} On the base, he sculpted a rebus with a tooth and an angel with a scythe that reads “dent-temps” (tooth-time), a phonetic clue to his name. On the side, Dantan-Jeune also represents a street seller who carries on his head a plank on which multiple portraits and statuettes are placed. This menial job summarizes Dantan-Jeune’s career. It shows the link between high and low art and the role that Dantan-Jeune played in connecting the two distinct realms of sculpture. Despite the popularity of Dantan-Jeune's work, his two-dimensional prints lacked the artistry and finesses of his three-dimensional counterparts. Daumier's lithographs successfully captured the illusion of three-dimensionality in his series of the \textit{Célébrités of the Juste-Milieu}, an undertaking that evaded Dantan-Jeune. Dantan-Jeune’s inability to reproduce two-dimensional works at Daumier's level was not important. He could hire artists to reproduce his works and his career was similar to Philipon’s enterprise created for financial profit.


In 1836, Dantan-Jeune collaborated with Neuhaus and Susse to publish *Muséum Dantanorama*, an album of twenty-four lithographs that he did not lithograph. Instead, J.J. Grandville, Ramelet and Lepeudry drew the lithographic counterparts, which resulted in reproductions that conveyed the three-dimensionality of Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures. Grandville lithographed the frontispiece in which Dantan-Jeune is depicted as his caricatural bust; however, Grandville added a narrative that told of the type of clients who purchased Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricatures (fig. 6.36). The print he makes represents a gallery inside the Susse store where Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted caricatures are placed in two rows. The caricatures have the size of monumental statues and are secured on tall bases. A group of elegantly dressed bourgeois look at them as if they were a series of formal sculptures. Grandville’s lithograph thereby reveals the social class that was able to purchase the sculpted caricatures of Dantan-Jeune, which was comprised solely of the upper and middle echelons of society. The lithograph is telling in its absence of any reference to the lower class. The latter were only able to laugh at the caricatures from the windows of the store reputed for selling delicate bibelots of all sort. Even though he was considered the creator of a new genre of *sculpture populaire* that lowered artistic standards, he was principally dealing with the middle class, whose perceived lack of taste was believed to have resulted from their newfound wealth.
L. Dantan-Jeune and the wide diffusion of sculpted caricature

The Susse brothers have a special style, which is to embrace all genres; it means that they have the most diverse and valuable objects for the most refined and different tastes... They have everything of the latest fashion done in the most artistic style... every time that I pass by this enticing store, place de la Bourse, there are adorable statuettes of famous people that we see in battle rows behind the windows.  

Dantan-Jeune’s most popular statuette was his full-length caricature of Paganini, which was compared to a ghost, a study on osteoporosis, or a crucified Christ (fig. 6.37). Indeed, the work truly embodied the skeletal physiognomy of Paganini and the stance that he held when playing on stage. Dantan-Jeune's bold approach resulted in a caricature filled with expressive energy, while preserving Paganini’s melancholia and inward nature. The statuette shows a complete break with the formal bust that Dantan-Jeune made for the Salon. The static approach that plagued his formal portrait-busts is absent. Paganini shows a Romantic preference for sketches and expression, instead of a care for highly-finished details. Paganini’s caricature appears to have been made quickly,

---

459 “MM. Susse ont un genre spécial, qui est d’embrasser tous les genres ; c’est-à-dire d’avoir les choses les plus diverses et les plus précieuses, pour les goûts les plus délicats et les plus opposés... MM. Susse ont tout ce qu’il y a de plus nouveau et de plus artistiquement travaillé... chaque fois que je passe devant ce reluisant magasin, place de la Bourse, ce sont les adorables petites statuettes de personnage célèbres que l’on y voit rangées en ordre de bataille derrière les carreaux...” The Susse publishing house was one of many stores located in the passage des Panoramas, which included the most renowned Parisian shops. Unlike the Palais-Royal, which was exclusively frequented by the most fashionable Parisians, the passage des Panoramas attracted foreigners and provincials alike. For a description of the Susse store see Jules Janin. “De la sculpture et des bronzes de M. Fratin. Sur le magasin Susse.” L’Artiste. Vol. XI. Paris: Aux Bureaux de l’Artiste, 1834, 46-47.

sharing the dynamic qualities of the Romantic sculptures of Daumier, Préault, and David d’Angers.

Paganini never walked in a straight line when entering or leaving the stage. Instead, he deliberately walked diagonally with slow and uncoordinated gestures. The dichotomy between Paganini’s thin, sick body and uneven shoulders and the powerful emotion that overtook him when playing certainly inspired Dantan-Jeune's caricature. The statuette is structured by contortions that evolve in a spiral of twists and turns. He uses diagonals and broken lines to convey the fiery soul of the musical virtuoso. Dantan-Jeune represents Paganini in an exaggerated contraposto that produces a disjunction between the upper and lower part of the body. The curve of the hips, attached to the lower body seemingly combines the two detached elements into a loose “S” shape. The caricature is a combination of sharp edges, curves, diagonals, and vertical lines. The subject's bony structure is emphasized through a concave shape at the bottom base, molded by Dantan-Jeune into a deep curve. The skeletal silhouette is covered with a performance costume that clings to Paganini’s body. Folds around the knee joints and at the base of the pants add to the bony legs, while folds between Paganini’s legs bring attention to the horizontal shape of his phallus. Two spidery-like hands hold the violin, and its bow stands out in a steep diagonal. His arms are twisted unnaturally against his upper torso and form a sharp diagonal that ends at the tip of his bow. The profile view of the back of Paganini's body forms a straight line that ends with the gentle curve of his head, as he tilts toward the violin. However, from the back, two uneven shoulders protrude on either side of a curved spine that is visible under the jacket. The front of the statuette is made of sharp points: the bony knee cap of the leg to stabilize him while
playing, the tail of his evening jacket, the right elbow that forms a “V”, and the tip of the violin. Paganini’s emaciated body and his violin have become one entity which appears animated by the contrasting and seemingly unbalanced shapes that nonetheless form a spiral that keeps on shifting from every side.

