Julia Langbein

LAUGH

LINES

Caricaturing Painting in 19th-Century France

BLOOMSBURY

Laugh Lines

The publication of this monograph was made possible with the generous support of the former Visiting Committee of the Department of Art History, University of Chicago.

Laugh Lines

Caricaturing Painting in Nineteenth-Century France

Julia Langbein

BLOOMSBURY VISUAL ARTS
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY VISUAL ARTS
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY VISUAL ARTS and the Diana logo
are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2022
Paperback edition published in 2024

Copyright © Julia Langbein, 2022

Julia Langbein has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and
Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgments on pp. xii–xiii constitute
an extension of this copyright page.

Cover design by Tjaša Krivec
Cover image: André Gill, Gill-revue. Le Salon pour rire.
Paris, 1868. Private collection. Photograph by Damian Griffiths.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or
transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including
photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,
without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for,
any third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this
book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher regret any
inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased to exist,
but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3501-8685-9
PB: 978-1-3501-8689-7
ePDF: 978-1-3501-8686-6
eBook: 978-1-3501-8687-3

Typeset by Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com
and sign up for our newsletters.

Contents

List of Illustrations vi
Acknowledgments xii
Note on Translations xiv

Introduction 1

1 Comic Reproduction in July Monarchy Paris 17
2 Dueling and Doubling: The Antagonism of Salon Caricature 49
3 Salon Caricature and the Physiognomy of Paint 77
4 Salon Caricature in the Age of Reproduction 99
5 Gravity and Graphic Medium in Cham and Daumier 121
6 Caricature and Comic Spectacle at the Paris Salon 149
7 Salon Caricature and the Making of Manet 175

Conclusion 213

Bibliography 218
Index 236

Illustrations

Plates

1 André Gill, untitled proof, 1875

2 André Gill, "Le Salon de 1875—Distribution des récompenses," *L'Éclipse*, May 9, 1875

3 Raymond Pelez, "Salon de 1842. Un bain à domicile. Fantaisie aquatique de M. Court," *Le Charivari*, May 11, 1842

4 Fidel Gudin after Joseph-Désiré Court, *Baigneuse algérienne*, date unknown

5 Paul Jourdy, *Prométhée enchaîné sur le rocher*, Salon of 1842

6 Raymond Pelez, "Salon de 1842. Prométhée changé en outre. Amplification d'Échine par M. Jourdy," *Le Charivari*, May 14, 1842

7 Dominique Papéty, *Rêve de bonheur*, Salon of 1843

8 Bertall, *Le Salon de 1843 (ne pas confondre avec celui de l'artiste-éditeur Challamel, éditeur-artiste.) Appendice au livret, représenté par 37 copies par Bertal* [*sic*], 1843, page 94

9 Bertall, "Revue comique. Salon de peinture, de sculpture, d'architecture, etc.[…]," *Journal pour rire*, July 28, 1849

10 Nicolas Galimard, *Junon jalouse*, Salon of 1849

11 Bertall, "Revue comique. Salon de peinture, de sculpture, d'architecture, etc. […]," *Journal pour rire*, July 28, 1849

12 Eugène Delacroix, *Arabe-Syrien avec son cheval*, Salon of 1849

13 Eugène Delacroix, *Le Christ en croix*, Salon of 1847

14 "Le Salon de 1847 illustré par Cham," *Le Charivari*, April 9, 1847

15 Cham, *Salon de 1866 photographié par Cham*, 1866

16 Théodule Ribot, *Le Christ et les docteurs*, Salon of 1866

17 Bertall, "Le Salon dépeint et dessiné par Bertall," *Le Journal pour rire*, May 16, 1853

18 Jean-François Millet, *Un berger; effet du soir*, Salon of 1853

19 Cham, "Le Salon pour rire, par Cham," *Le Charivari*, May 10, 1874

20 Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, *L'an 732, Charles Martel sauve la chrétienté par sa victoire sur les Sarrasins près de Poitiers*, Salon of 1874

21 Nadar and Darjou, "Nadar Jury au Salon de 1859," *Le Journal amusant*, June 4, 1859

22 "Le Salon de 1859," *Le Journal amusant*, June 18, 1859

23 Nadar et al, untitled maquette, 1859

24 "Nadar Jury au Salon de 1859," *Le Journal amusant*, July 16, 1859

25 Stop, "Visite au Salon de 1877," *Le Journal amusant*, May 5, 1877

26 Étienne Berne-Bellecour, *Dans la tranchée*, Salon of 1877

27 André Gill, *La Parodie*, July 1869

28 "Salon de 1861 par Cham et an amateur," n.d. (1861?)

29 Jean-Louis Hamon, *L'Escamoteur*, Salon of 1861

30 Louis Gallait, *Derniers honneurs rendus aux comtes d'Egmont et de Hornes*, Salon of 1852

31 Honoré Daumier, "Laisse-moi regarder encore un peu, papa!… Ça me fait bien de la peine le supplice de ce pauvre comte d'Egmont! —Tu ferais mieux d'avoir pitié du supplice de ton malheureux père qui a les bras cassés à force de te tenir en l'air!" *Le Charivari*, May 29, 1852

32 Cham, "Le Salon de 1852. Croquis par Cham," *Le Charivari*, April 18, 1852

33 Jean-Louis Hamon, *L'Aurore*, Salon of 1864

34 Cham, untitled, 1864

35 Adolphe Schreyer, *Chevaux de cosaques irréguliers par un temps de neige,* Salon of 1864

36 Cham, untitled, 1864

37 Cham, untitled, 1864

38 Édouard Manet, *The Bullfight*, 1864, and *Le Torero Mort*, 1864

39 Stock, *L'Épâtouflant Salon du Havre*, 1868, cover

40 Stock, *L'Épâtouflant Salon du Havre*, 1868, page 4

41 Stock, *L'Épâtouflant Salon du Havre*, 1868, page 8

42 Édouard Manet, *Polichinelle*, 1874

43 Stock, "Revue du Salon," 1874

44 Grosclaude & Albert Guillaume, "Le Salon Fantaisiste," *Le Figaro. Supplément illustré,* May 12, 1894

Figures

I.1 Pierre Ambroise Richebourg, *Photographies par Richebourg* [hall des sculptures et cimaises du Salon de 1861], 1861 2

