

Pictorial Modernism [Chicago and London, 2014], pp. 9-17.)

I am not sure to what extent this puts me in disagreement with the overall thrust of Michaels's argument, but it has seemed important to spell out certain basic differences between what the notion of crisis involves in his article and what it signifies in the present book. (Michaels's views are elaborated in his forthcoming book, *The Beauty of a Social Problem*.) Let me go a step farther and suggest that one way of understanding the crises in the Diderotian current or tradition represented by the art of later David or Géricault, or indeed by that of Daumier, Courbet, Manet, and Caillebotte (to mention no more names, as one might), is that to a large degree that current or tradition consists precisely of successive, interlocked moments of crisis or its equivalent: at every dialectical turn the current or tradition is concerned with its possible – one is tempted to say its inevitable – dissolution. This suggests not only that the current or tradition can best be understood at its moments of crisis, but also that it most fully emerges as such – as a historically developing force – in those moments. (My thanks to Jeremy Melius for inspiring these last sentences.)

It goes without saying that the larger topic of Kant and antitheatricity calls for far more serious treatment than it receives here.

- 15 In the light of the fact that the last two essays in this book deal with films (one regular film, the other stop-motion), it may be to the point that the 1760s in France saw the thought-invention, or one thought-invention, of movies in Diderot's brilliant account in his *Salon of 1765* of the young Jean-Honoré Fragonard's large history painting, *Coréus et Callirhoé*, one of the most original works of the period. See Michael Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (1980; Chicago, 1986), 141-5; hereafter, *AT*.

I DAVID / MANET

- 1 In *AT* I show that Diderot's *Salons* also imply what I call a "pastoral" conception of painting, according to which the beholder was to be led to imagine himself or herself within a particular picture (and therefore no longer in front of it), though again the actual outcome of that imagining was that the beholder was stopped and held before the canvas (118-45). The "pastoral" conception applied to landscapes, paintings of ruins, even still lifes – genres that for obvious reasons did not lend themselves to rigorously dramatic treatment. It therefore has no direct relevance to David's art; its fullest "realization" comes later, with the advent of Courbet.
- 2 I do this in part by reading David's canvas in the light of Diderot's commentary on a famous engraving after a seventeenth-century painting of *Belisarius Receiving Alms* then thought to be by Van Dyck and now attributed to Luciano Borzone. The commentary is found in a characteristically brilliant letter of 1762 to Sophie Volland (*AT*, 147-8).
- 3 As I note in *AT*, David felt that his knowledge of perspective was deficient and urged his students not to suffer under the same handicap (156). But something more than simple ineptitude is required to explain the awkwardness of the perspective structure in the *Belisarius*, and in any case David's difficulties with perspective may betray an emerging tension between the scenographic as such and the requirements of antitheatricity.
- 4 Also in *AT* I go on to consider the function of the obelisk in David's composition as well as to compare the *Belisarius* of 1781 with a smaller variant (the work largely of David's student François-Xavier Fabre) of 1785 (158-60). I further remark on how, in the painting of 1781, the two figures conversing behind the soldier and to his right (our left), who seem on the verge of leaving the scene, not only appear oblivious to the principal action but also, by virtue of their truncation by the left-hand framing edge, suggest the unboundedness of the

representation in that direction (a notion consistent with the possibility of rotation).

Finally, there is an analogy between the woman's gesture of drawing her cloak across her face with her left hand so as to conceal herself from viewers within the painting (while in the process leaving the right side of her face exposed to us) and Diderot's discussion of an unnamed Italian painter's treatment of the difficult because intrinsically voyeuristic subject of *Susannah and the Elders* (*AT*, 96-97). Interestingly, the same gesture will recur in one of David's last canvases, the *Fortune Teller* (1824; see fig. 22), to be briefly discussed toward the end of this essay.

Apropos of the *Belisarius*, see also Charles Dempsey, "The Eye of the Needle: Jacques-Louis David's *Bélisaire reconnu par un soldat qui avait servi sous lui, au moment qu'une femme lui fait l'aumône*," in Machtelt Israels and Louis A. Waldman, eds., *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 2013), 2: 645-50.

- 5 Norman Bryson, *Word and Image: French Painting of the Ancien Régime* (Cambridge, 1981), 226.
- 6 Thomas Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven and London, 1985), 240. The quotation from Honour is from his *Neo-Classicism* (Harmondsworth, 1968), 34-6.
- 7 "If the beholder is in the theater as before a canvas," Diderot writes, "on which the different *tableaux* follow one another by enchantment, why shouldn't the philosopher seated at the foot of Socrates's bed, and who is afraid to see him die, be as pathetic on the stage as are the wife (sic) and daughter of Eudamidas in Poussin's painting?" (Denis Diderot, "De la poésie dramatique," *Oeuvres esthétiques*, ed. Paul Vernière [Paris, 1959], 276; translation mine). ("Si le spectateur est au théâtre comme devant une toile, où des tableaux divers se succéderaient par enchantement, pourquoi le philosophe qui s'assied sur les pieds du lit de Socrate, et craint de le voir mourir, ne serait-il

pas aussi pathétique sur la scène, que la femme et la fille d'Eudamidas dans le tableau du Poussin?") For Diderot's scenario for a pantomime (by which he meant a succession of paintable *tableaux*) based on the death of Socrates, see *ibid.*, 272-6. The closeness of the *Socrates* to its probable source in Diderot is also emphasized by Anita Brookner, *Jacques-Louis David* (New York, 1980), 46-7.

- 8 I do not mean by this to minimize the differences, quite apart from that of size, between Poussin's stoic masterpiece and David's apotheosis of masculine will. As the last phrase suggests, one difference concerns the treatment of gender, a topic I must let pass. Another concerns the extent to which David's painting is felt to depict a single "pregnant" moment in a rapidly unfolding narrative as against the stilled, relatively unvectored temporal modality of the *Eudamidas*. Note, though, how the fact that swearing an oath typically cannot be done in an instant but rather requires at least some continuous engagement over time allowed David to combine an evocation of vectoredness with an effect of duration, just as the nature of that particular action enabled him to represent all three brothers participating in it not just simultaneously but *synchronously*: as if each is felt to belong to exactly the same *phase* of the action as the others.
- 9 E[tienne]-J[ean] Delécluze, *Louis David, son école et son temps, souvenirs*, new ed. with preface and notes by Jean-Pierre Mouilleseaux (1855; Paris, 1983), 120. "Around the years 1796-1800," Delécluze writes, "when he was entirely preoccupied with rediscovering Greek [artistic] doctrines, David judged his *Horatii* with truly remarkable and severe impartiality. He focused on the difficulty relative to the composition by saying that the latter was theatrical; as for the drawing, he found it small, petty [*petit, mesquin*] (those were his expressions), rendering the anatomical details with excessive care; and finally the color now struck him as inconsistent, destroying the beauty and grandeur of local tones." At the same time, as if

in partial contradiction to his own revisionist views, David is quoted as saying, "After all . . . there is energy in this painting, and the group of the Horatii is something I will never renounce!" (translation mine). Maybe, but the treatment of Romulus and Tatiüs in the *Sabines* is of an altogether different character. ("[V]ers les années 1796-1800, lorsqu'il était tout préoccupé de retrouver les doctrines grecques, David jugeait ses *Horaces* avec une équité sévère bien remarquable. Il tranchait la difficulté relativement à la composition en disant qu'elle est théâtrale; pour le dessin il le trouvait *petit, mesquin* (ce sont ses expressions), rendant les détails anatomiques avec recherché; et enfin le coloris, comme procédant par *enchantillons de couleur*, et détruisant la beauté et la grandeur du *ton local*. . . . Après tout . . . il y a de l'énergie dans ce tableau, et le groupe des Horaces est une chose que je renierai jamais!")

- 10 For the text of David's *livret*, including Hersilia's speech, see Daniel and Guy Wildenstein, eds., *Documents complémentaires au catalogue complet de l'oeuvre de Louis David* (Paris, 1973), 148-50.