Even though Dantan-Jeune used phrenology in his formal busts, he regularly ridiculed its scientific method when making caricatures. When he sculpted the statuette of Paganini, the accuracy of phrenology was already questioned. Dantan-Jeune was able to capture “the ridicule of humanity through bumps”. Indeed, he represents the forehead of Paganini as excessively large and long. The size of the violinist’s head is equal to his upper torso, resulting in a grossly deformed shape similar to a hydrocephalic. Surprisingly, the exaggeration does not shock. Instead, it fits well with the rest of the caricature made of seemingly discordant elements, which Dantan-Jeune combines into a grotesque, yet harmonious whole. In fact, aside from the exaggerated forehead, the caricature shares similarities with Delacroix’s 1832 Portrait of Niccolò Paganini (fig. 6.38). Delacroix represented the virtuoso engrossed on the stage in his music,

---

461 “Il serait trop long aujourd’hui d’énumérer le nombre de crânes, ou prétendus tels, que nous comptons, non pas en Europe, non en France, mais à Paris seulement: tout tourne au crâne…Jamais la science de Lavater, de Gall ou de Spurzheim n’avait prit un pareil essor et fait autant de prosélytes; nous sommes dans le siècle des protubérances, chacun en à sa part, et ceux qui ne travaillent pas d’après la bosse, donnent dedans. Demandez quel est l’artiste le plus occupé, le plus recherché, le plus répandu, chacun vous répondra: c’est Dantan, le sculpteur à la mode; Dantan qui a su animer la terre glaise et rendre le plâtre expressif; Dantan qui traduit spirituellement en bosse les ridicules de l’humanité.” Anonymous. “Les crânes.” Vert-Vert. (25 September 1832). Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune. Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.

and insists on the peculiar stance that Paganini always held when playing the violin. Dantan-Jeune’s statuette of Paganini shows the same stance and intense absorption; his caricature marks his origin as a Romantic sculptor.

M. Dantan-Jeune and the commerce of formal statuettes

Dantan is the embodiment of the independent artist: he does not need your Louvre; his Salon, it is Susse, it is Paris; his wealth, it is him who has acquired it... What worries him most, at this time, is a new series of elegant statuettes that he has in mind, which would retrace, without any caricature, the portraits of our dandies. We, who have already seen these precious sketches in Dantan's atelier, can predict him such a success that all the heroes of the fashionable Parisian clubs will have to pose. We congratulate Dantan for this formal reproduction of selected sitters. To fulfill its mission, the sculpture of Dantan must consult with the public on two points, its taste for elegance and for mockery.463

Dantan-Jeune did not just create a new type of sculpture by making caricatures; he also foresaw the public’s desire for accessible works of art in the formal style of statuettes. The popularity for statuettes embodies a conflict that arose between the Fine

---

463 "Dantan est l’artiste indépendant par essence: il n’a pas besoin de votre Louvre; son salon, c’est Susse, c’est Paris; sa fortune, c’est lui qui se l’est acquise... Ce qui le préoccupe le plus à l’heure qu’il est, c’est une nouvelle série de figurines élégantes qu’il a en tête, et qui retraceraient, sans charge aucune, les portraits de nos dandy. Nous qui avons déjà vu dans l’atelier de Dantan ces délicieuses esquisses, nous pouvons lui prédire un succès tel que tous les héros des clubs fashionables de Paris devront y passer. Nous félicitons ici Dantan de cette reproduction sérieuse de natures choisies. La sculpture de Dantan, pour remplir sa mission, doit consulter l’esprit public dans deux choses, sont goût pour l’élégance et pour la moquerie." Roger de Beauvoir. “Dantan!” La Mode. (18 February 1838), 163 and 167. Souvenirs de Dantan Jeune. Bibliothèque Nationale de la Ville de Paris. Fol.31 209.
Arts Administration and the lowering of the *noble* art of sculpture through commercialization. It also attests to the taste of the bourgeoisie for ornamental sculpture to decorate their apartments, including their foyers and other small rooms. Between 1831 and 1834, the Jury of the Salons accepted most small scale works; however, by 1835, the majority of submissions of statuettes were rejected.\(^{464}\) They had come to illustrate the lack of taste from the bourgeoisie who preferred to fill their mantle tops with statuettes of celebrities instead of virtuous models worthy of depiction. In addition, the reproduction of statuettes blurred the difference between artistry and industry. Depending on the artistic stand of the critics, the Administration, the bourgeoisie, or artists were blamed for the revival of small scale sculpture that flooded official Salons and specialty shops in the mid-1830s.

Dantan-Jeune exhibited statuettes at the Salons of 1833 and 1834, but stopped submitting when the Jury rejecting them *en masse* in 1835. They showed a lack of taste and were considered decorative objects unsuited for exhibition at the Salon. In 1838, however, Dantan-Jeune submitted six portrait-busts and one statuette. The busts were accepted but the statuette of Edmond-Roger de Bully (1809-1866; called Roger de

\(^{464}\) In France, the edition of statuettes was already popular in the eighteenth century during which small statues were made in biscuit or porcelain for the aristocracy. Its popularity fell out of favor when Neo-Classical portraiture swept aside the frivolous Rococo style of dainty statuettes that typically depicted dancers, performers, and Commedia Del’Arte personages. For more information, see James Holderbaum. “Portrait Sculpture”, Peter Fusco and H.W. Janson, *The Romantics to Rodin*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art and New York: George Braziller, Inc. 1980, 6-51; Luc Benoist. *La sculpture romantique*. Introduction by Isabelle Leroy-Jay Lesmaître. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1994; Isabelle-Leroy-Jay Lesmaître. “La statuette romantique.” *La sculpture française au XIX e siècle*. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1986, 254- 261. All of the eight statuettes that were submitted at the Salon of 1833 were accepted; by contrast, only one statuette was accepted at the Salon of 1843 for eleven submissions. See p. 488, fn. 13 and 21.
Beauvoir; fig. 6.39) was rejected.\footnote{Archives Louvre KK 32 and KK55, 22 février 1838: no. 2111, Dantan jeune, \textit{Roger de Beauvoir}, statuette plâtre, “refusée.” Lemaistre, 418, fn.23. For an illustration of Dantan-Jeune’s terra-cotta statuette of \textit{Roger de Beauvoir}, see Jacques Boulenger. \textit{Sous Louis-Philippe: les dandys}. Paris: Société d’éditions littéraires et artistiques, librairie Paul Ollendorf, 1907, 170.} This rejection shows that the Administration continued to reject what was perceived to be a lower art form even though the Jury accepted a least four statuettes from other sculptors.\footnote{Academic sculptor Johann Dominik Mahlknecht (1793-1876; called Dominique Molchnext) showed two bronze of female sitters; sculptor M. Grass, a full length bronze statuette of a \textit{Portrait d’homme}, and Gechter showed a group statuette of \textit{Jeanne d’Arc terrassant un Anglais} For a description of the statuettes, see Anonymous. “Salon de 1838. Sculpture.” \textit{Journal des Beaux Arts}. Fifth year. Vol. 1. No. 22. (22 April 1838), 200 and 202.} It is puzzling that Dantan-Jeune’s statuette of \textit{Beauvoir} was rejected and that the sculptor decided to submit a statuette when he no longer needed the publicity of the Salon. Consequently, his submission can be interpreted as a move to ridicule the members of the Jury. Roger de Beauvoir was a wealthy dandy, a writer, and a \textit{bon vivant} who had many friends and as many enemies. Beauvoir made enemies among members of the Institute whom he deemed unqualified to judge. In his first review of the Salon in 1836, Beauvoir wrote:

