

## Chapter 3: Poussin's and Rubens's Long Shadows

### Roman Charity, French History Painting, and the Hybridization of Genres

---

In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, gallery paintings of *Roman Charity* became ubiquitous all over Europe.<sup>1</sup> Inventories and cabinet paintings of private collections, including Vermeer's quotation of Dirck van Baburen's piece in *A Lady at the Virginals*, give ample evidence of this phenomenon (Figure 2.32). Sculptures, relief facades, prints and drawings, watch faces, figurines made from porcelain or amber, even bronze badges used as entrance tickets for – presumably risqué – theater shows depicted the theme.<sup>2</sup> Women artists such as Isabella Maria dal Pozzo (d. 1700), Isabella di Borbone (1741–63), and Angelika Kauffmann (1741–1807) engaged with the motif as well (Figure 3.1).<sup>3</sup> In the later eighteenth century, colonial adaptations of Maximus's



Figure 3.1: Angelika Kauffmann, *Roman Charity*, ca. 1765



Figure 3.2: Jean-Michel Moreau the Younger, *The Illness of Las Casas*, 1777

anecdote that cast Bartolomeo de las Casas as Cimon and an Amerindian princess as the breastfeeding Pero show the versatility and political resonance of the ancient emblem of filial piety (Figure 3.2).<sup>4</sup> Once again, the theme of Roman Charity proved “good to think with,” as it connected with debates on good and bad fatherhood during the Enlightenment. The brief comeback of the mother-daughter version during the French Revolution shows how the reciprocity in kinship relations, which the all-female version of the theme embodied, resonated with the theme of political equality, while the momentary reversal of patriarchal relations symbolized by Pero and Cimon, which had been meaningful under the ancien régime, was now a thing of the past. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, interest in the motif started to wane.

In the midst of this explosion of visual engagement with Pero and Cimon, Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665) stands out because of his rendering of the breast-feeding mother-daughter couple in his famous painting *The Gathering of the Manna* (1639) (Figure 3.3). Much has been written about this art work and the lactation episode at its center, as a result of the attention that Charles Le Brun paid to it in his talk at the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in 1667.<sup>5</sup> However, Poussin's idiosyncratic and unique choice of Maximus's first, not second, anecdote of filial piety and the triangulation of the scene through the addition of the daughter's son have largely gone unnoticed or under-analyzed.<sup>6</sup> Lactation imagery figures prominently also in an earlier masterpiece by Poussin, *The Plague at Ashdod* (1630–31), as Giovanni Pietro Bellori and Joachim van Sandrart point out in their respective artists' biographies of 1672 and 1675 (Figure 3.4).<sup>7</sup> As in *The Gathering of the Manna*, Poussin places a highly unusual adaptation of Charity at the center of this picture, a dead mother and her infant about to suckle from her bare breasts. As if inspired by Tintoretto's religious imagery, Charity groups appear in many of his depictions of scenes from the Old and New Testament as well, especially in representations of Moses's miracles, of Saint John baptizing the people, and in his two series of the *Seven Sacraments*.<sup>8</sup> In none of these paintings are the women with small infants in their care represented in the act of breastfeeding, however. Poussin's use of manifest lactation imagery is limited to his paintings of the *Manna* and



Figure 3.3: Nicolas Poussin, *The Gathering of the Manna*, 1639



Figure 3.4: Nicolas Poussin, *The Plague at Ashdod*, 1630

the *Plague*, in which odd, awe-inspiring, or “horrible” configurations of nursing – or almost-nursing – couples suggest his intention to play with, problematize, or even reverse the traditional meaning of charitable allegories.<sup>9</sup>