That what I have described as a de-dramatization of action in the *Sabines* was nevertheless perceived in 1799 within a dramatic framework emerges in contemporary responses to the picture. At the same time, David's choice of a moment of relative repose is commented on both by Chaussard (an antitheatrical critic), who writes that "David has seized the moment when the action is suspended naturally by that of Hersilia and the women who thrust themselves with their children between the swords" (P[ierre-Jean] Chaussard, *Sur le tableau des Sabines par David* [Paris, 1800], 4; translation mine) ("David a saisi le moment où l'action est naturellement suspendue par celle d'Hersilie et des femmes qui se précipitent avec leurs enfans entre les glaives"), and by Landon, who observes that "all the personages are in action and the pantomime is organized with such art that there is not a single personage who could not maintain

for several instants the attitude in which he [or she] is represented. This point is of the highest importance, it adds to the illusion and soothes the beholder. One feels that repose suits painting much better than a sudden action or a fleeting movement" ([Charles-Paul] Landon, "Réflexions sur ce tableau," Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Deloynes, ms. no. 593, 662-3; translation mine) ("tous les personnages sont en action et la pantomime est dirigée avec tant d'art qu'il n'y a pas un seul personnage qui ne peut conserver pendant quelques instans l'attitude où il est représenté. Ce point est de la plus haute importance, il ajoute à l'illusion et soulage le spectateur. On sent que le repos conviens à la peinture bien plus qu'une action subite ou un mouvement passagère").

Apropos of my association of the temporal modality of the *Sabines* with that of an operatic aria, it is striking that Chaussard draws an analogy between the women and children that David placed in the middle of the battle and "those priestesses of Diane that Gluck lets us hear among the ferocious Scythians, when the melodious laments of those virgins mix with the terrible accents of the bloodthirsty joy exhaled by Thoas and his atrocious horde" (in the opera *Iphigénie en Tauride*; *Sur le tableau des Sabines par David*, 20-21; translation mine) ("ces prêtresses de Diane que Gluck fait entendre au milieu des Scythes farouches, alors que les plaints mélodieuses de ces vierges se mêlent aux accens déchirans de la joie sanguinaire qu'exhalent Thoas et la horde atroce qui le suit").

- 11 See [François-Pierre-Guillaume] Guizot, "De l'état des beaux-arts en France, et du Salon de 1810," in *Etudes sur les beaux-arts en général* (Paris, 1858), 12-14; and Stendhal, "Salon de 1824," in *Mélanges d'art* [1932; Nendeln/Liechtenstein, 1968], 45-7.
- 12 Norman Bryson, *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix* (Cambridge, 1984), 94.
- 13 There is more to be said about the differences in our views. Bryson stages his chapters on

Belisarius and the *Oath of the Horatii* partly in rebuttal of my argument in *AT* (about which he also has favorable things to say). He writes:

[Fried's approach] confines itself to a definition of the viewing subject narrowly concerned with the issue of the admission and the exclusion of the observer: the viewing subject is variously kept out [of the painting] or ushered in, but either way he remains an agent who simply sees, a viewing substance invited into the sphere of perceptions. Fried's subject is the same subject that is posited in the phenomenological reduction: monadic and self-enclosed, the subject sees the world from the world's centre and in unitary prospect. . . . This leaves (at least) two things out: the presence of the other in vision which makes of *human* visuality (as opposed to the vision of the camera) a divided visuality, divided because the subject is not alone in his perceptual horizon, but surrounded by the visualities of others with which it must interact; and secondly (a corollary of this) the permanent division of visual subjectivity in the visual *sign*. (46; emphasis in original)

But in the first place, the identification of "Fried's subject" with the "subject . . . posited in the phenomenological reduction" does not hold water; the demand that paintings establish the ontological fiction that their dramatis personae are alone in the world precisely implies a subject who is anything but "alone in his perceptual horizon"; one might even say that it is precisely a new awareness of being part of a universal realm of spectatordom that underwrites the Diderotian aesthetic with its attempt to suspend that awareness in the grip of the work. Put slightly differently, *AT* speaks of Diderot as calling for "at one and the same time the creation of a new sort of object [artifact] – the fully realized *tableau* – and the constitution of a new sort of beholder – a new 'subject' – whose innermost nature would consist precisely in the conviction of his absence from the scene of representation" (104) – a

hyperbolic aim that is only intelligible as a response to a new consciousness of "the presence of the other in vision," indeed of the existence of others generally. See too my discussion in an appendix in *AT* of Rousseau's *Lettre sur les spectacles*, in which I remark that Diderot and Rousseau each expresses "an extreme distaste for what might be called the theatricality of theater as they know it, together with a suspicion that the corruptness of the theater in their time is only one manifestation of a deeper or more pervasive state of affairs involving the function of beholding and the condition of being beheld" (167).

More broadly, Bryson's commitment to a certain sort of divided subject, when brought to bear on David's paintings of the 1780s and after, produces dubious results. Specifically, Bryson's Lacanian assumption that human visuality is marked by "a decentering gaze, the Gaze of the Other" (58) leads to the repeated claim that figures in David's canvases are crucially involved in "projecting" images of themselves out toward others. "In the case of *Belisarius* and the child," Bryson writes, "an invisible inner state of want and need can only be relieved by transmitting into the world a certain image that will forcibly enter the vision of others . . . We can say that in the act of begging the essential terms are the hidden (hunger) and the theatrical (the image of pathos); just as in the sister act, charity, the essential terms are the discomfort of *concealment* (of money, of guilt, of sympathy) and a *conspicuous* act which relieves that discomfort (donation)" (59; emphasis in original). Similarly, Bryson states of the *Horatii*: "The image exactly traces the negative consequences of the subject's insertion into language and gender, for the visuality of the males is now dominated by the outward projection of heroically gendered self-imagery, moving forward to meet the description coming from outside, in the oath itself" (71).

As these citations demonstrate (a dozen others would have done as well), the combina-

tion of an a priori commitment to an ontology of the divided subject and an essentialist account of human action (acts of charity by definition involve a tension between concealment and conspicuousness) produces readings in which both the *Belisarius* and the *Horatii* (and, as seen, the *Sabines*) emerge as inherently theatrical. Needless to say, I find Bryson's readings of these and other paintings by David unpersuasive in their own terms. But what I want to stress is, first, that my disagreement with Bryson is not based on an *opposite* account of the works in question (it explicitly is not my claim that the *Belisarius* and the *Horatii* conclusively overcome the theatrical); and second, that Bryson's approach, by virtue of its assumption that a certain theatricality (his words for it are Otherness, decentering, splitting, etc.) is inherent in human visuality, prevents him from even considering the possibility that David's paintings may be the product of an antitheatrical *intention* (the heart of my account). He thereby blinds himself to their historical reality.

- 14 It is also true that according to Antoine Montfort, a young painter who had assisted Géricault during his campaign on the *Raft*, the latter after seeing the *Sabines* and *Leonidas* in David's Cluny studio came back discouraged; in particular the running Spartans at the lower right made him "almost turn his eyes away from his own work" (Antoine Montfort, "Le Manuscrit de Montfort," in *Géricault*, exh. cat. [Paris, 1991], 313; translation mine) ("il détournait presque les yeux de son travail"). A recent book that attempts a reevaluation of the "chains" of figures in the *Leonidas* is Satish Padiyar, *Chains: David, Canova and the Fall of the Public Hero in Postrevolutionary France* (University Park, Penn., 2007). Let me also take this opportunity to cite the extremely interesting discussion of the *Belisarius* and the *Horatii* in John Bender and Michael Marrinan, *The Culture of Diagram* (Stanford, Cal., 2010), pp. 92-151.
- 15 Delécluze, *Louis David*, 225-7. "Je veux peindre un général et ses soldats se préparant au combat comme de véritables Lacédémoniens, sachant bien qu'ils n'en échapperont pas; les uns absolument calmes, les autres tressant des fleurs pour assister *an banquet qu'ils vont faire chez pluton*. . . . Je veux essayer de mettre de côté ces mouvements, ces expressions de théâtre, auxquels les modernes ont donné le titre de *peinture d'expression*. . . . Mais j'aurai bien de la peine, ajouta David, à faire adopter de semblables idées dans notre temps. On aime les coups de théâtre, at quand on ne peint pas les passions violentes, quand on ne pousse pas l'expression en peinture jusqu'à la *grimace*, on risque de n'être ni compris ni goûté." [Emphasis in original] For Diderot's contrast in the *Entretiens* and the *Discours* between *tableaux* and *coups de théâtre* see *AT*, 78, 79, 93, 95-6, 207. According to Delécluze, David also found in the art of the ancients, as well as in Italian painting from Giotto to Perugino and Raphael, the inspiration for a system of composition which, instead of "sacrificing everything to dramatic effect," would seek on the contrary to fix the viewer's attention "successively on each personage by virtue of the perfection with which it was treated" (*Louis David*, 220-21; translation mine) ("sacrifiant tout à l'effet dramatique . . . successivement sur chaque personnage par la perfection avec laquelle il serait traité").
- 16 In *Courbet's Realism* (Chicago, 1990; hereafter, *CR*) I remark that David in 1807 gave Delécluze a drawing of two heads that he had made roughly thirty years before; one head had been copied accurately from the antique while the other, based on the first, had been enlivened in various ways. "I gave it," David remarked, "what the moderns call expression and what today I call grimace" (18; the reference is to Delécluze, *Louis David*, 112; translation mine). Significantly, the suspension of dramatic action in the *Sabines* goes hand in hand with an unmistakable toning down of expression among the principal figures.
- 17 Philippe Bordes, *Le Serment du Jeu de Paume de Jacques-Louis David: Le Peintre, son milieu et*