\begin{quote}
It is unfortunate for us...to have to repeat, after all coverage in the daily press, the complaints and recriminations that the jury has been subjected to this year. But dissatisfaction has been unanimous in the camp of artists who have all protested against the war council, which sits in the Louvre... Are musicians truly capable, we ask, to judge painters, and is an architect competent in front of a seascape? Must the artist who has been admitted in past exhibitions incur the \textit{veto} of censorship just because he has suddenly shown that he is equal to or has surpassed his critics?\footnote{“Il est malheureux pour nous...d’avoir à répéter, après tous les organes de la presse quotidienne, les plaintes et les récriminations dont le jury à été l’objet cette année. Mais le mécontentement a été unanime au camp des artistes, ils ont tous réclamé contre le conseil de guerre qui siège au Louvre...Des musiciens sont-ils bien aptes, dites-nous, à juger des peintres, et un architecte est-il compétent devant une marine? L’artiste reçu à de précédents expositions doit-il encourir un \textit{veto} de censure parce ce fait seul qu’il s’est montré tout d’un coup l’égal ou le maître de ses censeurs?” Roger de Beauvoir. “Salon de 1836. Premier article.” \textit{La Revue de Paris}. Vol. 27. Paris: Au bureau de La Revue de Paris, 1836, 165-166. That year, newspapers published a story involving an unnamed member of the Jury who, after learning that he mistress left him for Dantan-Jeune’s apprentice, asked that the sculptor make his portrait-bust. That request was a ploy to meet his rival. Dantan-Jeune made the bust but kept it hidden until the member realized he made a caricature instead of a formal bust. At the following Salon, the Academician was able...}
The rejection of the statuette of the critic is thus hardly surprising. Dantan-Jeune’s submission of the statuette of *Beauvoir* was a cynical statement against the sectarian Institute, which was ill-suited to judge artists’ submissions. In addition, Roger de Beauvoir embodied the dissipation of the wealthy Romantic youth who led dissolute lives. A contemporain described him as follow:

He was born Roger, just that, but being beautiful, well made and very elegant of his person, he told himself, one day while looking in the mirror, that all these benefits were well worth a title of nobility, and to enter high society, he added to his name, the patronyme of de Beauvoir, from the land that owned in Normandy...He was then one of our most elegant dandies. With his curly black hair and his blue coat with gilded buttons, his vest made of yellow goat hair, her pearl-gray trousers, his cane in rhinoceros horn, when he went in society all women had eyes on him.468

Dantan-Jeune’s full-length portrait-statuette represents *Beauvoir* in an elegant contraposto pose, with his upper torso and head turned slightly to the right. His left hand is placed on his thigh and holds his redingote to the side, a pose that allows Dantan-Jeune to reveal *Beauvoir*’s slim figure. He wears a tightly fitted vest with a deep shawl collar. Under the collar, a wrapped scarf covers the top of his shirt. The relaxed yet flexed pose to veto Dantan-Jeune’s formal bust of prolific play writer Augustin-Eugène Scribe (1791-1861) from the Salon. This tale exemplified the lack of partiality of the Jury who chose works based on personal preference instead of merit.

468 “Il était né Roger, tout court, mais étant beau, bien fait, et très élégant de sa personne, il se dit un jour en se regardant dans la glace, que tous ces avantages valaient bien un titre de noblesse, et pour se pousser dans le monde, il ajouta à son nom patronymique celui de la terre de Beauvoir, qu’il possédait en Normandie...C’était alors un de nos plus élégants dandys. Avec sa belle chevelure noire et frisée, son habit bleu à boutons d’or, son gilet de poil de chèvre jaune, son pantalon gris perle, sa canne en corne de rhinocéros, quand il allait dans le monde il donnait dans l’œil de toutes les femmes.” Léon Séché. *Études d’histoire romantique: Alfred de Musset, l’homme et l’oeuvre, les camarades*. Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1907, 170. For information on dandys, including de Beauvoir, see Jacques Boulenger. *Sous Louis-Philippe: les dandys*. Paris: Société d’éditions littéraires et artistiques, librairie Paul Ollendorf, 1907.
emphasizes folds on the vest and at the break of the arm, which give a lively and realistic representation of de Beauvoir. Dantan-Jeune shows the dandy with his right arm facing down. His hand holds the rim of his top hat and a thin cane which falls diagonally behind his leg. Beauvoir’s pair of fitted trousers, with creases at the knees, forms diagonals that echo the lines on his pelvis. Dantan-Jeune highlights his phallus by placing a dark crease underneath. The lower part of his trousers continues to taper, and partly cover a pair of thin, pointed shoes which are placed in opposite corners of the square base on which Beauvoir stands. Underneath, Dantan-Jeune has sculpted an elaborate pedestal with horizontal steps and vertical designs enhanced with tendrils on every corner. In the center of the base, an ornate scroll reveals the name of the sitter in an oval frame. Dantan-Jeune sculpted Beauvoir’s physiognomy with great care. The dandy looks away from the viewer and he holds his head erect, which conveys his haughty personality. A short mustache covers his upper lip. Under the lower lip a small patch of hair lies atop a round and clean-shaven chin. Beauvoir wears his hair in a pageboy style, curled on the ends. Dantan-Jeune made the statuette with great care for details, and its pose is typical of contemporary statuettes which represent celebrities, aristocrats, military figures, and other models. In fact, it hardly differs from other small-scale sculptures that were still accepted at the Salon, albeit in small numbers.

In 1837, Dantan-Jeune produced fewer caricatures because the fad had passed. Instead, he focused on formal statuettes of celebrities and of dandies who were thought to embody modern elegance, wit, and charm. The statuette of Beauvoir is one of many that he sold directly to the public. Dantan-Jeune’s series is a record of contemporary figures comparable to David d’Angers’ series of medallions. But the latter condemned Dantan-
Jeune’s choice of sitters. They lacked morality. They were visual embodiments of the dissipation of wealthy youth and, by association, of Dantan-Jeune, who frequented the group that Beauvoir called “the heroes”. The figure of the “hero” was no longer based on Ancient ideals of social, political, or military merit. Instead, the new heroes were a segment of society who led hedonist lives and who mocked the supposed morality of the bourgeoisie. The criticism against Dantan-Jeune intensified. An anonymous writer stated:

I denounce the Dantan appointed for public scrutiny. Here is why. We are inundated with statuettes. Statuettes come on us from I do not know where. They emerge from underground; they fall from the sky just as the locusts of Egypt, always, always, constantly without respite. The corpus delicti of Mr. Dantan has had the immediate effect of pushing a crowd of people, under the pretext of recording the features of models more or less worthless, or unknown, to sculpt a multitude of statuettes for which there is no need whatsoever.