Poussin, who single-handedly established a new canon of French classicizing art that lasted until the revival of history painting under Jacques-Louis David (1748–1825), had his own canons to deal with – and overthrow – when he came to Rome in 1624. Although Caravaggismo was on its way out as an avant-garde movement after the return of Simon Vouet to Paris in 1627 and the death of Valentin de Boulogne in 1632, the stylistic revolution that Caravaggio imparted left long-lived, ongoing ripple effects.<sup>10</sup> Especially when taking the fashion for *Roman Charities* à la Manfredi as a measure of his influence, it appears that outside of Rome, Caravaggismo was well and alive until the end of the century.<sup>11</sup> Poussin, who famously remarked that Caravaggio “had come into the world to destroy painting,” can be said to have established his own style in open antithesis to Caravaggio’s art and everything it stood for.<sup>12</sup> Contemporary art critics were aware of this polarization, sometimes applauding, sometimes criticizing Poussin for his rejection of Caravaggio’s style and method. Roger de Piles (1635–1709), for example, complains: “Poussin, by neglecting to imitate nature, the fountain of variety, fell often on very apparent repetitions.”<sup>13</sup> Giovanni Pietro Bellori, by contrast, praises Poussin for his disdain of street life, taverns, and gambling – source of inspiration to his nemesis – and his

preference for early morning studies of ancient statuary on the Campidoglio.<sup>14</sup> Joachim von Sandrart juxtaposes Caravaggio's controlled use of light in dark chambers with Poussin's love of "open air" and "wide fields" in an impartial manner.<sup>15</sup> André Félibien (1619–95), who summarized and published Charles Le Brun's conference talk of 1667, pronounced the two artists as "entirely opposed to each other" because of Poussin's constant search for nobility in his subject matter and Caravaggio's alleged belief in the sole truth of nature. He claimed that only the beautiful was worth representing, not vile things, thus grounding the Royal Academy's programmatic distinction between "high" and "low" art on a comparison between the two artists.<sup>16</sup>

Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, likewise, have seen Poussin's œuvre as a reverse interpretation of Caravaggio's art, as the attempt to undo the latter's "polemical attack on the traditions of art." They argue that most preceding art historians have "perceived [Nicolas Poussin] in curious isolation as the fons et origo of a permanent concept of style and national expression."<sup>17</sup> Already Louis Marin noted, however, how Félibien, Bellori, and other supporters of Poussin condemned Caravaggio for what they saw as his "slavish submission" to "unmediated" nature, presenting or doubling reality in the form of a simulacrum or *trompe-l'oeil* instead of re-presenting it with an edifying purpose in mind.<sup>18</sup> They criticized his neglect of design, ancient aesthetic, and Albertian perspective but also, above all, his preference for capturing moments that shock and freeze the viewer. Instead, they advocated for history paintings that represent the passage of time by showing human figures engaged in significant actions and dynamic relationships in a well-ordered pictorial space.<sup>19</sup> In Marin's view, Poussin's "condensation of ... temporal succession and of different moments in one instant of representation"<sup>20</sup> distinguishes his art from the Medusa-like effect of Caravaggio's paintings, in which the collapse of pictorial space and the snapshot-like quality of his figures' movements arrest the audience without offering a narrative to dissolve their stupor.<sup>21</sup>

Other observations of difference include remarks on the two artists' use of light and color, their expression of emotions, and their choice of details. According to Richard Spear, Poussin wanted to "express the various passions of the soul and to make visible what is in the mind,"<sup>22</sup> while Caravaggio, paradoxically, limited the visible in favor of darkness.<sup>23</sup> Caravaggio's restraint in depicting strong emotions creates an impression of pensive interiority and absorptive subjectivity,<sup>24</sup> while Poussin aims at "objectivity" and transparency in the representation of movements of the soul through what he believed was a universally valid gestural vocabulary.<sup>25</sup> His canvas is the quintessential Albertian window looking out, while Caravaggio's resembles a closed cube.<sup>26</sup> With respect to the use of significant details in their paintings, both artists depart from Alberti's recommendations in interesting, mutually exclusive ways. While Poussin creates a particular ambience for the purpose of allegorizing antiquity in an

austere and controlled manner, i.e., without falling victim to the superfluities of “copia” and the narrative abundance of particulars,<sup>27</sup> Caravaggio chooses the occasional ripped sleeve or dirty foot to signify “reality” in the sense of empirical materiality.<sup>28</sup> The differences between the two painters are so pronounced that art historians find it hard to refrain from taking sides. As Michael Fried has recently affirmed, Poussin’s “body of work ... has always rightly been seen – in the first place by Poussin himself – as standing in the strongest imaginable contrast to Caravaggio’s revolutionary but also deeply problematic achievement.”<sup>29</sup> And Louis Marin chides Caravaggio for his alleged iconoclasm, his preference for embracing rather than discursively dissolving the paradox of pictorial representation, and confirms “yes, indeed, this man came into the world to destroy painting.”<sup>30</sup>