- son temps de 1789 à 1792*, Notes et documents des musées de France 8 (Paris, 1983), 59; translation mine. Bordes's remarks on Diderot are explicitly based on *AT*. Further page references will be in parentheses in the text.
- 18 See Philippe Bordes, *Jacques-Louis David: Empire to Exile*, exh. cat. (Los Angeles and Williamstown, Mass., 2005), 69 (hereafter Bordes). When the painting was finished, however, Napoleon made a publicized visit to see it in David's Cluny studio; with the defeat of the Empire in the cards, the *Leonidas* could now be seen as rallying the French to fight on against overwhelming odds.
- 19 Dorothy Johnson, *Jacques-Louis David: Art in Metamorphosis* (Princeton, 1993), ch. 5, 221-72; Bordes; Ledbury, *David after David*. Further references to Johnson will be in parentheses in the text.
- 20 The only writer I have come across who notes this stability is Bordes, 209. Thomas Crow sees Phaon as having just approached Sappho in *Emulation: Making Artists for Revolutionary France* (New Haven and London, 1995), 265. He adds: "The characters' solicitation of the spectator's regard, insistent without carrying any expressive interest, seems a plea to excuse the insipid and derivative quality of the entire exercise, which he dispatched to Russia with almost surreptitious discretion" (265).
- 21 Susan Siegfried, "The Artifice of Antiquity: Sappho's Dream," in Ledbury, *David after David*, 95-8.
- 22 Writing in the Clark symposium volume, Siegfried follows me in noting that the "Anacreonic" works feature outward-facing figures but then adds specifically about the *Sappho, Phaon, and Cupid*, "In the final painting, Phaon exists on the threshold between drama and portraiture, fiction and reality. He is not gratuitously 'theatrical,' as is often said in deference to Michael Fried's work, since his attitude is anchored in the text [by which she means Ovid's poem, "Sappho to Phaon"]" (ibid., 102). I suggest, first, that Siegfried's adverb "gratuitously" is out of place - that is, notions like theatricality or facingness in no way imply that the actions of a particular figure or group of figures might not be anchored in a supporting text. Second, there is, however, no reason to think that David's painting follows Ovid's poem (in other words, in this case I see no such "anchoring"). And third, the "deference" to my work by previous David scholars that Siegfried wishes to contest has largely escaped my notice. She is referring to Antoine Schnapper's (to my mind perfectly straightforward) remarks in the 1989-90 Louvre catalogue entry for the *Sappho*: "Here the painter systematizes a procedure of portraitists, who have their personages look at the beholder, not at the scene in which they participate; this procedure is the opposite of that described by M. Fried . . . under the name of *absorption*. Already the plague-victim in the *Saint Roch* [a painting of 1780] or Brutus in the painting of 1789 address the beholder, but in this work there are two protagonists, which contributes strongly to the disconcerting impression, not of realism but of reality, provoked by the painting, as in, slightly later, *Cupid and Psyche in Cleveland*" (in Antoine Schnapper, Arlette Sérullas, and Elisabeth Agius-d'Yvoire, eds., *Jacques-Louis David, 1748-1825*, exh. cat. [Paris, 1989], 441). Siegfried also remarks that my thesis "lingers in Bordes" (107; like the aftermath of an illness?), and of course there are Bryson's criticisms cited earlier. But Siegfried need not worry - my arguments in *AT* and related writings have played only a modest role in David studies over the past forty-plus years. (There is a grand total of one passing reference to my work in a footnote in Johnson's monograph.)
- 23 *MM*, 262-364.
- 24 On Millet and absorption see *ibid.*, 188-92.
- 25 Facingness and strikingness are major themes throughout *ibid.* My account of Manet's art, in particular his response to increasingly problematic status of the depiction of absorption as a resource for ambitious painting, is discussed at length in Robert B. Pippin, *After the Beautiful: Hegel and the Philosophy of Pictorial Mod-*

- ernism (Chicago and London, 2014). See also idem, "Authenticity in Painting: Michael Fried's Art History," *Critical Inquiry* 31 (Spring 2005): 575-98.
- 26 A. de Kératry, *Annuaire de l'école française de peinture ou lettre sur le Salon de 1819* (Paris, 1819), 100-01; cited by Johnson, *Jacques-Louis David*, 250.
- 27 In this connection, look ahead to David's *Mars Disarmed by Venus and the Graces* (see fig. 21) and note Cupid's gleaming quiver, which in effect replaces the god's genitals covered by the cooing doves.
- 28 Issa Lampe, "Repainting *Love Leaving Psyche*: David's Memorial to an Empire Past," in Ledbury, *David after David*, 112. Further references to Lampe will be in parentheses in the text.
- 29 Johnson remarks that "[t]he brutal characterization of the god brings to mind an Amor [Cupid] equally shocking in its realism - Caravaggio's *Amor Vincit Omnia* - a work well-known to David and his contemporaries" (248), which is true as far as it goes. Equally to the point, perhaps, might have been a *Resurrection* painted by Caravaggio for the church of Sant'Anna dei Lombardi in Naples around 1608 and destroyed in an earthquake in 1788 (so David, who visited Naples in 1779, could not have failed to see it). In that painting, according to one early commentator, Christ was depicted "with one foot in the tomb and the other resting outside it" (the commentator is Luigi Scaramuccia; see the interesting discussion of the *Resurrection* in Peter Robb, *M: The Man Who Became Caravaggio* [New York, 1998, 1999], 411-14).
- 30 In fact Cupid was modeled for by the 17-year-old son of the American diplomat Albert Gallatin; amusingly, the young man in his journal regrets that he and the young model for Psyche are not to pose together (Bordes, 232).
- 31 E.-F. Miel, *Essai sur les beaux-arts et particulièrement sur le Salon de 1817* (Paris, 1817), 237-8. Cited by Johnson, *Jacques-Louis David*, 248. In fact Johnson compares David's use of the myth of Cupid and Psyche to "the problematic of sexual exploitation raised by Manet's *Olympia* as well as modern psychoanalytic interpretations of the mythology of desire. David understood and demonstrated the essence of the Odalisque theme - male domination over, and imprisonment of, a captive woman who is reduced to a sexual slave and denied an existence independent of her sensuality" (254).
- 32 See *MM*, 153.
- 33 See *ibid.*, 172, 525-6 n. 114. Cf. Anne Wagner, "Why Monet Gave Up Figure Painting," *Art Bulletin* 76 (Dec. 1994): 613-29.
- 34 Thomas Crow, "The Imagination of Exile in David's *Anger of Achilles*," in Ledbury, *David after David*, 132.
- 35 Claude Lebensztejn, "Histoires belges," in Michel, *David contre David*, 2: 1018.
- 36 Johnson cites a letter from Mme David to Gros of May 13, 1819: "At this moment [David] is finishing a painting which represents the wrath of Achilles at the moment when Iphigenia is led to her sacrifice. It is composed of four half-length figures; it is harmonious overall. The expressions are of the greatest beauty. The head of Clytemnestra unites fear and hope to a most eminently beautiful degree. The majestic calm of Agamemnon is also of a rare beauty. The resignation of Iphigenia is of an admirable sensibility. In short, our friend makes his exile enjoyable with his cherished painting and I assure you that the paintings he will have executed in Flanders will mark another epoch in his painterly life" (258). *Ecole nationale supérieure des beaux-arts*, ms. 316, no. 34.
- 37 This is stressed by Johnson in *Jacques-Louis David*, 11-69 (a chapter entitled "The Eloquent Body: 'Gestes sublimes' and the Formation of a Corporal Aesthetic").
- 38 See in this connection Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, *Necklines: The Art of Jacques-Louis David after the Terror* (New Haven and London, 1999), 130-235 (a chapter entitled "The Revolution Glacée"). Hereafter, Lajer-Burcharth.
- 39 There are two especially pertinent texts in this regard, Paul Friedland, *Political Actors: Repre-*