Nonetheless, the financial success that Dantan-Jeune achieved from his production of caricatures and formal statuettes went against the basic foundation of artists who were supposed to depend on the Academy for patronage and commissions. This independence shows a clear break between modern artists who took charge of their own production and those who waited for the protection of the all-mighty artistic establishment. Consequently, Dantan-Jeune’s active participation in the commercialization of sculpture was criticized by elitists. They wanted to keep the art of
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sculpture to a status quo that had ceased to be relevant during the July Monarchy’s Industrial Revolution. The supposed didactic mission of sculpture was lost with the emergence of consumerism. Dantan-Jeune’s sculpted body of work embodies a divide from a static art form which bored the audience because of its sitters’ immutability, nobility, elitism, and depiction of virtue.

N. Dantan-Jeune and the demise of sculpted caricature

David d’Angers worked on Balzac’s medallions and the large bust for approximately ten years. During those years, Dantan-Jeune’s caricature continued to be referenced in satirical lithographs. In 1842, Grandville caricatured l’Apothéose Balzac (The Apotheosis Balzac; fig. 6.40), an unrealized project that shows the holding power of Dantan-Jeune’s caricatures. Grandville directly copied Dantan-Jeune’s caricature of Balzac as a dandy in an ink and crayon drawing that shows the writer on a pedestal. Under him, a swarm of admirers form an unruly procession. Even though he is presented as a caricature, Balzac is represented as an illustrious figure worthy of commemoration.

In the center of the composition, Grandville portrays Balzac as a gargantuan man seated
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471 Grandville left his project unfinished. The sketch for the fan is typically dated 1842 although Judith Meyer-Petit believes that conception of the drawing originated between 1836 and 1838. For more information on Granville’s project, see Judith Meyer-Petit. “Le Balzac de Grandville: un “éventail” de lectures.” L’Année balzacienne. Nouvelle série. No. 12. 1991, 455-461. The drawing is held in the Collection of La Maison Balzac, Paris. Ref: BAL. 0001. In 1844, Grandville once again caricatured Balzac in the lithograph Grande course au clocher charivariq, which was no longer the replica of Dantan-Jeune’s caricature but resembled the caricature of Benjamin Roubaud’s 1842 Grand chemin de la postérité. Grandville’s print was published in Le Charivari of 20 February 1844. Collection Maison Balzac, Paris. Ref: BAL. 0277
He holds his massive cane as the symbol of his genius; bright rays emanate from the large sun that Dantan-Jeune represented on the caricature of Balzac as a Cane.

That year, Philipon published Benjamin Roubaud’s (1811-1847) color lithograph, *Grand chemin de la postérité* (High Road to Posterity; fig. 6.41) in *Le Panthéon Charivarique.* It shows Victor Hugo riding a chimera and leading the way for contemporary authors and critics. Hugo holds a pole with a banner that reads *Le laid c’est le beau* (Ugliness is Beauty). The artistic motto that Romantic artists adopted was still valid a decade after Hugo’s call for the depiction of the grotesque and the ugly. Roubaud has represented Balzac as an overweight and gregarious dandy. His facial features are different from Dantan-Jeune's caricatures but his outfit and overall physiology is still directly based on the sculptor's caricature. In fact, Roubaud acknowledged the artistic merit of Dantan-Jeune in a second caricature that he published in *Le Panthéon Charivarique* (fig. 6.42). Dantan-Jeune is looking in a hand-held mirror to work on his own caricature. Multiple statuettes of recognizable celebrities that he caricatured are placed on a wide table and directly on the floor. The caption reads, “Younger brother of your chisel, Dantan, our pencil caricatures your portrait, the mischievous caricature
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472 At the Salon of 1831, Romantic artist Antonin Moine (1796-1849) exhibited *Les Lutins en voyage,* a relief sculpture of a fantastical winged creature, half-horse and half-dragon. Two laughing goblins with pairs of wings on their back rode the imaginary creature. Moine exhibited plaster medallions, portrait busts, and two low reliefs. *Les Lutins en voyage* represents the chimera, which is part of a composition that depicts “deux faunesques adolescents ailés…ricanant, dans le vertige d’une course échevelée, sur la croupe d’un hippocampe ailé…” (two young winged fauns…grinning, in the frenzy of a tousled race, on the rump of a winged seahorse…) For the list of Moine’s sculptures and paintings exhibited at the Salon of 1831, see J.B. Galley. *Un Romantique oublié: Antonin Moine* (1796-1849). Saint-Etienne: Imprimerie administrative & commercial Ménard, 1898, 36-37. The caption of Roubaud’s lithograph reads: “Hugo roi des Hugolâtres, armé de sa bonne lame de Tolède portant la bannière de Notre-Dame de Paris” (Hugo, King of the Hugo Worshippers, Armed with his Toledo Sword, Holding the Banner of Notre Dame de Paris). It depicts, among many, Théophile Gautier, Gérard de Lamartine, Paul Foucher, George Sand, Eugène Scribe, Eugène Soulié, Alexandre Dumas (fils), Alfred de Vigny, and Jules Janin. The colored lithograph is held in the collection of La Maison Balzac, Paris. Ref: BAL. 0082.
renders your sarcastic face uglier but your name always remains beautiful.\footnote{The caption reads: “Frère cadet de ton ciseau, notre crayon, Dantan, charge ta portraiture, la maligne caricature fait laide ici ta caustique figure, mais ton nom reste toujours beau.” Two versions of Roubaud’s lithograph (a color and a black and white) are included in Grandville’s Museum Dantanorama. Although not part of the original album, various caricatures of Dantan-Jeune and Grandville have been added at an ulterior date. The album is held in the Collection of the Musée Carnavalet, Paris.} The writer of the verse – perhaps Philipon – succinctly acknowledged the superiority of sculpted caricature over its two-dimensional counterpart.