I.2 Moloch, *Belphégor au Salon*, 1869 4

I.3 *Salon pour rire par Miequellangepuiskinefopatkroute*, 1890 5

1.1 Honoré Daumier, "Ascension de Jésus-Christ," 1840 18

1.2 Honoré Daumier, "Gargantua," 1831 19

1.3 Louis Coignard, "Petit Pêcheur au bord de la mer," *Le Charivari*, May 5, 1842 23

1.4 Bertall, *Le Salon de 1843 (ne pas confondre avec celui de l'artiste-éditeur Challamel, éditeur-artiste.) Appendice au livret, représenté par 37 copies par Bertal* [*sic*], 1843, page 95 36

1.5 Samuel F. B. Morse, *Gallery of the Louvre*, 1831–33 38

1.6 "Beaux-arts. Salon de 1843. Première Vue du Salon carré," *L'Illustration*, March 25, 1843 39

1.7 Bertall, *Le Salon de 1843 (ne pas confondre avec celui de l'artiste-éditeur Challamel, éditeur-artiste). Appendice au livret, représenté par 37 copies par Bertal* [*sic*], 1843, page 104 40

2.1 Bertall, "Revue comique. Salon de peinture, de sculpture, d'architecture, etc., […]," *Journal pour rire*, July 28, 1849 51

2.2 *Le Salon caricatural. Critique en vers et contre tous, illustrée de soixante caricatures dessinées sur bois*, 1846, page 1 62

2.3 *Le Salon caricatural. Critique en vers et contre tous, illustrée de soixante caricatures dessinées sur bois*, 1846, page 6 64

3.1 Illustration from Johann Caspar Lavater, *L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie,* tome 2, plate 65 82

3.2 Henri-Gérard Fontallard, title vignette, *La Silhouette*, 1829 84

3.3 Thomas Holloway, "A Sure and convenient machine for drawing silhouettes," 1792 85

3.4 Charles Philipon and Louis-Joseph Trimolet, "Le dedans jugé par le dehors," *Le Musée Philipon*, vol. 2, no. 10, 1841, page 76 86

3.5 Hadol, "Pourquoi les femmes vont au Salon," *Le Charivari*, May 8, 1874 89

3.6 Cham, *Salon de 1868. Album de 60 caricatures,* 1868 91

4.1 Stop, "Le Salon de 1872," *Le Journal amusant*, May 18, 1872 109

5.1 Cham, "Le Salon de 1861. Croquis par Cham," *Le Charivari*, May 16, 1861 125

5.2 "Salon de 1861 par Cham et an amateur," n.d. (1861?) 129

5.3 Henry Linton and Edmond Morin after Charles-Édouard Armand-Dumaresq, "Bataille de Solferino," *Le Monde illustré*, May 5, 1861 129

5.4 "Salon de 1861 par Cham et an amateur," n.d. (1861?) 131

5.5 Pierre Ambroise Richebourg, *Photographies par Richebourg* [hall des sculptures et cimaises du Salon de 1861], 1861 131

5.6 Honoré Daumier, “Ma femme … …, comme nous n’aurions pas le temps de tout voir en un jour; regarde les tableaux qui sont du côté droit …, moi je regarderai ceux qui sont du côté gauche, et quand nous serons de retour à la maison, nous nous raconterons ce que nous aurons vu chacun de notre côté … … ” *Le Charivari,* April 18, 1859 134

5.7 Honoré Daumier, “Se posant en connaisseurs,” *Le Charivari*, April 24, 1852 135

5.8 “—Viens donc …, mon ami, je ne trouve pas ce tableau joli. —Si fait, en ma qualité de pharmacien, il m’intéresse beaucoup …, ce tableau représente sans doute, l’essai d’une nouvelle médecine. …. voyons ce que dit mon livret?” *Le Charivari,* June 21, 1859 138

6.1 Nadar, *Album du Salon de 1852. Nadar Jury*, 1852 150

6.2 Nadar, *Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857,* 1857, cover 155

6.3 Nadar, *Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857*, 1857, page 2 157

6.4 Nadar, *Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857*, 1857, page 47 157

6.5 Nadar, *Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857*, 1857, page 5 158

6.6 Cham, *Revue du Salon de 1853 par Cham*, 1853 162

6.7 “Une pluie de chefs-d’œuvre,” *La Vie parisienne*, June 8, 1872, 360–1 162

6.8 “Une pluie de chefs-d’œuvre,” *La Vie parisienne,* June 8, 1872, 360–1, detail 163

6.9 Dey & Roby, “La Saison à Paris—Théâtres—Modes. Étrangers et étrangères,” *La Vie parisienne*, June 1, 1872, 344–5 164

6.10 Nadar and Darjou, “Nadar Jury au Salon de 1861,” *Journal amusant*, July 6, 1861 166

7.1 Bertall, “La queue du chat, ou la charbonnière des Batignolles,” from “Le Salon, par Bertall,” *L’Illustration*, June 3, 1865 175

7.2 Bertall, “Le Salon, par Bertall,” *L’Illustration*, June 3, 1865 176

7.3 Carolus-Duran, *Fantin Latour et Oulevay*, 1861 185

7.4 Cham, "Une promenade au Salon. Croquis par Cham," *Le Charivari*, May 22, 1864 188

7.5 Marcelin, "Le Salon de 1863—4e série: Les Folichons," *La Vie parisienne*, no. 349, 1863, page 234 191

7.6 Untitled [album of caricatures after paintings by Manet]. Photograph, nineteenth to early twentieth century, after a drawing, c. 1863 198

Acknowledgments

This book began as a PhD dissertation at the University of Chicago under the supervision of Martha Ward and it would not have come to fruition without her guidance and support, for which I am very grateful. I also thank my dissertation committee members W.J.T. Mitchell and Ralph Ubl whose invaluable input helped to set the course of this project from the outset.