- sentative Bodies and Theatricality in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 2002); and Susan Maslan, *Revolutionary Acts: Theater, Democracy, and the French Revolution* (Baltimore, 2005). Friedland's book, the work of a historian, is particularly good on the deliberations in the Estates General and the National Assembly as regards the issue of the so-called general will; Maslan's book, the work of a literary scholar, provides a rich and detailed account of the interface between the political arena and actual theatrical productions of the period. (The two studies complement each other.) Apropos of the question of "transparency," the fundamental text remains Jean Starobinski, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Transparency and Obstruction*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (1957, 1971; Chicago and London, 1988).
- 40 The classic work on the Revolutionary festivals is Mona Ozouf, *Festivals and the French Revolution*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1988). But see also Warren Roberts, *Jacques-Louis David and Jean-Louis Prieur, Revolutionary Artists: The Public, the Populace, and Images of the French Revolution* (Albany, N.Y., 2000), ch. 6, "Robespierre, David, and Revolutionary Festivals," 269–311. The previous chapter, "David and the *Tennis Court Oath*," 227–68, is also of interest.
- 41 Mention of the *Tennis Court Oath* suggests another question: to what extent (if at all) might the dramaturgy of that composition, with its intended inclusion of the beholder in the action of swearing the oath, have prepared the way for the "facing," beholder-acknowledging character of the "Anacreonic" paintings?
- 42 On these drawings see especially Dorothy Johnson, "Lines of Thought: David's Aporetic Late Drawings," in Ledbury, *David after David*, 153–69. "Aporetic" is her term, a good one. She notes that Pierre-Yves Kairis has shown that four of five figures in one *A Scene of Mourning* are adapted from figures in Lambert Lombard's *Burial of Saint Denis* (ca. 1550), which was in a church in Liège which David could have visited (and evidently did) (163).
- 43 Interestingly, there is a somewhat analogous development in the late, smudged carpenter's pencil drawings of the great nineteenth-century German painter-draftsman Adolph Menzel, which suggests that we may be dealing here with a psychological – specifically, an old-age – phenomenon as well as a strictly artistic one. It is striking, though, that none of the personages in Menzel's drawings stares out at the viewer, theatricality and related issues never having been among his concerns. See *MR*, 219–29.

2 DAVID / MARAT

- 1 See T. J. Clark, "Gross David with the Swoln Cheek: An Essay in Self-Portraiture," in Michael S. Roth, ed., *Rediscovering History: Culture, Politics, and the Psyche* (Stanford, Cal., 1994), 243–307 (hereafter, Clark); and Lajer-Burcharth, 33–54. Subsequent references to both will be in parentheses in the text. See also the brief discussion in Bordes, 16, cat. 1.
- 2 See Delafontaine's brief account of accompanying David to prison and bringing him the mirror in Daniel and Guy Wildenstein, *Documents complémentaires*, 131, no. 1 (hereafter, Wildenstein).
- 3 Umberto Eco, in a chapter on mirrors, insists that mirrors do not reverse or invert. "A mirror reflects the right side exactly where the right side is," he writes, "and the same with the left side. . . . It is only when we anthropomorphize the virtual image that we are puzzled by right and left – that is, only at this point do we start wondering what right and left would be if the virtual image were the real object." See his *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Bloomington, Ind., 1984), 205–6.
- 4 Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp, 1500–1700* (Princeton, N.J., 1987), 202.
- 5 *MM*, 365–98. See also *CR*, 53–84 and passim.
- 6 Michael Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*,

close call with the guillotine and his year in prison and that never again would he execute a self-portrait" (16). But it was not simply because of unpleasant associations that David wanted it out of his hands:

- 23 See the entry on that painting in Schnapper, Sérullaz, and Agius-d'Yvoire, *Jacques-Louis David*, 238, no. 98. I was fortunate to view it again at an exhibition of paintings and drawings by David at the Musée Jacquemart-André. See Musée Jacquemart-André, *Jacques-Louis David, 1748–1825*, exh. cat. (Paris, 2005), 100–01, no. 34.
- 24 Let me say in closing that I take the present essay to offer an unequivocally affirmative answer to Clark's de Manian question as to whether David's *Self-Portrait* "ends up being by someone – and understandable to the extent that this is the case." Clark, 490 n. 56; emphasis in original.

3 GÉRICAUT'S ROMANTICISM

- 1 Basic modern secondary sources on Géricault include Lorenz E. A. Eitner, *Géricault: His Life and Work* (London, 1983); Germain Bazin, *Théodore Géricault: Etude critique, documents et catalogue raisonné*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1987–97); *Géricault*, exh. cat., curated by Sylvain Laveissière and Régis Michel (Paris, 1991; hereafter, *Géricault* 1991); Régis Michel, ed., *Géricault*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1996), a collection of papers given on the occasion of a 1991 colloque at the Louvre and Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen (hereafter, *Géricault* 1996); and *Géricault: La folie d'un monde*, exh. cat., curated by Bruno Chenique and Sylvie Ramond (Lyon, 2006; hereafter, *Géricault* 2006). The catalogue of the 1991 exhibition includes an invaluable detailed chronology of the artist's life, "Géricault: une vie," by Bruno Chenique (261–308); hereafter, Chenique. The still indispensable nineteenth-century study of the painter's life and work is Charles Clément, *Géricault: Etude biographique et critique avec le catalogue raisonné*

de l'oeuvre du maître, 3rd ed., 1879, re-ed. Lorenz Eitner (Paris, 1973). But see the extended critique of Clément by Bruno Chenique in *Géricault au coeur de la création romantique: Etudes pour le Radeau de la Méduse*, exh. cat. (Clermont-Ferrand, 2012), esp. 70–87. See also *Tout l'oeuvre peint de Géricault*, documentation by Philippe Grunchev (Paris, 1978) and Germain Bazin, *Théodore Géricault: étude critique, documents et catalogue raisonné*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1987–97).

- 2 The comment is reported by Géricault's first biographer, Louis Batissier, "Biographie de Géricault," *Revue de XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1842; republished by Pierre Courthion, *Géricault raconté par lui-même et par ses amis* (Vézénas-Geneva, 1947), 35. See Eitner, *Géricault*, 322 n. 10.
- 3 In this connection see esp. Bruno Chenique, "A l'extrême gauche de Géricault," in *Géricault* 2006, 45–63.
- 4 For Chenique, the "small success" attributed by Clément to the *Raft* in the Salon of 1819 "is a myth, a pure creation of the history of art. As for the prize that Géricault didn't obtain, its history is much more complex. The prize for history painting was purely and simply canceled. Several artists, Géricault among them, then obtained a gold medal" ("Les Fondations mythologiques du Radeau de la Méduse," in *Géricault au coeur de la création romantique* [129]; translation mine). There is truth in this in the sense that with the *Raft* Géricault established himself as one of the most promising painters in his generation, but it is also true that he appears to have been disappointed in the response to it and of course it was not acquired by the government until after his death, and then owing to persistent appeals by the Director of the Louvre, the Count de Forbin, who finally succeeded in persuading the relevant ministry to provide sufficient funds to purchase it from Géricault's friend Dedreux-Dorcy, who made it available at a low price (Lorenz Eitner, *Géricault's "Raft of the Medusa"* [London and New York, 1972], 67).