Roubaud based his portrayal on the small caricatural bust of 1832, Dantan-Jeune, \textit{par lui-même} (Self-Portrait by Dantan-Jeune; fig. 6.43). The \textit{Self-Portrait} divulges the hidden side of Dantan-Jeune, who appears to be a tortured artist.\footnote{Dantan-Jeune made a second caricature the following year, which was even more expressionistic than the first rendition. In the 1833 caricature, he represented himself with caved in features, eyes partially shut, and two veins that popped out of his neck. He appeared to have anticipated the weathering of old age and showed himself in an even more improbable depiction. Both caricatures are illustrated in Philippe Sorel. “Les Dantan du Musée Carnavalet: portraits-charges sculptés de l’époque romantique.” \textit{Gazette des Beaux-Arts}. 6ème période. Vol. CVII. 128th year. 1986, 27. Ref. S. 1036-D.405 and Ref. 1037, respectively.} Dantan-Jeune was only thirty-two but his facial features are already worn out. His deep set eyes express melancholy with his downward gaze. The bust shows asymmetrical characteristics, and he emphasizes his ugliness with a crooked nose, uneven eyebrows, and deep furrows across his forehead. His unkempt hair stands out in thick chunks, adding to the inharmonious traits. His upper lip is thicker on one side and his lower lip droops dramatically toward his chin. High cheekbones emphasize caved-in skin and withered flesh. His sickly thin neck has a protruding Adam’s apple. His collar bones jut out from an emaciated upper torso. Dantan-Jeune clearly used his bare hands to mold the caricature, resulting in protruding masses that clash with hollow parts. Dantan-Jeune only used a sculptor's tool for the sole purpose of drilling deep holes throughout his forehead, his cheeks and neck, in order to represent the smallpox scars that he bore. Clearly,
Dantan-Jeune made his *Self-Portrait* to show that he did not spare his own image. Indeed, he used it in lithographic form for the covers of his albums of caricatures sold in 1833 and thereafter. Dantan-Jeune’s *Self-Portrait* embodies the reverse side of formal portraiture. It is a bust that shows modernism in the freedom of handling, the accentuation of physical flaws, the validity of ugliness, and the externalization of the artist’s tortured nature.

Dantan Jeune's *Self-Portrait* is akin to Carpeaux's 1874 unfinished portrait *Le Docteur Achille Flaubert* (fig. 6.44). Carpeaux sculpted the head of *Flaubert* when already very ill and died before completing it. Carpeaux represents *Flaubert* with eyes looking down, a slightly opened mouth, a crooked aquiline nose, and an unruly beard that flows in waves below the neck. The whole face is made of uneven pieces of plaster that Carpeaux has not smoothed out. The portrait is a combination of imprecise modeling that gives movement to the sculpture. Perhaps Carpeaux would have smoothed out his first impulse. It results in a sketch that shows his facility of handling and his modernity. Yet, Dantan-Jeune's loose handling and unequivocal depiction of ugliness in his *Self-Portrait* attest to his Modernism as much as does Carpeaux's sketch. A difference needs to be emphasized: forty years separate the two busts.

Conservatives slowly accepted the depiction of ugliness in sculpture so long as the sitter status was worthy of commemoration. Slowly, the sculpted caricatures of Dantan-Jeune lost their popularity. In 1840, *La Mode* published an unsigned lithograph that attest to the artistic change (fig. 6.45). The caricature represents Dantan-Jeune trying to escape from a swarm of sculpted caricatures that he has made in the past. They attack him with the attributes that he included, which they now use as weapons to beat him.
Dantan-Jeune’s facial features are based on his *Self-Portrait*, which is more exaggerated than the original. The sculpted caricatures that made him famous have grown to his height and assault the frightened sculptor who tries to flee from the nightmarish encounter. Balzac is part of the large group of caricatures that have come to life; he uses his massive cane to hit Dantan-Jeune. The caption reads, "The reign of ugliness has finally arrived. The beautiful is driven out of painting...the novel, the theater and sculpture. Dantan is outdated, antiquated...all the great men that he has shown, all these celebrities in plaster find him too lovely...The artistic and literary revolution has happened. Long live the ugly! Beauty is rococo." Dantan-Jeune was under fire from multiple critics who had grown tired of the sculpted caricatures that he continued to produce, albeit at a much slower pace than he did in the early 1830s. Like all trends, they lost their appeal and ceased to be amusing to the public. The depiction of ugliness had become more acceptable. Hugo's call for new artistic style that reflected contemporary life had been answered.
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475 “Le règne du laid est enfin arrivé...Le beau est chassé de la peinture...du roman, du théâtre et de la statuaire. Dantan est dépassé, vieilli...tous ces grands hommes qu’il a illustrés, toutes ces célébrités en plâtre le trouvent trop joli...La révolution artistique et littéraire s’accomplit. Vive le laid ! Le beau est rococo.” The color lithograph, “Miroir caricatural” from *La Mode* (14 Mars 1840) is included in *Album Grandville. Dantanorama*. Collection of the Musée Carnavalet, Paris.
Conclusion: Origins of Modernism in French Romantic Sculpture

The purpose of my thesis has been to re-evaluate the sculptures that Préault, David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, and Daumier produced in the 1830s, which suggest, perhaps surprisingly, a significant level of modernism. When commissioned, sculptors were compelled to work in a conservative style; yet when making portraits that were tokens of friendship, or when they chose their models, their works contained a dynamism and progressivism that anticipated the expressive sculpted portraiture made at the end of the nineteenth century. The sculptures of these four artists have been overshadowed by contemporary art historians who have decisively selected Carpeaux and Rodin as the embodiments of Modern sculptors, an assertion that I contest.

In contrast to Wagner’s assertion that Carpeaux is the first Modern sculptor, I have argued that the progressivism of an earlier generation of the sculptors studied here, in fact, surpassed his achievements and serve as early examples of a kind of expressive sculpture that would later be identified with figures such as Rodin. In addition, the 1890’s works of Émile Antoine Bourdelle (1861-1929) and Jules Desbois (1851-1935) find direct antecedents in the progressive style of portraits and caricatures that Préault, David d'Angers, Dantan-Jeune and Daumier had sculpted fifty years before. The younger two sculptors rejected the representation of realistic details; they emphasized the most significant features of their subjects; they accentuated high reliefs and deep grooves which resulted in an interactive play of lights and shadows; and they left the marks of
their hands and tools on unfinished surfaces to convey their presence through direct handling.