I rewrote most of the book and undertook important archival research as a Junior Research Fellow at Trinity College, Oxford, between 2014 and 2018. Because of the legacy of Francis Haskell, his archives, and his former students (many of whom I met via the department), the Art History department at Oxford was the ideal place to expand my thinking about this subject. I thank Clare Hills-Nova for facilitating my research in the Haskell collection, and I thank the members of the department for engaging with me so helpfully about this project among other things.

I have benefited from the expertise of librarians and archivists, too many to cite, in the United States, the UK, and France. I must mention Valérie Sueur-Hermel and the staff at the Cabinet des estampes at the BnF, where I did the majority of my research. Many thanks to Pauline Clement-Bayer and Jean-Michel Buck at Musée du vieux Montmartre for sharing the Gill archives with me and Claire Martin for help with images at the Petit Palais. In the United States, I thank Nancy Spiegel at the University of Chicago Library and Yuri Long at the National Gallery of Art Library in Washington, DC.

One of the greatest pleasures of researching this book has been getting to know, in person or virtually, museums and collections all over France and Belgium—I am grateful to the many institutions that provided me with images and many more who helped me source paintings and drawings along the way. I particularly want to thank Jean-Loup Leguay at Musée de Picardie for going out of his way to help me find images pertaining to Court.

I have benefited from many opportunities to share this work over the years. I wish to thank in particular the group of graduate students convened by Nancy Thebaut and Thomas Pavel at the University of Chicago Paris Center in 2016 for a pivotal workshop. Thanks to Jennifer Greenhill, Alastair Wright, and

Ségolène Le Men for opportunities to test my research in the classroom. I thank Ian Bourland, Ros Holmes, and Jennifer Johnson for reading chapters. I thank Tobias Czudej and Taber Coletti for helping me to reconceive of my research material as an exhibition, which had a major and positive impact on the text. I thank the press's anonymous readers for their excellent suggestions.

Katherine Desplanques, Camille Mathieu, and Aurélie Petiot found, helped me find, or tried to help me find things in the archives. Thanks to Jean-Philippe Lemée for help with jokes—and for introducing me, as a high school student in France, to art history as a field of study in which the hilarious and the profound were often intertwined. I have benefited enormously from—and greatly enjoyed—conversations with David Kunzle and Tom Gretton, and I thank them for their generosity. Margaret MacNamidhe has been very kind about all my Delacroix queries. Anna Lee was a great help with photography.

I did the final revisions for this book under lockdown conditions in Dublin, and I am indebted to the library staff at Trinity College Dublin, who mailed a good portion of the stacks to my home when Covid restrictions would not permit library access. Thanks to Rachel Coombes for help with the manuscript during that difficult time.

I am very grateful to the many people at Bloomsbury who shepherded this manuscript to publication with such care and insight through an unstable market and often difficult pandemic working conditions, including Frances Arnold, April Peake, Yvonne Thouroude and Ross Fraser-Smith.

I thank the Visiting Committee to the Department of Art History at the University of Chicago for a generous publication grant.

I am grateful for the long-term and multidimensional support of my parents. The journey from dissertation to book took a couple detours to the maternity hospital. I non-ironically thank my daughters for momentarily making me a stranger to, and therefore a better critic of, my own work. Finally, I thank my husband. I would not have been able to finish this project without his patience, encouragement, and—aptly enough—humor.

Note on Translations

Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in the book are by the author.

Introduction

In early May 1875, André Gill (Louis Alexandre Gosset de Guînes, 1840–1885) passed through the stone facade of the Palace of Industry on the Champs-Élysées and into its soaring, open-plan nave, the sun pouring down through the iron-and-glass roof. He faced a lawn crossed with paths, potted with palms and flowers, strewn with sculpture. Above him, two stories of aisles wrapped around the central court, crammed with pictures. Of the 4,152 works of art at the Salon that spring, perhaps Gill had already decided, based on hearsay or studio visits, which to select, or perhaps, perambulating through the crowds, Gill looked to laugh.

The Palace of Industry, just two decades old, was designed to display everything from locomotives to livestock (a horse show had occupied the Palace the month before) and had to be jerry-rigged with temporary partitions to suit the display of painting. As Gill circulated through the makeshift galleries, he faced a ledge at about thigh height above which canvases filled the wall in a gapless, asymmetrical mosaic (Figure I.1). His eyes scanned a jumble of styles and genres: portraits of women in the newest dresses, elbows on the mantle; two peasants shearing; eighteenth-century genre scenes in the French mode; seventeenth-century genre scenes in the Spanish mode; an episode from a famous battle; a cavorting satyr.

Whether he sketched *sur place* or merely made mental notes, Gill surely called upon the old muscle memory of his days training as a painter at the Académie des beaux-arts, where he had learned to draw in part by looking closely at classical paintings and copying them in small-format sketches on paper.[1] Gill, like many painters, draftsmen, press artists, and amateurs, thought of exhibitions not merely as occasions for viewing but as habitats for copyists, like those who, benefiting from a special entry permit, snuck Gill into the Musée du Luxembourg in his youth.[2]

Figure I.1 Pierre Ambroise Richebourg, *Photographies par Richebourg* [hall des sculptures et cimaises du Salon de 1861], 1861. Photograph. 42 × 53 cm. Bibliothèque nationale de France

Within a little more than a week's time, Gill drew—and painted—a composition of six caricatures arranged around a hovering painter's palette for the cover of the comic journal *L'Éclipse* (Plate 1). The black-and-white armature was either drawn on transfer paper or photographed for transfer to a zinc plate for relief etching. Those process-engraved prints were the basis for two different editions, a hand-painted one that copied Gill's vibrant colors precisely and a color-printed one in three wan washes (Plate 2). Gill's "Le Salon de 1875—Distribution des récompenses" ("Salon of 1875—Distribution of Awards") landed in the salons, cafés, kiosks, and reading rooms of Paris,[3] alongside caricatures by his colleagues at *La Vie parisienne*, *Le Journal amusant*, *Le Monde illustré*, *Le Chronique illustré*, *L'Esprit follet*, and others. By the 1870s, the French reading public had come to anticipate that in the spring, at the opening of the central, state-sponsored exhibition of fine arts in the capital, journal pages would flood with caricatures of painting, and, to a lesser extent, sculpture. This genre was known as *le Salon pour rire* (the Salon to laugh at) or *Le Salon caricatural* (Salon caricature).