What has gone unnoticed despite this long – and easily extendable – catalog of polar opposites is that at least on one occasion, Poussin allowed himself to be inspired by Caravaggio in a positive manner. His painting of *The Gathering of the Manna* is proof of this gesture, despite its momentous importance in the history of French classicism. Like Caravaggio, Poussin integrates a Roman Charity into a complex religious painting, and, like Caravaggio, he departs from the canonic representation of Pero and Cimon in interesting ways. Since both painters did not habitually depict lactation scenes – in contrast to Tintoretto and Rubens, for example – their choice of Maximus’s anecdote of “filial piety” stands out in their respective œuvres and assumes programmatic significance. The two episodes can be regarded as lenses that highlight important features of their individual methods and philosophies. Both Caravaggio and Poussin express a marked disdain for traditional lactation scenes in *The Seven Works of Mercy* and *The Gathering of the Manna*, respectively, paintings devoted to depicting permutations of the very theme of Charity. And both seem intent on breaking the Church’s monopoly on what it calls its “cardinal” virtue by disassociating the allegory from Catholic orthodoxy. They do so in different ways but wind up expressing similarly dissenting perspectives on mainstream Catholicism: while Caravaggio stresses the importance of anti-clerical spirituality at a time of Tridentine supremacy, Poussin elaborates heterodox narratives of the early Church and focuses on Old-Testament precursors to the history of Christian redemption.

Caravaggio secularizes and politicizes Charity by couching Pero as the breastfeeding Madonna’s successor and representative on earth whose needy father, awaiting nurture, renewal, and redemption, is a Saint Peter look-alike. He thus openly calls for a reform of the papacy on an altarpiece of a Neapolitan church associated with a confraternity dedicated to poor relief and the assistance of prisoners. Caravaggio does seem to be responding to Maximus’s ekphrasis and demand for enargeia in calling for a “life-like,” i.e., vivid and breathtaking, manner of representing the scene, but he departs from his textual source by

having Pero breastfeed her father through the bars of a prison window, as the episode circulated in oral culture. Having chosen the moment of Pero's fear of discovery, Caravaggio succeeds in rendering the scene as an eye-catching point of entry into a busy painting teeming with his trademark "realism," classical allusions, and unorthodox spirituality.

While Poussin's choice of Maximus's mother-daughter couple to express the Israelites' suffering and hunger is idiosyncratic, his interest in the all-female lactation scene is not quite unprecedented, as some art historians claim.<sup>31</sup> Apart from illuminations of French manuscript editions of Boccaccio's *Famous Women* (Figure 1.5), a drawing attributed to Lambert Lombard (1505–66) already depicts the two nursing women (Figure 2.7). They are surrounded by onlookers in the midst of a ruinous cityscape, in front of remnants of what looks like the Colosseum, in an intriguing collapse of the ancient and the contemporary. It is unlikely that Poussin would have seen this drawing, but he might have known the print by Étienne Delaune (1518/19–88), which imagines the same episode to be taking place in a classicizing interior of magnificent architecture (Figure 2.5). Also, some French viewers were perhaps familiar with the morality play or "Histoire Rommaine" printed in Lyon in 1548, in which a very lively and verbose young woman challenges her mom to endure her suffering with greater dignity, before finally succumbing to her requests to be nursed (see Chapter 4).