- 5 For information and documents pertaining to the London stay, see Chenique, 288–97, and the letter of April 14, 1821 to Dedreux-Dorcey in “Lettres et documents,” ed. Bruno Chenique, *Géricault* 1991, 320.
- 6 See “Le Manuscrit de Montfort” in *Géricault* 1991, 316. The manuscript, reminiscences of Géricault by the painter Antoine Montfort, was written in the mid-1860s for the use of Clément.
- 7 In this I am happy to find myself in agreement with Roger Fry, who wrote of Géricault that he “was almost the most gifted artist of the nineteenth century, at least as regards what one may call his physiological equipment” (*Characteristics of French Art* [New York, 1933], 87).
- 8 Wheelock Whitney, *Géricault in Italy* (New Haven and London, 1997), 201.
- 9 Eugène Delacroix, *Journal*, ed. Michèle Hannoosh, 2 vols. (Paris, 2009), 2: 1741.
- 10 The secondary literature on Delacroix is less than inspiring. But see Hannoosh’s edition of the *Journal* as well as the following essays by Ralph Ubl (who currently is preparing a book-length study of the artist):
 “Eugène Delacroix: Das Detail des Anderen,” *Was aus dem Bild fällt: Funktionen des Details*, ed. W. Pichler, E. Futscher, S. Neuner, and R. Ubl (Munich, 2007), 351–72.
 “Eugène Delacroix: Von der Freiheit zur ästhetischen Gemeinschaft,” *Bild und Gemeinschaft*, ed. B. Fricke, M. Klammer, and S. Neuner (Munich, 2011), 273–313.
 “Eugène Delacroix: Mit dem Meer malen,” *Das Meer, der Tausch, und die Grenzen der Repräsentation*, ed. H. Baader and G. Wolf (Berlin and Zurich, 2010), 75–99.
 “Delacroix’ Tiere,” *Politische Zoologie*, ed. J. Vogel and A. von der Heiden (Berlin, 2007), 243–57.
 “Delacroix’ Wärmeräume,” *Räume der Romantik*, ed. G. Neumann and I. Müllder-Bach (Freiburg, 2007), 277–306.
 “Delacroix’s *Jewish Wedding* and the Medium of Painting,” *Judaism and Christian Art*, ed. H. Kessler, D. Nirenberg (Philadelphia, 2011), 359–88.
 “Entwurf und Leben: Zu Delacroix’ Zeichnungen,” *Notizen, Skizzen, Gekritzelt: Zeichnen und Schreiben als Entwurfsinstrumente*, ed. Karin Krauthausen and Omar Nasim (Zurich, 2010), 189–218.
 “Figurationen der Freiheit,” *Ästhetische Regime um 1800*, ed. Friedrich Balke, Harun Maye, and Leander Scholz (Munich, 2009), 139–64.
 “Tiefe des Lebens, Reflexion der Malerei, Sitten der Tiger: Zu Eugène Delacroix’ *Jeune tigre jouant avec sa mère*,” *Transgressionen/Animationen: Das Kunstwerk als Lebewesen* (Hamburger Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte Bd. 4), ed. U. Pfisterer and A. Zimmermann (Berlin, 2005), 183–206.
- 11 Nothing in the large literature on Ingres matches in penetration Ubl’s essay on the *Jewish Wedding*, to name only that impressive text. But there is much that is relevant to my overarching claim in Susan L. Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined* (New Haven and London, 2009).
- 12 *CR*, 40–45; idem, *MM*, 188–92, and passim. Further page references to both books will be in parentheses in the text.
- 13 In what follows I shall be making use of portions of the first chapter of *CR*, “Approaching Courbet,” along with ones in my essay “Géricault’s Romanticism” in *Géricault* 1996, 2: 641–59. On Gros’s Napoleonic paintings see Robert Herbert, “Baron Gros’s Napoleon and Voltaire’s Henri IV,” in *The Artist and Writer in France: Essays in Honour of Jean Seznec*, ed. Francis Haskell, Anthony Levi, and Robert Shackleton (Oxford, 1974), 52–75; Christopher Prendergast, *Napoleon and History Painting: Antoine-Jean Gros’s La Bataille d’Eylau* (Oxford, 1997); Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post-Revolutionary France* (New Haven and London, 2002), ch. 2, “Plague. Egypt–Syria: Gros’s *Bonaparte visiting the Plague Victims of Jaffa*, 1804,” 65–103; David O’Brien, *After the Revolution: Antoine-*

- Jean Gros. Painting and Propaganda Under Napoleon* (University Park, Penn., 2006); and Marnin Young, "Napoleon Disfigured: Injury and Identity in Antoine-Jean Gros's *Battle of Eylau*," *Nineteenth-Century Studies*, forthcoming.
- 14 The affinity between Géricault and Crane would need to be developed at length. But see the last chapter of John Berryman's brilliant study, *Stephen Crane* (New York, 1950), "The Color of This Soul," 297-325. The least that one can say is that in Crane, too, themes of war, violence, shipwreck (as in "The Open Boat"), and blackness (as in "The Monster") play crucial roles. In addition Berryman notes Crane's passionate interest in horses, culminating in the remark: "Even Crane's conversation shows the obsession: 'Say, when I planted those hoofs of mine on Greek soil . . .' One wonders with pain, at last, just what form he has - animal or man - in his dying words to [his friend Robert] Barr: 'Robert - when you come to the hedge - that we must all go over -'" (324). My own intense interest in Crane is evident in my essay "Stephen Crane's Upturned Faces" in *Realism, Writing, Disfiguration: On Thomas Eakins and Stephen Crane* (Chicago and London, 1987), 91-161.
- 15 See Régis Michel, "Le Mythe de l'oeuvre," *Géricault* 1991, 36.
- 16 See Régis Michel, "Le Nom de Géricault ou l'art n'a pas de sexe mais ne parle que de ça," introductory essay to *Géricault* 1996, I: 1-37. Michel's essay is paginated only every other page; I will designate unnumbered pages "b," following the previous paginated ones. His discussion of the *Chasseur* is on 5-11, the reference to Michelet (specifically to a journal entry of 1840) is on 6b. As its title suggests, Michel's essay is rhetorically extreme but it is also continually insightful - *passionant* is the French term that fits. In the light of my particular concerns I am struck that Michel elsewhere describes Géricault's military figures as often "absorbed to the point of ecstasy in their interior dream" ("Mythe de l'oeuvre," 36; translation mine). On the *Chasseur* project see also Eitner, *Géricault*, 26-36. Michelet's greatest text on the painter belongs to the course of lectures at the Collège de France that he was forced to discontinue in early 1848; see Jules Michelet, *L'Étudiant* (Paris, 1970), 107-15.
- 17 A sadistic sexual strain glossed in psychoanalytic terms in Géricault's art is a major theme in Michel, "Nom de Géricault"; see esp. its last two sections headed "La Guerre des sexes" and "Le Destin de pulsions," 25b-27. See also Régis Michel, "Géricault ou le coït sadique," in *Posséder et détruire: Stratégies sexuelles dans l'art d'Occident*, exh. cat. (Paris, 2000), 126-43.
- 18 Géricault quoted by Montfort, cited in *Géricault* 1991, 316.
- 19 On the Riderless Horses project see esp. Eitner, *Géricault*, 99-135, and Whitney, *Géricault in Italy*, 89-155.
- 20 As reported by Clément, *Géricault*, 266. At greater length: "He was remarkably well-built, and [Horace] Vernet affirmed that he had never seen a more handsome man; his legs above all were superb: those of the ephebe who holds the horse in the middle of the [Louvre] *Race of the Riderless Horses*, M. Dorcy tells me" (translation mine).
- 21 See Montfort, "Manuscrit de Montfort," 316.
- 22 For example, writing in 1810 the young Diderotian art critic (and future politician and historian) Guizot criticized the *Sabines* for subordinating action to posing and warned against the theatricalizing effect of gestures taken from the actor Talma (François-Pierre-Guillaume Guizot, "De l'État des beaux-arts en France, et du Salon de 1810," in *Études sur les beaux-arts en général* [Paris, 1852], 13-14, 22-3).
- 23 On the *Raft*, see, in addition to sources already cited, Eitner, *Géricault's "Raft of the Medusa"*; Grigsby, *Extremities*, 165-235, and *Géricault au coeur de la création romantique*, esp. the texts by Chenique.
- 24 Charles Paul Landon, *Annales du Musée et de l'école moderne des beaux-arts: Salon de 1819* (Paris, 1820).
- 25 Delacroix quoted in Chenique, 286; translation

mine (“On a descendu le tableau de *Naufragés* et on le voit de plein pied pour ainsi dire. De sorte qu’on se croit déjà un pied dans l’eau. Il faut l’avoir vu d’assez près, pour en sentir tout le mérite”).