Salon caricature developed apace with the satiric press.[4] It emerged in a few embattled journals and a handful of albums in the 1840s, despite the July Monarchy's intense distrust of caricature. Salon caricature spread to new illustrated journals and albums in the 1850s and established its conventions as a genre. In the 1860s, particularly in the concessionary period of Napoleon III's reign after 1866, and again accelerated by innovations in reproductive technology (particularly the relief-etching of which Gill's "Salon de 1875" is an example), Salon caricature multiplied across dozens of new comic journals. It appeared in general-interest papers and cultural gossip sheets, oppositional organs, ephemeral leaflets, and the bulletins of insular artistic circles. Its seasonal publication in the press and in albums continued into the 1890s.

A few caricaturists, including Cham (Amédée de Noé, 1818–1879) and Bertall (Charles Albert d'Arnoux, 1820–1882), made the genre their specialty, but a wide range of caricaturists—some also writers, painters, etchers, photographers—tried their hands at this pictorial, comic re-view of contemporary fine art. Salon caricature appeared in quickly scrawled lithography and in lavish hand-tinting, in one-off issues like *Belphégor au Salon* (1869) (Figure I.2) and in the same journal for thirty-plus years.[5] Salon caricature was the private passion of an anonymous amateur, who filled an unpublished scrapbook with attempts at little comic canvases,[6] while at the same time, it reached a broad readership in general-interest newspapers and magazines with print runs in the tens, and eventually hundreds, of thousands.[7]

Salon caricature adopted different formats according to its intended use. When it appeared as one of many diversions in a comic journal, particularly in a large-format journal with a subscriber base,[8] Salon caricature was surely intended to be read at home or in shared spaces like cafés and reading rooms. But from its earliest appearances, Salon caricature also took the form of portable stand-alone albums, which could be carried around the exhibition as an antic, illustrated version of the official exhibition catalogue or *livret*.[9]

These small albums may have been sold outside the exhibition.[10] The cover of a one-off *Salon pour rire* published in 1890[11] shows a street vendor hawking his album to a crowd queuing at the entrance of a Salon (figured as an oven, baking "crusts," or botched paintings) (Figure I.3). Wherever they were consumed, caricatures of the exhibition were almost never published alongside faithful reproductions[12] but rather had to be compared to the originals at the exhibition, to a memory of firsthand contact with original works, or to reproductions published elsewhere.

Figure I.2 Moloch, *Belphégor au Salon*, 1869. Bibliothèque nationale de France

Salon caricature certainly relied on the public's preexisting awareness of the conventions of painting, acquired in part through reproductions. But in an era before the viability of photographic reproduction in the press (which only occurred in the last two decades of the century), these warped graphic interpretations of the canvases on display in the capital also diffused knowledge of the Salon to readers in Paris and in the provinces. Because Salon caricaturists published their caricatures rapidly, often relied on fewer middlemen than

Dc 2119

Figure I.3 *Salon pour rire par Miequellangepuiskinefopatkroute*, 1890. Bibliothèque nationale de France

precise reproduction and covered many canvases in a given journal spread or album, it is likely that comic versions of fine art were frequently the first wave of information about new painting to reach journal-reading audiences. (Gill's hand-painted "Salon de 1875" gave viewers a glimpse of five notable works only eight days after the May 1 opening of the Salon; by comparison, the finely detailed wood-engravings-after-photographs published in the bourgeois weekly *Le Monde illustré* appeared in a trickle of two or three per week from May through June. For information-value, both *L'Éclipse* and *Le Monde illustré* paled in comparison to Stop at *Le Journal amusant*. In May-June of that year, he caricatured nearly fifty works per weekly issue, an astonishing 220 works in all.) People in the second half of the nineteenth century not only laughed at these comic versions of the paintings they had seen in person or seen in reproduction elsewhere, but they came to know a great deal about painting in the first place through caricature.

It did not constitute a minor note of misbehavior, an aberrant moment of misunderstanding, to encounter painting as something mixed up with the comic, perhaps even to laugh at painting in person or via a handheld paper miniature.

Rather, Salon caricature is evidence—long ignored as such—that comedy was endemic to the public life of painting in nineteenth-century France. This fact is corroborated by the warnings and laments of written critics, increasingly vocal in the years of Salon caricature's proliferation, about the risibility of the Salon. Comedy was described variously as a result of decadence among painters, as a sign of the ignorance of an expanding public for art, and as the side effect of the exhibition's increasingly chaotic, bazaar-like display.

This study interrogates Salon caricature for the first time as a representation not only of painting, but of painting and spectatorship within a particular exhibition context. I argue that Salon caricature provides important evidence of the problems of spectatorship that plagued the Salon in its last decades, as debates about the accessibility of high art to a broad public reached a fever pitch. The canvases in Gill's "Salon de 1875" are not images of images in a void, but caricatures of an experience of reception at the Salon, a complex sensory, social, and symbolic event. Gill, both caricaturist and painter, offered the tiny telescope at the bottom of the "Salon de 1875" (Plates 1 and 2) to his readers as a visual aide, to help them locate his own canvas in the cavernous Palace, where it hung at a disadvantageous height. With this exhortation that his readers look through the telescope, Gill asked them to imagine journal-reading as spectatorship.