In choosing to paint the mother-daughter episode, Poussin was able to demonstrate his knowledge of a lesser-known passage in Maximus's text and of French precedents of the theme. His choice suggests that he catered toward a highly educated, French humanist audience with a taste for the rare and slightly arcane.<sup>32</sup> In sync with his erudite style and ambition for the "correct" representation of ancient artifacts and texts, he may also have wanted to draw attention to the misnomer of contemporary portrayals of Pero as Roman Charity, whom Maximus envisioned to be Greek.<sup>33</sup> Most importantly, his version of the breast-feeding scene avoided the erotic or pornographic insinuations often associated with Pero's enactment of "filial piety." Caravaggio was careful to restrain and neutralize those fantasies by taking recourse to the prison bars, having the scene take place on a busy street corner, and reducing Cimon to a disembodied head. Poussin preempts the imminent danger of seeing the scene as an intimate sensual encounter between two women by adding the daughter's son to the episode, who, quite realistically but in deviation from his textual source, distracts his mother with his own demands for her milk. As an extra precaution against a "lesbian" reading of the two women's unusual display of physical love, Poussin supplements the scene with an observer to the left, who, according to Le Brun, models the proper reaction to the event in order to avoid the viewer's possibly "inappropriate" interpretation of the scene. In convoluted and obscure prose, Félibien has Le Brun explain why Poussin chose to display this middle-aged male observer in such a prominent place:

“He [Le Brun] said, it was not without intention that Monsieur Poussin represented a man of a certain age, who attentively watches the woman who is giving the breast to her mother. For such an unusual act of mercy has to be watched by a dignified person, so that it achieves validity and can be appropriately regarded in its content and meaning. By assuming the task of watching the woman, he [the observer] motivates those, who are beholding the painting, to pay closer attention to her. He [the artist] did not wish [the observer] to be a rough and uncouth man, because this sort of people does not consider things, which necessarily have to be contemplated [in viewing the picture].”<sup>34</sup>

In order to capture the audience’s attention, the observer raises his hand as if to arrest the viewing process and ward off improper vibrations, thoughts, and feelings. He seems to want to restrain the spectator from engaging in a possibly dangerous misreading of the scene and protect the picture against an uninitiated beholder’s faulty hermeneutics. The observer is of paramount importance for the correct “reading” of the painting, which Le Brun underscores by detecting traces of the Laocoon in his proportions.<sup>35</sup> Louis Marin, in fact, calls him a meta-figure “who, through a view of admiration and a gesture of surprise, gives the spectator ... the exact key for the true reading of ... the painting.”<sup>36</sup> He resembles the kind of first-person observer who, according to Niklas Luhmann, structures any discourse about the painting by making the initial distinction: is it or is it not a true gesture of charity? Like Caravaggio, Poussin engages the viewer in a self-reflective meditation on the authenticating quality of this foundational distinction for meaning to emerge, but unlike Caravaggio, he does not create a grey zone of uncertainty or question the process of representation as such. The viewer, or second-order observer, needs to arrive at exactly the intended reading of the scene, which in this case needs to exclude any erotic fantasies and subversive underpinnings.

Poussin seems to have worried a lot about possible misunderstandings; his aim was to produce a Roman Charity truly in sync with its assumed meaning of filial piety, purged of all irony. In his correspondence, he assumes the observer’s role himself, trying to guide and control his colleagues’ and clients’ reactions. In a letter to Jacques Stella, a fellow artist, he expresses his hope that the “mixture of women, children, and men of a certain age ... will not displease those who are able to read [*sic*] them correctly.” And to Paul Fréart de Chantelou, the commissioner of the painting, he wrote:

“If you ... consider the painting as a whole, I believe you will easily recognize those who languish and those who admire, those who have pity, or show charity, great need, the desire to feed, consolation and other [emotions], because the first seven figures to the left will tell you everything which is written there [*sic*] and all the rest is of the same stuff.”<sup>37</sup>

Poussin’s conception of his painting as a text has been much commented upon. While his idea of an “alphabet” of *affetti*, i.e., of facial gestures and