French expressive sculpture of the 1890's is based on the distortion of facial features to a point of gross exaggeration, an artistic style that is associated with the art of caricature. The subjectivity that Bourdelle and Desbois infused in their expressive periods borrows stylistics strategies that had already been developed during the July Monarchy. Physiognomy and phrenology opened new venues for Romantic sculptors who used these "pseudo-sciences" to exaggerate and emphasize the inner nature of their sitters rather than just making realistic or idealized portrayals of them. As a result, the sculpted portraits and caricatures of the four artists generated an artistic mechanism based on subjectivity and expressionism, which conservative art critics and members of the Salon Jury tried to suppress. Their works were misunderstood because of the perceived ugliness of their subjects and the lack of finish, traditionally considered an artistic flaw in the art of sculpture. Sculpture was considered immutable and was imagined to follow the tradition of Ancient precedents. Instead, the four artists showed a complete rupture by creating modern sculptures based on a hybrid and eclectic style that shattered artistic values of decorum.

The works of David d’Angers, Dantan-Jeune, Préault, and Daumier all show a distinct rejection of formal portraiture. They had the audacity to create what I believe was an unprecedented avant-garde style of portraiture. Anticipating the expressivity of late nineteenth century sculptors, the four artists showed their progressiveness by purposely leaving their portraits and caricatures with irregular surfaces, exaggerated mops of hair, distorted facial features, and by emphasizing physiognomic and physiologic
characteristics, thus overthrowing Academic traditions of the realistic and idealized beautification of sitters. Dantan-Jeune's 1833 caricature of Louis-Hector Berlioz appears as an enormous mop of hair in which snakes intertwine with the composer's hair, and his 1833 *Dantan-Jeune par lui-même* (Dantan-Jeune's Self-Portrait; figs. conclusion.1 and 2) is made of broken and unfinished facets that are comparable to Bourdelle's 1895 *Figures hurlantes* (Screaming Figures) and 1891 *Portrait de Beethoven aux grands cheveux* (Portrait of Beethoven with full hair; figs. conclusion. 3 and 4). Fifty years before Desbois' depictions of *La Mort casquée* (Death with a Helmet) and *La Misère* (Misery; figs. conclusion. 5 and 6), Daumier was already constructing a variant of modernism by sculpting caricatures of figures who appeared as cadaverous, ravaged, and ugly portrayals of his contemporaries. Daumier's 1833 sculpted busts of Jean-Claude Fulchiron and Auguste Gady exemplify a progressive style as expressive as that of Desbois, a method that completely shattered the concepts of beauty and morality expected from sculpted portraiture (figs. conclusion. 7 and 8).

Yet, despite the modernist qualities that the four sculptors exhibited, Carpeaux has become the household name that draws in crowds in the name of Modernism. In 2008, the Musée d'Orsay held the exhibition "Masques de Carpeaux à Matisse", which started with examples of Ancient masks and evolved chronologically to objects from the turn of the twentieth century. Carpeaux was represented by three masks of the same model, Anna Foucart, which he often used for his group sculptures. Carpeaux made the masks in 1860. The young and pretty sitter is looking to the side and her smile reveals a set of perfect teeth. The naturalism of her face is typical of the numerous unblemished female portraits that Carpeaux made. In the exhibition, Dantan-Jeune was represented
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with only one mask, although he made multiples. Dantan-Jeune's 1834 mask of Niccolò Paganini is an example of formal portraiture turned on its head (figs. conclusion. 9 and 10). The face of the violinist seems at first to be a distorted caricature that nonetheless resembled the violinist. The mask’s expressiveness – with sunken features, broken contours, disjunctions, exaggerations, and ugliness of features defied the expectation that beauty ought to be present in art. Unlike Carpeaux's mask, which in comparison appears dated, the mask of Paganini exudes contemporaneity. This example is one of many to affirm that Carpeaux was not the first modernist sculptor.

My thesis is also written to establish the importance of the art of sculpted caricature as a generator for expressive sculpture of the late nineteenth century. Caricatures allowed a range of expressive distortions that were rarely admissible in formal portraiture. The vogue of sculpted caricatures in the 1830's turned three-dimensional portraiture inside out. Nonetheless, sculpted caricatures have often been dismissed as lesser art works unworthy of academic discussions or ambitious curatorial projects. In 1999, La Maison de Balzac held the exhibition "L'Artiste selon Balzac" in which Judith Meyer-Petit writes that the caricatures of Balzac do not hold status akin to his formal portraits. I disagree with this point of view. Sculpted caricatures must be included with formal portraiture in order to give a comprehensive range of artistic styles that emerged during the early part of the July Monarchy, and which reveal a surprising degree of modernism. Despite Meyer-Petit's statement, Dantan-Jeune's 1835 caricature of Honoré de Balzac in the shape of his cane is illustrated next to Rodin's 1897 monumental
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477 "Une fois éliminées les caricatures qui n'ont pas leur place ici, la quasi-totalité des autres portraits est exposée..." (once we have eliminated the caricatures that have no place here, the majority of the other portraits are exhibited...). Judith Meyer-Petit. "Figures et figure de l'artiste selon Balzac", L'Artiste selon Balzac: entre la toise du savant et le vertige du fou. exh. cat. Paris: Paris-Musées, 1999, 24.
This visual comparison validates the precedence of Dantan-Jeune's variant of modernism prior to Rodin's version. In fact, Rodin imbued his statue of Balzac with caricatural characteristics of exaggeration, simplification, and distortion. Later on, Rodin conceded: "The only thing that I realize today is that the neck is too thick. I thought that I needed to enlarge it because, to my mind, modern sculpture ought to exaggerate forms, in a moral stand point." Thus, the primary difference between Rodin's concept of modern sculpture and that of caricaturists was based on a lingering sense of morality and decorum vis-à-vis the art of sculpture, which had been completely shattered in the 1830s.

My intention has been to re-evaluate the works of four Romantic artists who have not been yet firmly positioned within the discussion of Modern sculpture. David d'Angers, Préalut, Daumier, and Dantan-Jeune have been studied independently; however, a comprehensive analysis of their artistic importance in the history of modern sculpture was lacking. Consequently, this thesis was written to address a scholarly deficiency in the study of Romantic sculpture, especially to highlight Romantic sculpture as a generator for Modern sculpture. In their own way, the four artists answered the calls of Victor Hugo, Théophile Gautier and Charles Baudelaire for a contemporary artistic style to reflect their times. In fact, they far exceeded the writers' demands and revolutionized the art of sculpture. It would take fifty years for French expressive sculptors to absorb the innovations of their predecessors and to integrate them in their
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own "Modern" sculptures.
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1.7 Honoré Daumier, lithograph of *Ratapoil*, 1850
1.8 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Caricature de Cherzère, chef de gare de Drouai*, ca. 1860

1.9 Dantan-Jeune, *César Ducornet*, ca. 1826
1.10 Dantan-Jeune Drawing of César Ducornet, ca.1827
1.11 César Ducornet, Self-Portrait, ca.1827
1.12 Anonymous, Illustration of statuette of César Ducornet, 1856
1.13  David d’Angers,  Bust of *La Douleur*, 1811
1.14 Jean-Antoine Houdon, Bust of *Buffon*, 1793