For reasons of clarity and accuracy, in this book I describe Salon caricature as "comic" rather than addressing it as "parody," "satire," or "humour."[13] In the *Salon pour rire,* "pour rire" or "for laughter" is the imprecisely translatable two-word signpost that surged in nineteenth-century print culture for what we would call "comic" in English—intending to make laugh. "Parody" gets at Salon caricature's comic imitation, and "satire" invokes the long graphic tradition in which Salon caricature surely falls, but both terms are inappropriately loaded. Parody has primarily been associated with literary genres,[14] while satire instrumentalizes the comic "to expose … prevailing immorality or foolishness, esp. as a form of social or political commentary."[15] My aim is to move away from reading caricature as "commentary," reducible to phrase or opinion, and instead to focus on Salon caricature's pictorial relations. Salon caricature could have literary, political, and ethical dimensions, but it is first and foremost a repicturing intended to make laugh—a comic image. Throughout the book, laughter will be characterized and historicized differently as an aesthetic response, a nervous symptom, and a social practice, but we start with the premise that Salon caricature's overriding aim was to remake painting graphically for laughs.

"Comic" in my analysis does not entail merely light or popular, but indeed a category of art and visual experience that became highly contested in the years

I cover. In 1867 Émile Zola described "blind laughers and gawpers" at the Salon who "look at art like children look at images: for amusement, to have a little fun."[16] Through the period the book covers, the description of public laughter was used by some critics to identify a discredited class of art consumers. *Laugh Lines* shows how a narrow interpretation of laughter as a sign of ignorance took shape, forming a profile of modernist and avant-garde inaccessibility. Instead, I explore how comic responses positively constituted a range of sophisticated relations within visual culture. For example, by the 1870s, if an artist drew a comic version of a painting, it might signify that he possessed intimate knowledge about that painting, reviving caricature's early modern roots as an art of portraiture between intimates. Indeed, the week after *L'Éclipse* published Gill's caricatural "Salon de 1875," his colleague Hadol (Paul Hadol, 1835–1875) published another "Salon comique" in which he caricatured some of the same paintings and some new ones—including canvas No. 915, *Un joyeux compagnon* (A Merry Fellow), by André Gill.[17]

To fully understand how caricature constituted a range of relations to painting, my approach situates caricature within nineteenth-century image culture more widely. My subject, as an art about art, provides rich opportunities to see caricature's self-positioning in this economy. Gill's "Salon de 1875," for example, is not only a representation of painting in caricature, but a valuation of it. In relation to the life-size palette, the little paper canvases, casting thin shadows, appear miniaturized—belittled, even. Yet the hand-painted version of this issue of *L'Éclipse,* in vibrant, saturated colors, sold for three times the price of the version color-printed in three pale washes. So even while Gill depicted painting as comic, trivial, and paper-thin, the journal put a premium on painterliness, which Gill's sopping palette played up seductively.

L'Éclipse's economic valuation of paint described above is bound up with social characterizations of the journal consumer as print connoisseur and of Gill's dual status. Like a superior, he hands out awards to painters; yet at the same time he is himself an unfortunate victim of the exhibition, helpless as his unseen canvas idles in Salon Siberia. While this study veers away from direct social caricature, I nevertheless attend to the ways that Salon caricature's self-positioning reveals complex characterizations of artists, critics, and readers alike.

Salon caricature was a phenomenon of the press, indebted to evolving image technology, embedded in a mixed culture of artists and writers high and low, as variable as its many participants and, like the exhibition that engendered it, susceptible to historical change. And yet the image of Salon caricature that has come down to art historians is narrow and unchanging, not so much a

phenomenon of the press as a disembodied rejection of painting, not so much drawing as jeering. In fact, the two names associated most with Salon caricature are not Cham and Bertall, lifetime caricaturists, but the painters Édouard Manet and Gustave Courbet. As recently as 2011 scholars claimed that the "artists most quantitatively significant" later became "the great heroes of the modernist and formalist interpretation of modern art," specifically Courbet and Manet.[18]

So let me address this study's relation to modernism. It is not true that caricatures after canvases by painters valorized by modernist art history, particularly Courbet and Manet, were the most quantitatively significant, although they are certainly the most quantitatively reproduced and cited today. They were originally scattered among a sea of caricatures after painters of all types and genres. Look at Gill in 1875, the year Manet's *Argenteuil* produced such scandal: he finds comic potential in a realist-influenced pair of wrestlers by sculptor-painter Alexandre Falguières; a modern landscape with nudes that owes much to Frédéric Bazille and Manet, by Carolus-Duran, better known as a society portrait painter; and a Dutch-style comic genre scene by Jehan-Georges Vibert.[19] The cumbersome taglines required by these artists remind us of the range of hybrid categories art history has neglected—they are not merely avatars of stasis in contrast to a self-conscious modernity found elsewhere.[20] The attentions of caricaturists show us how much more there is to say about these and other frequent targets like neoclassical genre painter Jean-Louis Hamon, biblical-mythological painter Émile Bin, battle painters Adolphe Yvon and Alexandre Protais, and "painter of women" Charles Marchal, to name just a handful, not for their heroic modernity but for the very strangeness of the hyphenated strategies they were forced to pursue.[21]

This study quickly disproves the assertion that Salon caricaturists presciently identified future modernists by voicing public incomprehension of and hostility to the aesthetic challenges they presented. At the same time, I explore why it is that many Salon caricaturists were particularly insightful about artists who have proven important to later artists, art historians, and museum culture, for example, Eugène Delacroix, Manet, Jean-Léon Gérôme, and Pierre Puvis de Chavannes.

I also address modernism in this study as a matter of historiography, because Salon caricature primarily entered art-historical literature in accounts of modernist painters. Particularly the final chapter, "Salon Caricature and the Making of Manet," grapples with caricature's place in art historiography, a place dictated in large part by Manet criticism. I do not argue that caricature played a role in establishing Manet's place in the modernist canon, rather that caricature

was later recruited, wrongly in my view, as evidence that Manet's modernism was hermetic and publicly inaccessible.