bodily movements capable of expressing unequivocal emotions, was found to be convincing until at least the middle of the eighteenth century,<sup>38</sup> his effort to create pictorial unity despite the sequential representation of interrelated moments was much debated since Le Brun's conference talk in 1667.<sup>39</sup> His Roman Charity was at the heart of this debate.<sup>40</sup> While Poussin's critics did not openly question the moral intention of using Maximus's anecdote, or object to the use of a pagan story to illustrate an Old Testament event, they denied the need for the representation of the old mother's suffering, pointing to the fact that God had already sent quails to the Israelites the evening before the miracle of the manna.<sup>41</sup> In any case, one might add, now that the manna has fallen to the ground, the old mother could satiate her hunger by eating it instead of imposing on her daughter for milk. Le Brun counters these objections by arguing that Poussin intended to demonstrate the magnitude of God's miracle, for which purpose it was necessary to show the intensity of the suffering that preceded it.<sup>42</sup> The mapping of an ancient Roman example of filial piety onto the representation of an Old Testament miracle creates poetic – if not historical – truth, and it realizes the principle of *peripeteia* derived from Aristotle's drama theory.<sup>43</sup> It implies the representation of a plot reversal without violating the rule of *verisimilitude*. Pictorial unity is established through the convincing portrayal of the figures' emotions along with their proper spatial arrangement to indicate the unfolding of their relationships in time. The correct "reading" of the mother-daughter breastfeeding scene thus assumes programmatic importance in Poussin's development of a new brand of history painting that combines the collapse of different moments in time with the sequencing of its individual plot elements.

Le Brun and Félibien spell out exactly how to proceed in deciphering the painting's narrative. Because of its prominent position, bright light, and unusual action, the Roman Charity group catches the viewer's eyes first. Left of the daughter, we see a naked child that she addresses and consoles, followed by the above-mentioned observer dressed in red and another man in a crouching position who leans against a stick and watches the tender scene from behind. To the daughter's right, an old, half-naked man is seated on the ground, Cimon-like, with a deeply receding hairline and a bushy grey beard. He looks away from the nursing couple, following the outstretched hand of a young man who stands behind him, and points to the Israelites who kneel before Moses in gratitude.<sup>44</sup> The mother-daughter couple on the left is matched by a Charity group on the right, a woman seen from behind who supports an infant on her right hip and addresses a young man with a basket, pointing to the old man alias "Cimon" behind her who seems to need help. This woman is dressed in the same yellow and blue hues as the breastfeeding mother-daughter couple to the left; a similar bright light illuminates her upper body and left arm.<sup>45</sup> She is surrounded by children who fight over the manna, a man who kneels and prays



Figure 3.5: Tintoretto, *The Birth of Saint John the Baptist*, 1563

in gratitude, and other people collecting the food that has fallen on the ground. Finally, the viewer's gaze falls on Moses further in the back, whose right arm points upward to the sky, presumably to indicate to his worshippers that God is the true source of the miracle. In spite of the celebration of Moses's agency and leadership in and through this painting, the pictorial focus is on the two Charity groups in the foreground.<sup>46</sup>

Already Tintoretto made narrative use of allegories of charity. In his decorative program of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, they served to connect Old Testament miracles with the gospels' promise of redemption by portraying Moses as a precursor to Christ, but they served also to give women greater prominence in the theater of salvation. Many of his portrayals of women engaged in reproductive activities are based on apocryphal sources, as, for example, the inclusion of Mary's midwives in his *Adoration of the Shepherds*.<sup>47</sup> His vision of the Virgin as – almost – wet-nursing Saint John the Baptist right after Elizabeth's delivery expands on these sources, in which breastfeeding women are given ample consideration (Figure 3.5).<sup>48</sup> Tintoretto's efforts to extend the visibility of female occupations and experiences such as the preparation and serving of food, birth, and lactation were politically motivated because of the concomitant stress on Venice's Byzantine, i.e., anti-Roman, traditions. By contrast, Poussin's interest in refashioning Charity as an ancient pagan and Jewish virtue had the purpose of establishing a more "masculine" counter-discourse to orthodox, post-Tridentine Catholicism based on historical research.<sup>49</sup> Poussin, who according to artist Giovanni Battista Passeri (1610–79) "vilified the Latin style" in favor of ancient Greek aesthetics – in anticipation of Winckelmann – was much influenced by anti-colonial visions of antiquity and alternative narratives of the early church.<sup>50</sup>