1.15 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of *Ernest André*, 1862
1.16 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of Charles Garnier, 1868

1.17 Pierre-Philippe Roland, Bust of Augustin Pajou, 1797
1.18 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of Napoléon III, 1872-73
1.19  Lysippus, *The Dying Alexander*

1.20  David d’Angers  Bust of *Lieutenant Poupart* 1810

1.21  Pierre-Philippe Roland,  Bust of *Denis-Sèbastien* Leroy, 1796
1.22 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of Henri-François d’Aguesseau, ca. 1853
1.23  Claude-André Deseine, *Comte de Mirabeau* and detail, 1891

1.24  Jean Tessier, *Bust of Comte de Mirabeau*, 1791
1.25  Jean-Antoine Houdon, Herm *Bust of Mirabeau*, 1791

1.26  David d'Angers *Fronton du Panthéon*, 1833-1837

1.27  David d'Angers, Detail of *Fronton du Panthéon and Mirabeau*, 1833-1837
1.28  David d’Angers *Tête d’Ulysse*, 1815
2.1 François-Joseph Heim, *Charles X distribuant des récompenses aux artistes à la fin du salon de 1824 au Louvre*, 1827

2.2 David d'Angers, *Bernard-Germain de Lacépède*, 1827

2.3 Eugène Delacroix, *La Mort de Sardanapale*, 1827
2. 4  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *La Danse*, 1869

2. 5  David d’Angers, Statue of *the Grand Condé*, 1827 (after 1816 model)
2.6  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Portrait of an Unknown Man*, 1849

2.7  Auguste Préault, Medallion of *Xavier Sigalon*, ca. 1829
2. 8  Henri Charles Guérard, Lithograph of a medallion of Honoré Daumier, ca. 1888

2. 9  Honoré Daumier, Portrait d’une jeune fille, ca. 1826
2.12 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bust of *Le Chinois*, 1868

2.13 Dantan-Jeune, Bust of *Esprit Noir*, 1827

2.14 Lithograph *Osages Arriving in Paris in 1827*, 1827
2.15 Carle Vernet, *Les Incroyables*, ca. 1796
2. 16  Dantan-Jeune, Formal bust of *Horace Vernet*, 1829

2. 17  Dantan-Jeune, Formal bust of *Carle Vernet*, 1829
2. 18  Dantan-Jeune, Caricatural Bust of *Carle Vernet*, 1829

2. 19  Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of *Carle Vernet as a Horse*, 1832
2. 20  Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of Jean-Baptiste Tolbecque, 1833

2.21  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Bust of Charles Carpeaux*, 1870
2. 22  Dantan-Jeune, Caricatural bust of *Horace Vernet*, 1829

2. 23  Dantan-Jeune, Full-length caricature of *Horace Vernet*, 1832

2. 24  Horace Vernet, *Self-Portrait*, 1832
2. 25  David d’Angers, Medallion of Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, 1826

2. 26  David d’Angers, Drawing of Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, 1826
2. 27  David d'Angers, Medallion of Eugène Delacroix, 1828

2. 28  David d’Angers, Medallion of Eugène Deveria, 1828

2. 29  David d’Angers, Medallion of Horace Vernet, 1828
2. 30 Auguste Préault, Medallion of Christophe Pittermann, ca.1830

2. 31 Auguste Préault, Portrait of a Man, ca.1830
2. 33 Auguste Préault, Posthumous medallion of Eugène Delacroix, 1864

2. 34 Auguste Préault, Lithograph of the medallion of Eugène Delacroix, 1864
3.1 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Portrait de Jean-Léon Gérôme*, 1872

3.2 David d’Angers, *Buste de Goethe*, 1831
3.3  Johann Gottfried Schadow, *Bust of Goethe*, 1822-1823

3.4  Julius Ludwig Sebbers, *Portrait of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe*, 1826
3.5 Anonymous, *Colossal Head of Constantine*, (ca. 280-337)

3.6 David d’Angers, *Buste de Goëthe*, 1831
3.7  Jehan Duseigneur, *Roland furieux*, 1831

3.8  Auguste Préault, *Tuerie*, 1834
3.9 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Ugolin et ses fils*, 1863

3.10 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Sketch for a relief for *Ugolin et ses fils*, 1863
3.11 Auguste Préault, *Despair* (also called *Hécube*), 1835
3.12 Cham, Caricature of *Hécube*, Salon of 1863
3.13 Jean-Pierre Cortot, *Le Triomphe de Napoléon 1810*, 1833

3.14 François Rude, *Le Départ des volontaires 1792*, 1833

3.15 François Rude, *Le Génie de la guerre*, 1833

3.16 Auguste Préault, Detail of *Tuerie*, 1834
3.17 Eugène Delacroix, 28 Juillet, La Liberté guidant le people, 1831
3.18 Auguste Préault Medallion of Aulus Vitellius, 1864
(after plaster of *Vieil Empereur Romain*, 1834)

3.19 Joseph François Domard, *Louis-Philippe* “à la grosse tête laurée”, 1830
3.20  David d’Angers, *Les Funérailles du général Foy*, 1827

3.21  David d’Angers, Medallion of *Victor Hugo*, ca. 1828

3.22  David d’Angers, Medallion of *Victor Hugo*, 1828
3.23  David d’Angers, Portrait Bust of Victor Hugo, 1837

3.24  David d’Angers, Bust of Victor Hugo Lauré, 1842
3.25 Dantan-Jeune, Formal bust of *John Webb*, 1834

3.26 Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of *John Webb*, 1833
3.27  Dant-an-Jeune, Back view of the caricature of *John Webb*, 1833
3.28  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Back view of *Ugolino and his Sons*, 1863
3.29  Dant-an-Jeune, Back view of the caricature of *Dominico Ferri*, 1834
3.30 Dantan-Jeune, *Charles-Maurice, Prince de Talleyrand-Périgord*, 1833

3.31 François Bosio, *Buste de S.A.S. le prince de Benevent* (Talleyrand), 1810
4.1 Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of *Charles X à la française*, 1830

4.2 Dantan-Jeune, Caricatural Head of *Charles X*, 1830

4.3 Théophile Bra, *Charles X en costume de sacre*, 1825
4.4  Charles Philipon, Woodcut of *Un Jésuite*, 1830

4.5  Charles Philipon, *Oh! Le vilain masque!!!*, 1830
4.6  Honoré, Daumier, *Gargantua*, 1831

4.7  Honoré Daumier, *Les Célébrités du Juste Milieu*, 1832-1835

4.8  Honoré Daumier. *Baron Maurice-Apollinaire d'Argout*, 1832
4. 9  Honoré Daumier, Caricatural bust of Charles Philipon, 1832
4.10  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Plaster *Bust of the Chinese Man*, 1872