My method in this study is to explore the shared ground between caricature and the painting it cannibalized in graphic line for laughter, consuming painting's media in its own kindred techniques.[22] At times, my language shadows the terminology of modernism. I will show that on occasion Salon caricaturists were drawn to evident surface qualities of paint, qualities we associate with "medium-specificity." Likewise, *gillotage* and other relief-etching technologies that entered the press in the 1850s will be described as importing a new "flatness," a value in modernist criticism that was identified as coming to prominence in the painting of Manet and his followers precisely in these years.

In using this language, my point is not to argue that pictorial modernism developed in the illustrated press. Rather, I show that the qualities that modernist critics later identified as important—including flatness and a naked display of medium—had a range of values across painting and press art in nineteenth-century French visual culture. Gill's "Salon de 1875," as I've discussed, drew attention to its own paintedness but did so as part of a complex strategy of self-positioning in a marketplace. Likewise, Gill presented four smaller canvases as completely flat, continuous with the print surface, while two larger canvases were given beveled frames, which cast shadows on the print page. This game of differential flatness was entirely Gill's invention (Salon regulations required all canvases framed), a way of importing to the journal page the differences in valuation and visibility conferred by placement at the Salon. In other words, "flatness" here did not obtain in painting's modernity but in the representation of its embattled reception by a distant viewer.

The image's self-positioning is bound up with Gill's own role not so much as artist in the modernist sense—individual and original—but as a hybrid painter, draftsman, and guide. In press art, the "hand" of the artist is an aggregate of layered input from various artist-technicians, from Lefman, the line-block setter (he signs within the lower-right caricatured canvas) or the unnamed hand-colorists. As much as possible, I bring Salon caricature's collective facture to bear on my analysis of the images.

If authorship was technically aggregate, it was also often playfully oblique. One of Salon caricature's most important features is its play with fractured, fictional authorship. Its makers posed as buffoons, imps, and devils—Count de Noé, an aristocrat, studio-trained, repressed his skill at chiaroscuro to scrawl as Cham, while Alphonse Hector Colomb (1849–1909), as Moloch, took on the persona of Belphégor, a demon whose inky silhouette leaped between canvases (Figure I.2)[23]

These gestures gave on to the antic culture of self-disaggregation developed by the left-bank societies of fin-de-siècle Paris, but also, in their own time, permitted Salon caricature's fundamental relation to the original as something other than reproduction—instead, as a comic-fictional coexistence of paint and print.

I should address a few omissions. This book focuses on the relation between caricature and painting, putting aside in large part the question of sculpture as a target. This is for two main reasons. First, Salon caricaturists spent the vast majority of their energy on painting, usually addressing sculpture in their albums and journal coverage lastly and little. Second, the caricature of painting played off the reproduction of painting, its expectations, its failures, and its pretensions. Meanwhile, the pictorial reproduction of sculpture in the nineteenth century was arguably less fraught. Photography, for example, had early success in representing sculpture, while the photographic reproduction of painting remained elusive, debated, and disruptive to print culture through the 1880s.[24]

Courbet does not occupy a central role in this study. That is because readers interested in Courbet's relation to comic art and the press have a rich bibliography to explore.[25] More importantly, Courbet fashioned a singular media persona in nineteenth-century France, a persona that attracted caricatural attention as much as his paintings themselves.[26] Courbet's complex relation to comic media, therefore, deserves to be considered apart.

My study focuses on the period of 1840–1880—from the genre's emergence to the end of the Salon as a state-sponsored event.[27] I regret that this scope seems to follow an art historical pattern that disregards Salon art of the fin-de-siècle and early twentieth century, whereas in fact the production of comic Salon coverage through the century attests to the Salon's continued cultural relevance. However, after around 1880, there is a notable shift in the production of Salon caricature. As images appeared more widely in general-interest newspapers and magazines but also books, posters, post cards, brochures, and so on, exhibition caricature (as there were multiple Salons) competed with and increasingly resembled other kinds of print material. After the last oppressive press laws were abrogated in 1881, the development of a mass press transformed the market for art writing.[28] Salon caricature after 1880 also reacted to the development of exhibition parody on and off the page, notably Les Incohérents, whose first exhibition took place in 1882.[29] In short, Salon caricature in the last decades of the century merits a study that positions it in new print-cultural and avant-garde networks.

Finally, the first Salon caricature by a woman that I have found is Gyp's *Bob au Salon* (1888). This comic novella and its author—a prolific anti-Semite and right-wing agitator—represent a late and inauspicious entry for women into the

genre. Decades after women were occasionally gaining recognition as painters, entering studios, and writing serious criticism, caricature remained an almost exclusively masculine sphere. As late as 1906, Paul Gaultier wrote in *Le Rire et la caricature* that the "total" absence of female caricaturists was evidence that women were "closed to irony"; they were, he argued, too wounded by caricature's distortions to experience the enjoyment it should provoke.[30] While the ideological barriers for women's entry to comic art were evidently high, one of the most important aspects of Salon caricature is its comic recuperation of qualities negatively associated with female spectatorship. Indeed John Grand-Carteret, whom I turn to repeatedly as the only nineteenth-century critic to take up Salon caricature in depth, characterized Salon caricature as something like a feminized formalism.

The book begins by tracing, in the first two chapters, the establishment of Salon caricature in the press between 1840 and the early years of the Second Empire. Chapter 1, "Comic Reproduction in July Monarchy Paris," traces the emergence of Salon caricature in a series of experiments in *Le Charivari* in the early 1840s. Lithographic reproductions began to disobey their role and to animate and warp the painting. Immediately they provoked a response from the caricaturist Bertall, whose *Salon de 1843* can be seen as the first album of Salon caricature.

Chapter 2, "Dueling and Doubling: The Antagonism of Salon Caricature," situates Salon caricature's emergence in an era when caricature was defined legally, politically, and morally as an act of violence. Caricature developed an absurd antagonism on the model of the *duel pour rire* or joke duel. Baudelaire's theories of comic form, written between 1846 and 1855, identified the essence of comic art as *dédoublement* or "doubling," the ability to be self and other in the same stroke, crucifier and collaborator.