- 26 See *CR*, 85–110, 148–55.
- 27 See n. 21 above.
- 28 Eitner, *Géricault*, 73.
- 29 Eitner also sees a reference to the Ugolino episode from Dante’s *Inferno* (“Raft”, 45–6), and in fact the Ugolino story occurred to other viewers at the time. In her powerful and original chapter on the *Raft* (see n. 23 above), Grigsby focuses on the issue of cannibalism, which she sees the painting as at once thematizing and suppressing. More recently, Chenique writes of the “father” figure with the Napoleonic Legion of Honor on his breast: “Flaunting that now useless medal, symbol of the warlike follies of a despot, this cannibal father, who turns his back on the scene of hope and deliverance, is guilty, like Ugolino, like Brutus, of having devoured the living forces of the nation, symbolized here by the dead son” (*Géricault au coeur de la création romantique*, 177; translation mine).
- 30 A basic study of the *Brutus* is Robert L. Herbert, *David, Voltaire, “Brutus” and the French Revolution: An Essay in Art and Politics* (London, 1972).
- 31 Grigsby finds that “the so-called father is the final picture’s least successful figure,” seeing in its “classical” (Davidian) origins an unsuccessful disguise for its grounding in earlier drawings and sketches of rape and cannibalism (*Extremities*, 214–15). My counter-suggestion (see p. 99, footnote, and fig. 71) is that the “father” alludes beyond the framework of French painting of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to the ancient sculpture of *Laocoön and His Sons*.
- 32 Michel writes:

There are, in the *Raft of the Medusa*, two paintings in one: the scene of hope and the scene of mourning. One is riveted to the distant motif of the rescue ship – the brig *Argus*

– of which one does not know with certainty whether it is approaching or sailing further away: the personages there are absorbed in the action (it is a collective narrative with a unitary tendency) and the beholder identifies with their uncertain question (he adheres to their group without any mediation). Michael Fried long ago showed the crucial importance of such narrative phenomena. The other is dominated by the father who clasps his moribund son in a pose analogous to that of Dürer’s *Melancholy*. This frontal attitude – almost: the gaze is elsewhere – has for its rhetorical function to implicate the beholder in this work of mourning. Now, the two paintings ignore one another. Indeed they turn their backs on one another. This centrifugal scheme – a major violation of the proprieties – is almost without precedent in the classical tradition, founded on a tireless requirement of centrality (spatial, narrative, psychological). The *Raft of the Medusa*, a monumental work, has an hiatus at its center: it is constructed around a void. And this void is a constant of loss [“un constant d’échec”]. It marks the failure of history painting. Géricault ruins the naïve illusion of a linear narrative which presumes to reproduce the world by giving it a meaning (“Nom de Géricault,” 25; translation mine).

Of course, my point all along has been that the *Eudamidas* model installs an hiatus at the very center of the Davidian *tableau*.

- 33 In *CR* I suggest that the “son” lies behind the foreshortened corpse in Honoré Daumier’s large lithograph *Rue Transnonain* of 1834 (37); and in *MM* I claim to find an allusion to the former in the figure of Christ in Manet’s *Dead Christ with Angels* of 1864 (92–5), a proposal that seems to have persuaded almost no one since it was first put forward in 1969. Nevertheless, I hold to it still. The “son” is also clearly a term of reference (also of difference) in Delacroix’s ambitious early paintings, most obviously the *Bark of Dante* and *Liberty at the Barcades* (1830).

- 34 Norman Bryson, "Géricault and 'Masculinity,'" in Norman Bryson, Michael Ann Holly, and Keith Moxey, eds., *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations* (Hanover, N.H., 1994), 228-59.
- 35 The pertinence of Maine de Biran's philosophical writings to the issues at stake in the present essay as well as in "David/Manet" is considerable even as it is also difficult to pin down. The concept of "sensation of effort" plays a decisive role in one of Biran's major texts, *De l'aperception immédiate*, the so-called *Mémoire de Berlin* of 1807. (See the recent edition by Anne Devarieux [Paris, 2005].) Basically, Devarieux explains in a useful Introduction, Biran associates the sense of self with the notion of *effort*, "a relative fact that comprises two terms, 'distinct but not separate,' namely, a force called hyperorganic and the interior resistance of the body itself" (8; translation mine). As she also writes: "Biran never abandons his 'principle of principles,' the primitive fact of effort, the internal feeling of a willed movement, *sui generis*, unrepresentable (excluding all throwing into relief of the interior man), altogether distinct from a banal sensation of movement because arising from an originary modification which cannot be denied without denying one's own existence. Michel Henry has seen in his philosophy an 'ontological dualism,' with immanent effort as its principle, which comports badly with traditional dualisms and forces one to rethink radically the means of apprehending consciousness [la conscience]" (11; translation mine). See e.g. Michel Henry, *Philosophy and Phenomenology of the Body*, trans. G.J. Etkorn (The Hague, 1975). Thus Biran:

[I]l y a un mode individuel, très distinct de toutes les autres espèces de sensations, et que l'on est autorisé à regarder comme *formel* en tant qu'il a son fondement unique dans le sujet de la perception, dans le *moi*, qui n'est peut-être pleinement constitué qu'en lui et par lui. Ce mode actif est celui que j'appelle *effort*, le quel, s'effectuant librement et suiv-

ant certaines conditions que nous verrons à déterminer par la suite, comprend dans l'aperception immédiate de la force vivante que le reproduit sans cesse le sentiment corrélatif d'une résistance organique ou matérielle, nécessairement et primitivement perçue hors de la force comme son terme d'application, hors du *moi* comme son objet. (111-12; emphasis in original)

(There is an individual modality, very distinct from other species of sensation, and which one is authorized to regard as *formal* in that it has its basis solely in the subject of perception, in the *moi*, which perhaps is only fully constituted in and by it. This active modality is the one I call *effort*, which, acting freely and obeying certain conditions which we will determine further on, contains [embraces?] in the immediate apperception of the living force which unceasingly reproduces it the correlative feeling of an organic or material resistance, necessarily and primitively perceived outside the force as its term of application, outside the *moi* as its object" [translation mine].)

A great deal more would need to be said to develop the point adequately, but this should at least be enough to show that the concepts of effort and of the sensation of effort were the focus of sustained phenomenological analysis during the years of David's later production, a body of work in which the evocation of effort is strikingly etiolated, and of Géricault's entire career (Biran, born in 1766, died in 1824), which I am suggesting took place under the sign of titanic physical effort (indeed of a titanic effort to "project" physical effort) from the outset through at least the campaign on the *Raft*, after which the heroic body recedes, in a certain sense.

A further aspect of Biran's thought concerns the role of habit, "habitude," which he understands in a negative sense as always tending to reduce the volitional to the merely habitual or automatic. This calls for special efforts to make

the actions in question volitional once more, but of course there is no gainsaying the tendency of habit to undo those efforts sooner or later. On this complex topic see François Azouvi, *Maine de Biran: La science de l'homme* (Paris, 1995), 456–63. Various other difficulties involved in Biran's conception of effort are scrupulously analysed by Azouvi; see esp. 217–52. (The next philosophical development with respect to the concept of habit takes place in Jean-Gaspard-Félix Ravaisson's treatise *De l'habitude* [1838], a text I relate both to Flaubert and to Courbet in *Flaubert's "Gueuloir": On Madame Bovary and Salammbô* [New Haven and London, 2012], 63–84.)

Régis Michel with characteristic acuteness draws attention to the affinity between Biran and Géricault several times in "Nom de Géricault" (6b, 10b, 11).