4.11  Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Bronze *Bust of the Chinese Man*, 1868
5.1 Honoré Daumier, Caricatural bust of André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin, 1832

5.2 Honoré Daumier, lithograph of André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin, 1832
5.3 Eugène Disderi, Photograph of André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin, ca.1850

5.4 Eugène Disderi, Photograph of André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin, ca.1850
5.5  David d’Angers, Detail of *Le Général Foy à la chambre des députés*, 1827

5.6  David d’Angers, Detail of *Les Funérailles du Général Foy*, 1827

5.7  François Rude, *Buste de Mr. Dupin*, 1838

5.8  David d’Angers, Medallion of *André-Marie Jean Jacques Dupin*, 1828
5.9  David d’Angers, Plaster *Buste de Niccolò Paganini*, 1831

5.10  David d’Angers, Bronze *Buste de Niccolò Paganini*, 1831
5.11 Jean-Auguste Ingres, Drawing of Niccolò Paganini, 1819

5.12 Eugène Delacroix, Lithograph of Mephistopheles, 1827
5.13 Dantan-Jeune, *Buste de Niccolò Paganini*, 1833
5.14  Dantan-Jeune, Caricatural statuette of *Niccolò Paganini*, 1832
5.15 Francisque Joseph Duret, *Jeune pêcheur dansant la tarentelle*, 1833
5.16 Dantan-Jeune, “Half-caricature” of Niccolò Paganini, 1832

5.17 David d’Angers, Drawing of Niccolò Paganini (after Dantan-Jeune), ca. 1832
6.1 Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, *Portrait de Louis-François-Bertin*, 1833

6.2 Anonymous, *Mr. Bêtin-Le-Veau*, 1833
6.3 Antonin Moine, *Buste de la Reine*, 1833

6.4 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Mme. Chardon Lagache* 1872-73

6.5 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Mme. Chardon Lagache* 1872-73
6.6 Jean Gigoux, Portrait *de M. G. L*, 1834

6.7 Auguste Bouquet. Lithograph of Auguste Préault’s *Misère*, 1835
6.8 Auguste Préault. *Buste d’Achille Allier*, 1837

6.9 Anonymous. Lithograph of *Achille Allier*, ca.1832
6.10  Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of Honoré de Balzac, 1835
6.11  Dantan-Jeune, *Honoré de Balzac as a Cane*, 1835

6.12  Théodore Maurisset, Wood engraving of *Honoré de Balzac as a Cane*, 1838
6.13  Louis Boulanger. *Portrait de M. de B...*, 1838

6.14  Théodore Maurisset, Wood engraving of *Honoré de Balzac*, 1838
6.15  David d’Angers, Medallion *Honoré de Balzac*, 1842
6.16  David d’Angers, Medallion *Honoré de Balzac*, 1843
6.17  David d’Angers. Ink study of *Honoré de Balzac*, 1843
6.18  David d’Angers, Bust of *Honoré de Balzac*, 1843
6.19  Dantan-Jeune, Caricature of *Auguste Romieu*, 1835
6. 20  David d’Angers, Medallion of *Ferdinand Hérold*, 1815

6.21  Louis Dupré. Lithograph of *Ferdinand Hérold*, ca. 1829
6.22 Jean-Antoine Houdon, Bust of Benjamin Franklin, 1778

6.23 David Martin, Portrait of Benjamin Franklin, 1766
6.24  Dantan-Jeune, Portrait bust of *Ferdinand Hérold*, 1833

6.25  Charles-Joseph Traviès. Lithograph of *Ferdinand Hérold*, 1833
6.26  Honoré Daumier, Bust of *Antoine Odier*, 1833

6.27  Honoré Daumier, Lithograph of *Antoine Odier*, 1833
6.28  Honoré Daumier, Bust of Jacques Lefebvre, 1832

6.29  Honoré Daumier, Lithograph of Jacques Lefebvre, 1832
6.30  Honoré Daumier, Bust of *Alexandre Lecomte*, 1833

6.31  Honoré Daumier, Lithograph of *Alexandre Lecomte*, 1833
6.32 David d’Angers, Medallion of *Achille Collas*, 1835
6.33  David d’Angers, *Horace Vernet* (Procédé Collas), 1838-39

6.34  David d’Angers, *Eugène Delacroix* (Procédé Collas), 1838-39
6.35  Dantan-Jeune, Album *Dantanorama*, frontispice, 1833

6.36  J.J. Grandville, Album *Muséum Dantanorama*, frontispice, 1836
6.37  Dantan-Jeune, caricatural statuette of Niccolò Paganini, 1832
6.38  Eugène Delacroix. Niccolò Paganini, ca. 1832
6.39  Dantan-Jeune, Statuette of *Roger de Beauvoir*, 1838
6.40 Jean-Jacques Grandville, *l’Apothéose de Balzac*, 1842

6.41 Benjamin Roubaud, *Le Grand chemin de la postérité*, 1842
6.42  Benjamin Roubaud, Lithograph of *Dantan-Jeune*, ca. 1836
6.43 Dantan-Jeune, *Self-Portrait*, 1832

6.44 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, Sketch bust of *Docteur Achille Flaubert*, 1873
6.45  Anonymous, "Le règne du laid est enfin arrivé...", 1840
Conclusion. 1 Dantan-Jeune, *Louis-Hector Berlioz*, 1833

Conclusion. 2 Dantan-Jeune, *Dantan-Jeune par lui-même*, 1833

Conclusion. 3 Antoine Bourdelle, Detail of *Figures hurlantes*, 1895

Conclusion. 4 Antoine Bourdelle, *Portrait de Beethoven aux grands cheveux*, 1891
Conclusion. 5 Jules Desbois, *La Mort casquée*, 1887-1920

Conclusion. 6 Jules Desbois, *La Misère*, 1894-96

Conclusion. 7 Honoré Daumier, *Jean-Claude Fulchiron*, 1833

Conclusion. 8 Honoré Daumier, *Auguste Gady*, 1833
Conclusion. 9 Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, *Anna Foucart*, 1860

Conclusion. 10 Dantan-Jeune *Niccolò Paganini*, 1834
Conclusion. 11  Dantan-Jeune *Honoré de Balzac*, 1835

Conclusion. 12  Auguste Rodin, *Honoré de Balzac*, 1897
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