The third chapter, "Salon Caricature and the Physiognomy of Paint," argues that physiognomy laid the groundwork for Salon caricature's legibility as a comic-critical genre. Physiognomy, a post-enlightenment pseudoscience popular in France from the 1820s through the end of the century, claimed to extract inner character from outward facial features. The first illustrated comic journals in France in the 1830s exploited readers's familiarity with physiognomy, twisting physiognomic techniques and vocabulary to comic ends. Understanding the physiognomic underpinnings of Salon caricature helps to explain why it targeted certain painters, including those valorized by modernist art history.

The fourth chapter, "Salon Caricature in the Age of Reproduction," traces how the changing technology available to caricaturists in the illustrated press shaped

its relation to painting. In contrast to accounts of nineteenth-century media which emphasize lithography and photography as the primary agents of change, this chapter shows how relief-etching processes such as *gillotage*, developed in the 1850s and further refined over the next two decades, provided new registers for Salon caricature's comedy.

Chapter 5, "Gravity and Graphic Medium in Cham and Daumier," revisits the long-standing comparison—invented rivalry, even—between Honoré Daumier and Cham, colleagues who caricatured side by side for the influential comic journal *Le Charivari* for nearly thirty years. In comparison to Daumier's tactile lithography, Cham understood the image in a way that we might compare to our own experience of the digital, as dematerialized and convertible, and he encouraged the reader's own manipulation and intervention. A remarkable document, an unpublished album of amateur Salon caricature modeled after Cham's albums, helps us understand how Salon caricature invited active interventions like coloring-in and cutting-out.

Chapter 6, "Caricature and Comic Spectacle at the Paris Salon," mines Salon caricature for a new understanding of the public art exhibition as a troubling, and troublingly comic, event in the second half of the nineteenth century. Focusing on the Salon caricature of Nadar, who famously experimented with such modern technologies of vision as hot-air ballooning and photography, this chapter illustrates how Salon caricature fashioned itself not just as a press genre but as a visual technology (recall André Gill offering his readers, through Salon caricature, a tiny telescope).

Chapter 7, "Salon Caricature and the Making of Manet," describes how the first art critics and historians to posthumously establish Édouard Manet as the leader of the French School and the founder of a new modern art propagated the idea that Manet had been a singular object of hostile public laughter. For some, notably Théodore Duret, Salon caricature incarnated that public laughter. This chapter argues on the contrary that already in the 1860s and 1870s, the caricature of Manet used laughter as a shibboleth to identify communities of like-minded individuals and to express belonging and insider knowledge.

There is plenty to be said about modernist and avant-garde debt to the culture of the comic journal and to Salon caricature in particular; yet it is strange that Salon caricature attracts the conflicting accusations of reactionary (hostile to innovation)[31] and revolutionary (prescient, propaedeutic):[32] How can a single genre represent a public left behind by modernist innovation, until suddenly it is ahead of its time? An overarching aim of the chapters that follow—an aim amply rewarded by the richness of these comic images—is to attend to relations

between the caricature, the journal, the wider graphic image economy, and the canvas itself, not as antimodern or prescient, but in their own time. That time begins in the July Monarchy, two decades before Manet's first canvas entered the Salon. The first chapter tells the story of how, already in the early 1840s, a handful of graphic artists in the illustrated press began, with subtle deviations, occasional innuendo, and a new understanding of the comic possibilities of medium itself, to get a laugh out of painting.

Notes

1 Some of Gill's undated copies of Old Master and other works from before entering the EBA are held at the Musée du vieux Montmartre, Folder I—Années de jeunesse—1851–1860.

2 André Gill, *Vingt années de Paris* (C. Marpon et E. Flammarion, 1883), 13.

3 *L'Éclipse,* like many Parisian journals, also had subscribers in the provinces, although precise figures are not available. On the development of readership in Paris and the provinces, see Gilles Feyel and Benoît Lenoble, "Commercialisation et diffusion des journaux au XIXe siècle," in *La Civilisation du journal: Histoire culturelle et littéraire de la presse française au XIXe siècle*, ed. Dominique Kalifa, Philippe Régnier, Marie-Ève Thérenty, and Allain Vaillant (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2011), 181–212 and André-Jean Tudesq, "La Presse Provinciale de 1814–1848," in *Histoire de la presse française, tome II* (Paris: PUF 1969), 149–94.

4 On the history of the French satiric press in the latter half of the century, see Philippe Roberts-Jones, *La presse satirique illustrée entre 1860 et 1890* (Paris: Institut français de presse, 1956) and Fabrice Erre, *Le pouvoir de la satire: deux siècles de presse satirique, de la Révolution à Charlie* (Paris: Dargaud, 2018). On the history of caricature in the press, see Bertrand Tillier, *A la charge! La caricature en France de 1789 à 2000* (Paris: les Éditions de l'Amateur, 2005); Tillier, *La Républicature: la caricature politique en France*, *1870–1914* (Paris: CNRS, 1997); Jacques Lethève, *La caricature et la presse sous la IIIe République* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1986); and Philippe Roberts-Jones, *De Daumier à Lautrec. Essai sur l'histoire de la caricature française entre 1860 et 1890* (Paris: Les beaux-arts, 1960).

5 *Le Charivari* published Cham's Salon caricature from 1845 through 1878; *Le Journal pour rire*, later retitled *Le Journal amusant* published Salon caricature between 1849 and 1899.

6 Anonymous, "*Le Salon de 1861 par Cham et un Amateur*," unpublished, undated (1861?). Yale Special Collections Art Library, N5066 C43 (LC). Discussed in depth in Chapter 4.

7 For example, by the mid-1860s, *Le Monde illustré* (founded 1857) reached print runs of over 30,000, which entailed many more than 30,000 readers, as copies were read

publicly, shared, even sub-let. *Le Figaro*, which published Salon caricature in the 1890s, then printed over 100,000 copies.