- 36 In Delacroix's so-called "Cahier autobiographique, 1853–1860," he regrets the loss of Géricault and recalls: "He squandered his youth; he was extreme in everything: he liked only to leap onto horses, and chose the stormiest. I saw him several times at the moment when he mounted a horse: he almost could only do this by surprise; hardly in the saddle, he was swept away by his mount. One day when I was dining with him and his father, he left before dessert to ride to the Bois de Boulogne. He took off like a lightning bolt, having no time to turn around to say good evening, and I sat down to table with the good old man. After ten minutes we heard a loud noise: he returned on the gallop; he was missing one of the tails of his outfit: his horse had brushed him up against something or other, and he had lost this necessary accompaniment" (*Journal*, 2: 1740; translation mine).
- 37 The French word for "accord" is "unisson," a term that plays a key role in the remarkable discussion in Balzac's short story "Massimilla Doni" (written 1837, published 1839) between two characters, Capraja and the Duke of Catanéo, on the respective merits of two artistic devices, "la roulade" (basically, the arabesque)
- and "l'unisson." (The art in question is music, but the concepts themselves have much broader implications.) This is not the place for a fuller treatment of this opposition, but see Jean-Pierre Richard's brilliant summary of the exchange in "Corps et décors balzaciens," *Études sur le romantisme* (Paris, 1970), 137–38. Richard has more to say about the relevance to Balzac's fiction of both notions, which he understands as lying very near the core of his enterprise (138–9). My own interest in the topic concerns the relevance of Balzac's notion of "unisson" to the accord between men and horses in Géricault's art. And it is given further point by the appearance of an imaginary arabesque toward the end of Balzac's story "Le Colonel Chabert," which I discuss in relation to Géricault in the last part of this essay. For "Massimilla Doni" see Honoré de Balzac, *Le Chef d'oeuvre inconnu, Gambara, Massimilla Doni*, ed. Marc Eigeldinger and Max Milner (Paris, 1981), 157–269.
- 38 A painting that all but spells this out is the *Portrait of a Carabinier* (ca. 1815) in Rouen, which depicts a cavalryman in a cuirasse gazing directly out of the painting with the dark head of a horse bent and downward-looking just beyond his left shoulder. It is impossible not to see the horse as an "emanation" of the man, or perhaps vice-versa; in any case, the two together make a single psychic "presence."
- 39 Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker (Bloomington, Ind., 1995), 185ff. The statement that "the stone is worldless, the animal is poor in world, man is world-forming" first occurs on 185; Heidegger's attempt to elucidate the concept of "world" takes off from the second item in this statement. Further page references will be in parentheses in the text.
- 40 Cf. my claim in *CR* that Géricault found in the subject of horses in movement "a means of representing actions and expressions that at once relate intimately to human impulses and desires, far surpass human capabilities, and

- owing to their nonhuman nature – their animality – escape being perceived as theatrical, as grimace. . . . More broadly, the representation of animals, whether active or in repose, provided Géricault with something like a natural refuge from the theatrical, as if for him the relation of animals to their bodies and to the world precluded the theatricalizing of that relation no matter what. This is to say more than that animals take on an unprecedented expressive burden in Géricault's art, though that is certainly true. It's also to maintain that, in his tragic pictorial universe, animality becomes an ideal of humanness that ultimately lies beyond human reach. (The unattainability and consequent bestializing of that ideal is variously imaged in his oeuvre, most movingly in the *Cattle Market*.)" (24).
- 41 Eitner suggests ca. 1815 (*Géricault*, 72). Interestingly, he notes that "Géricault did not take this expressive study from life, but based it on a very indifferent print after Carle Vernet" (*ibid.*).
- 42 I hesitate to suggest this but just possibly Géricault's feeling for blacks or say for non-Caucasians such as his domestic, the Turk Mustapha, also has something to do with the sense in which at least in European society they were rendered "poor in world." A recollection by Louis-Alexis Jamar (like Montfort, a young painter who assisted Géricault) of the artist's burial is pertinent here. "I remember that at the burial there were three of us, Montfort, Lehoux [another young painter], and me together we wept also I was very moved to hear the words that were pronounced over the tomb. Mustapha, his servant, wasn't far away from us also I remember that Ernest Leroy seeing him weep said pretty stupidly that friends weren't Turks [i.e. that Mustapha had no business being there?] and at such a moment I didn't find those words truly spiritual for a friend of Géricault's" (cited by Chenique, 307-8; translation mine).
- 43 On the landscapes see Eitner, *Géricault*, 142-5, and Gary Tinterow, *Géricault's Heroic Landscapes: The Times of Day*, repr. from *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* (Winter, 1990/91). Tinterow places the *Deluge* around 1818 (57), a dating that goes against the consensus but seems to me to have a lot to recommend it.
- 44 The basic article remains Margaret Miller, "Géricault's Portraits of the Insane," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 4, no. 3/4 (1940-41): 151-63. See also Eitner, *Géricault*, 241-9 (though I find wholly unpersuasive his suggestion that the portraits of monomaniacs show the influence of the British painter Sir Thomas Lawrence); and Michel, "Mythe de l'oeuvre," 244.
- 45 According to Etienne-Jean Georget, a student of Esquirol and Géricault's exact contemporary, persons afflicted with the illness then known as monomania were described not only as wholly absorbed in one or another obsessive delusion but also as seeking to flee their fellows, either to escape being seen by them or "to entrench themselves all the more securely in their own manner of looking" (*De la folie: Considérations sur cette maladie . . .* [Paris, 1820], 112; translation mine). The lability that this alternative captures goes to the heart of Géricault's vision. The key passage reads: "Dans la lypémanie [a term for depressive monomania invented by Esquirol] ou mélancolie, les aliénés sombres, ennemis du tumulte, absorbés et profondément attentifs à l'idée qui les domine, fuient leurs semblables, tantôt pour se soustraire à leur vue s'ils croient leur déplaire, ou s'ils craignent d'en devenir victimes, d'autres fois pour chercher un repos qu'ils ne peuvent trouver, ou pour se fortifier à leur aise dans leur manière de voir."
- 46 Honoré de Balzac, *Le Colonel Chabert*, ed. Stéphane Vachon (Paris, 1994 and 2012). Page references will be in parentheses in the text.
- 47 "Another quality, very great, very vast, of Delacroix's talent, and which makes him the painter loved by poets, is that he is essentially literary" (Charles Baudelaire, "Exposition Universelle de 1855," *Curiosités esthétiques: L'Art romantique et autres oeuvres critiques*, ed. Henri

Lemaître (Paris, 1962), 239; translation mine. Cf. in this connection Baudelaire's characterization of Delacroix's singularity in his "Salon of 1846":

Each of the old masters has his kingdom, his territory – which he is often compelled to share with illustrious rivals. Raphael has form, Rubens and Veronese color, Rubens and Michelangelo the imagination of drawing. A portion of the empire remained, where only Rembrandt had made some excursions, – drama – natural and living drama, terrible and melancholy drama, expressed often by color but always by gesture.

As regards sublime gestures, Delacroix's only rivals are outside his art. Frédéric Lemaître and Macready. (129; translation mine)

The comparison with Rembrandt and the reference to color show that Baudelaire when he speaks of drama has something other in mind than the Davidian tradition, while the reference to Lemaître and Macready, two of the leading actors of the period, suggests that the entire issue of theatricality was something of a dead letter for him.

- 48 Honoré de Balzac, *Père Goriot*, trans. A.J. Krailsheimer (Oxford and New York, 1991), 9. For the French see Honoré de Balzac, *Le Père Goriot*, ed. Pierre-Georges Castex (Paris, 1981), 18. A superb analysis of Balzac in this regard is Jean-Pierre Richard, "Corps et décors balzaciennes," 89–11. See also Jacques Neefs, "L'intensité dramatique des scènes balzaciennes," in Stéphane Vachon, ed., *Balzac: une poétique du roman* (Montreal, 1996), 143–52.
- 49 The classic study is Peter Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven and London, 1976), 1–5, 110–52.
- 50 Significantly, the second half of the 1820s and early 1830s saw the emergence of the painter Paul Delaroche (b. 1797, so six years younger than Géricault and a near-exact contemporary of Balzac), whose canvases of historical sub-

jects such as the *Children of Edward IV in the Tower* (1830) and *Jane Grey* (1833) were understood by contemporary audiences as referring to the stage by virtue of their emphasis on historically accurate costumes, choice of moment, and manifestly theatrical *mise-en-scène*. See my discussion of Delaroche in *CR* (32–5), in the course of which I emphasize the fact that his work was criticized on those grounds in its own time and indeed that during the 1830s "a liking for the theatrical became identified by a gradually emerging avant-garde as the hallmark of a general debasement of artistic taste, an identification that persisted throughout the rest of the century" (35). Various observations by Gustave Planche are especially telling in this connection (298–9 n. 38). On Delaroche see the masterly study by Stephen Bann, *Paul Delaroche: History Painted* (London, 1997).