8 E.g., *Le Journal pour rire*, 1848–1855, which had a large format of 61 cm × 43 cm.

9 On the livret, see *Documenting the Salon: Paris Salon Catalogs 1673–1945*, eds. John Hagood, Yuriko Jackall, Kimberly A. Jones, and Yuri Long (Washington: National Gallery of Art Library, 2016) and Ed Lilley, "On the Fringe of the Exhibition: A Consideration of Some Aspects of the Catalogues of the Paris 'Salons,'" *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies* 10, no. 1 (March 1987): 1–12.

10 David Kunzle suggests that when *Le Charivari* first took up Salon caricature in 1845, its special double issue was published for distribution outside the Louvre. Kunzle, "Cham, the 'Popular' Caricaturist," *Gazette des beaux-arts* 96 (1980): 214–24, 221.

11 The Salon having been abandoned by the state after 1880, the exhibition caricatured is the 1890 Salon of the Sociéte des artistes français. See the *Catalogue illustré du Salon de 1890*, *publié sous le direction de F.-G. Dumas* (Paris: L. Baschet, 1890).

12 Denys Riout notes a single exception. See Riout, "Les Salons Comiques," *Romantisme* 75 (1992): 51–62, 52.

13 On taxonomy of comic terms, see Margaret Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) and Rose, *Pictorial Irony, Parody and Pastiche: Comic interpictoriality in the arts of the 19th and 20th centuries* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2011).

14 For example, Bertrand Tillier discusses Cham's caricatures of novels as parody. Tillier, *Parodies littéraires: précédé par Cham, le polypier d'images* (Paris, Jaignes: Phileas-Fogg, La Chasse au Snark, 2003). On the evolution of the term see Daniel Sangsue, *La Parodie* (Paris: Hachette, 1994).

15 Satire, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, is "[a] poem or (in later use) a novel, film, or other work of art which uses humour, irony, exaggeration, or ridicule to expose and criticize prevailing immorality or foolishness, esp. as a form of social or political commentary." "satire, n." OED Online. Accessed December 2021. Oxford University Press. The association of "satire" with political caricature particularly results from the foundational scholarship on British graphic satire. E.g., M. Dorothy George, *Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social Change in Graphic Satire* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin, 1967).

16 " … ce groupe de badauds et rieurs aveugles …." "Il [le public] regarde des œuvres d'art, comme les enfants regardent les images: pour s'amuser, pour s'égayer un peu." Émile Zola, "Édouard Manet. Étude biographique et critique," *La Revue du XIXe siècle*, Jan 1, 1867. Reprinted in Émile Zola, *Écrits sur l'art*, ed. Jean-Pierre Leduc-Adine (Paris: Gallimard, 1991), 141–69, 164–5.

17 Hadol (Paul Hadol), "Le Salon comique, par Hadol," *L'Éclipse*, 19 May 1875, 4.

18 "Il faut d'ailleurs relever que les œuvres et les artistes auxquels revient la place la plus significative quantitativement au sein de ce corpus sont aussi ceux qui essuient les charges les plus vives. Or il n'est pas difficile de s'aperçevoir que les intéressés sont devenus les grands héros de l'interprétation moderniste et formaliste de l'art

moderne et de son développement téléologique." Laurent Baridon and Martial Guédron, "Caricaturer l'art: Usages et fonctions de la parodie," in *l'art de la caricature*, ed. Ségolène Le Men (Paris: Presses Universitaires Paris Ouest, 2011), 87–108, 96.

19 The works caricatured are *Portrait de M. H …* (no. 97), Jules Bastien Lepage; *Respha protège les corps de ses fils contre l'oiseau de la proie* (no. 125), Georges Becker; *Roses de mai* (no. 409), Charles Chaplin; *Fin d'été* (no. 739), Carolus Duran; *Lutteurs* (no. 782), Alexandre Falguière; *La Cigale et la Fourmi* (no. 1951), Jehan-Georges Vibert.

20 Exemplary analysis of such under-examined figures includes Hollis Clayson, "Jean-Alexandre-Joseph Falguière: Sculpting Resistance," in *Paris in Despair: Art and Everyday Life Under* Siege *(1870–71)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 273–83 and Marc Gotlieb, *The Deaths of Henri Regnault* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

21 In his foundational study on Salon caricature, Thierry Chabanne argued that a broad aesthetic and ideological range of painters was equally "caricaturable," carrying out a sustained comparison of Courbet and Charles Marshal. Chabanne, *Les Salons caricaturaux* (Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1990).

22 Denys Riout has argued that Salon caricature's importance lies in its use of a shared semiotic system with painting. Riout, "Les Salons Comiques," 60. Margaret Rose has explored "comic interpictoriality" broadly across modern visual culture, touching briefly on Salon caricature. Rose, *Pictorial Irony*, 53–6.

23 According to an 1863 compendium of folklore, Belphégor was a god of ingenious invention; he was also sometimes employed as the Devil's ambassador to France. Jacques-Albin-Simon Collin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire infernal: répertoire universel des êtres, des personnages, des livres … qui tiennent aux esprits, aux demons* […], 6th ed. (Paris: H. Plon, 1863), 89, 186.

24 On photography's relation to sculpture, see Geraldine Johnson, *Sculpture and Photography: Envisioning the Third Dimension* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See also Anne McCauley, *Industrial Madness: Commercial Photography in Paris, 1848–1871* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 268–70.

25 Petra Ten-Doesschate Chu, *The Most Arrogant Man in France: Gustave Courbet and the Nineteenth-Century Media Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Denise Delouche, "Le tableau et sa caricature: les oeuvres de Courbet vues par les caricaturistes," in *L'Image par l'image* (Rennes: GRAC, Université de Rennes-II, 1983), n.p.; Klaus Herding, *Courbet: to Venture Independence*, trans. John William Gabriel (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991); and Thomas Schlesser and Bertrand Tillier, *Courbet face à la caricature: Le chahut par l'image* (Paris: Kimé, 2007).

26 The first and still most comprehensive anthology of Courbet caricatures contains more images of his person than of his canvases. See Courbet *selon les caricatures et les images*, ed. Charles Léger (Paris: P. Rosenberg, 1920). See also Frédérique