- 51 See the ambitious study by Sheryl Kroen, *Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815–1830* (Berkeley, Cal., and London, 2000). More broadly, there are interesting essays on a range of topics in Jean-Yves Mollier, Martine Reid, and Jean-Claude Yon, eds., *Repenser la restauration* (Malesherbes, 2005).
- 52 Charles Baudelaire, "Théophile Gautier," *Curiosités esthétiques*, 679.
- 53 See in this connection the brief discussion of Daumier in *CR*, 35–40.
- 54 For example, Joseph Brideau in *La Rabouilleuse* admires the poetry of Byron, the painting of Géricault, the music of Rossini; the *Raft of the "Medusa"* is cited favorably early on in *Pierre Grassou*; a painting by Géricault figures in the collection of Pons in *Cousin Pons*; and so on.
- 55 A term that recurs in the last pages of "Le Colonel Chabert" when Derville, recognizing Chabert in the inmate of Bicêtre by the side of the road, says to Godeschal, "That old man there, my dear, is an entire poem, or, as the romantics say, a drama" (138; translation mine).
- 56 See in this connection n.37 above.
- 57 Three further points. Early in the story, after Chabert leaves, the clerks call him back and ask

his name. He tells them Chabert and one asks, mockingly, whether he is the colonel killed at Eylau, and of course Chabert answers, "The same." He departs again, and the clerks engage in a spirited conversation as to whether they have just seen a "spectacle" and, going on from that, about what exactly a "spectacle" is:

"What is a spectacle," Godeschal resumed. "Let's first establish the facts of the case. What am I betting on, gentlemen? a spectacle. What is a spectacle? something that one sees . . ."

"But on that system, would it be enough for you to show us the water flowing under the Pont-Neuf?" cried Simonnin interrupting him.

"That one pays to see," said Godeschal, continuing.

"But one pays to see lots of things that aren't a spectacle. The definition isn't exact," said Desroches.

"But, listen to me!"

"You reason badly, my dear," said Boucard.

"Curtius [the creator of waxworks and teacher of the future Madame Tussaud; his establishments, on the boulevard du Temple and at the Palais Royal, still existed during the Restoration], is that a spectacle?"

"No, responded the master-clerk [Boucard], "that's a cabinet of figures."

"I bet a hundred francs against a sou," countered Godeschal, "that Curtius's cabinet constitutes the ensemble of things on which has devolved the name of spectacle. It applies to something to see at different prices, according to the different places one occupies." (65-6; translation mine)

(- Qu'est-ce qu'un spectacle? reprit Godeschal. Etablissons d'abord le *point de fait*. Qu'ai-je parié, messieurs? un spectacle. Qu'est-ce qu'un spectacle? une chose qu'on voit . . .

- Mais dans ce système-là, vous vous accitteriez donc en nous meanant voir l'eau

couler sous le Pont-Neuf? s'écria Simonnin en interrompant.

- Qu'on voit pour l'argent, disait Godeschal en continuant.

- Mais on voit pour l'argent bien des choses qui ne sont pas un spectacle. La définition n'est pas exacte, dit Desroches.

- Mais, écoutez-moi donc!

- Vous déraisonnez, mon cher, dit Boucard.

- Curtius, est-il un spectacle?

- Non, répondit le Maître-clear, c'est un cabinet de figures.

- Je parie cent francs contre un sou, reprit Godeschal, que le cabinet de Curtius constitue l'ensemble de choses auquel est dévolu le nom de spectacle. Il comporte une chose à voir à différents prix, suivant les différentes places où l'on veut se mettre . . .)

In other words, the conversation concerns the nature of something like a theatrical production ("spectacle" was Rousseau's term of choice in his *Lettre à d'Alembert*), and I take one implication of Godeschal's position to be that "Le Colonel Chabert" is itself a "spectacle," offering something to be viewed for money, perhaps with the further qualification that the nature of a literary text eliminates the difference between places.

Second, an early review of "Le Colonel Chabert" appeared in the October 20, 1832 issue of the *Journal des femmes*; the author, Mme Alida de Savignac, praises the story highly, concluding with the following statement, the pertinence of which to my argument I take to be self-evident. "I used to believe," she writes, "before reading [*Le Colonel*] *Chabert*, that the genre that consists in imitating in words the works of great painters, and in shaping one's style to the point where a literary work becomes a *tableau*, was worthless. I take it back. The pages I have just read proved to me that in literature there is no bad genre, there are only bad authors" (213; translation mine) ("J'avais cru, jusqu'à la lecture du *Comte Chabert*, que le genre qui constitue à imiter

avec la parole les oeuvres de grands peintres, et à travailler son style jusqu'à ce qu'une oeuvre littéraire soit devenue un tableau, ne valait rien. Je m'en retractes. Les quelques pages que je viens de lire m'ont prouvé qu'en littérature il n'y a pas de mauvais genre, qu'il n'a y que de mauvais auteurs.")

Third, in a recent article Diana Knight persuasively demonstrates Balzac's engagement with Diderotian issues in an early story, "Une double famille" (1830); Diana Knight, "Absorption and Theatricality: Tableaux of Toil in Balzac's 'Une double famille,'" *Dix-neuf* 17 (July 2013): 104–23.

4 ORIENTATION IN PAINTING

- 1 Joseph Leo Koerner, *Caspar David Friedrich and the Subject of Landscape* (New Haven and London, 1990), 163; hereafter, Koerner, *Subject*. Koerner continues: "They are the ubiquitous, almost obsessive, signatures of Friedrich's *Erlebniskunst* ['art of experience']," a notion Koerner deploys throughout his important study.
 - 2 Entitled "Synergies," the symposium was held on May 17–18, 2013 in Berlin. My thanks to the organizers, Joachim Küpper and Danièle Cohn, for inviting me to deliver the keynote lecture on a subject of my choosing.
 - 3 On Chardin and absorption see *AT*, 11–16, 44–53. Further references to this book will be in parentheses in the text.
 - 4 For more on Géricault see Ch. 3, "Géricault's Romanticism," above.
 - 5 *CR*. No specific page references seem necessary.
 - 6 I go on to say that my remarks on the concept of the self in Fichte were indebted to a course of lectures on German Idealism taught at Harvard in the spring of 1973 by Professor Dieter Henrich, who remains to this day perhaps the major figure in the renewal of interest in Kant's immediate successors. It was a great stroke of luck for me to be able to attend those lectures.
- It is also true that my familiarity with the writings of Kant, Fichte, and others at the time I wrote that footnote could not have been more tenuous. Henrich's lectures were much later published as *Between Kant and Hegel: Lectures on German Idealism* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 2003). I should say, too, that my use of the terms "cognizing" and "cognition" in the present essay are intended in a *loosely* Kantian spirit. There is today lively debate as to the precise meaning of Kant's notion of "Enkenntnis," usually translated as cognition, in relation to "Wissen," or knowledge proper – not a topic that I am qualified to explore, much less resolve.
- 7 Immanuel Kant, "What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking?," *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason and Other Writings*, trans. and ed. Allen Wood and George di Giovanni (Cambridge, 1998), 4–5; emphasis in original. Further page references will be in parentheses in the text.
 - 8 This painting along with a number of others discussed in this essay was on view in the exhibition "De l'Allemagne 1800–1939 de Friedrich à Beckmann" at the Louvre in spring 2013; the exhibition complemented the symposium mentioned in n. 2. In this connection see the catalogue of the same title, ed. Sébastien Allard and Danièle Cohn (Paris, 2013). Particular thanks to Jennifer Ashton, Jean-Pierre Criqui, Thomas Demand, Walter Benn Michaels, and Robert Pippin, in whose company (mostly separately) I had the pleasure of looking closely at Friedrich's work in Paris, Berlin, and Hamburg during the writing and revising of this essay. Also to Ruth Leys, Leonardo Lisi, Charles Palermo, Ralph Ubl, and David Wellbery for feedback on various drafts.
 - 9 William Vaughan, *Friedrich* (London and New York, 2004), 197–8.
 - 10 Cf. in this connection Kant's treatment in the *Critique of Judgment* (1790) of the "I think" that always, in his view, "precedes the experience which is required to determine the object