Many of Poussin's religious paintings emphasize the leadership of Moses and Saint Paul, art works that are inspired by the writings of, among others, Josephus Flavius (37–ca. 100 CE) and the "paper museum" of Cassiano dal Pozzo.<sup>51</sup> If his references to Josephus's *History of the Jewish War* (78 CE) and *Jewish Antiquities* (93 CE) served to hint at an anti-imperial tradition of history writing, dal Pozzo's collection of drawings and prints of ancient Roman artifacts fed Poussin's interest in the history of the early Church and comparative religion.<sup>52</sup> Both served to undermine the vision of Saint Peter as the sole, inevitable, and undisputed leader of the Roman Church. Commenting on his painting of the *Manna*, for example, Poussin calls Moses "legislator" under reference to Josephus; most importantly, he includes a Cimon-like character begging for help who resembles Saint Peter. A young man encourages this pathetic figure to follow the example of other Israelites who thank Moses by kneeling down, while the charitable lady to the right is receptive to his pleas and organizes help.<sup>53</sup> Such humiliating circumstances in portraying a figure meant to evoke associations with the papacy are at least as boldly anti-clerical as Caravaggio's fusion of Saint Peter with Cimon in his *Seven Works of Mercy*. Moreover, in his *Edinburgh Confirmation* (1645), Poussin gives explicit preference to Paul over Peter in portraying early Church leadership.<sup>54</sup> Saint Paul is the officiating priest, wearing the pallium [later: papal ribbon] over his tunic, while Saint Peter, recognizable by his well-known features, hides in semi-darkness behind an elegant young woman dressed in red.<sup>55</sup>

In many of Poussin's paintings of religious-political impact, Charity groups appear, but they are classically poised women clad in ancient garments with high necklines. By contrast, Tintoretto's nurses and female care workers elegantly lounge about in partial dishabille and contemporary dress, casually nursing infants as well as older children.<sup>56</sup> In Poussin's work, the lactation motif is usually not manifest but implied, as in his Hermitage version of *Moses Striking Water from the Rock* (1649) (Figure 3.6). In this companion piece to the *Gathering of the Manna*, a woman who wears a similar headdress to the nursing daughter's sits in the right-hand corner begging for water. Her toddler is not breastfeeding, but asking for it, while a sickly elderly woman lies in her lap. The addition of the elderly woman dressed in blue, a color scheme that matches the yellow dress of the mother, reveals this Charity group to refer back to the female nursing couple of the *Gathering of the Manna*. This time, the mother is not suckling, but lying weak and exhausted in her daughter's arms. A similar Charity group consisting of a woman with two naked toddlers dressed in yellow and blue is part of the *Adoration of the Golden Calf* (ca. 1633–37).<sup>57</sup> The woman sits right underneath Moses and impassively watches the dancers, while her fellow Israelites argue angrily with their leader. In the *Triumph of David* (1628–31), women with naked babies are decoratively placed in the front of the painting, wearing the obligatory colors of yellow and blue.<sup>58</sup> Le Brun and Félibien already commented on the programmatic importance of these colors in Poussin's works: "Because yellow and blue ... resemble light and air the most, Monsieur Poussin dresses his main figures in yellow and blue cloth."<sup>59</sup>



Figure 3.6: Nicolas Poussin, *Moses Striking Water from the Rocks*, 1649



Figure 3.7: Nicolas Poussin, *The Death of Germanicus*, 1627

In the *Crossing of the Red Sea* (1633–37), women with small children in their care point to Moses at the opposite end of the painting, who is commanding the waters to drown the Egyptians.<sup>60</sup> In gospel scenes such as the *Entry of Christ into Jerusalem* and the Los Angeles and Paris versions of *Saint John Baptizing the People* (1633–40), women with children are either watching the proceedings or waiting their turn to participate. In several of his paintings from the two series of *Sacraments*, such as the *Leicestershire Matrimony* (1636) and *Extreme Unction* (1636), the *Edinburgh Baptism* (1646) and the two *Confirmations* (1636, 1645), Charity groups appear as well.<sup>61</sup> As in Tintoretto's œuvre, such allegories express the hope and joy connected with scenes of food multiplication and baptism. In Poussin's work, they also highlight the positive roles that King David, Moses, Saint John the Baptist, and Saint Paul played in the history of Christianity.

From this perspective, the casting of Germanicus's wife and son as a Charity group – dressed in yellow and blue – in his famous early masterpiece the *Death of Germanicus* (1627) is astounding and deserves commentary (Figure 3.7). His wife is not about to breastfeed – she grieves over the approaching death of her husband, who has just been poisoned by his stepfather – but the nude, pre-school-aged son standing by her side reminds of this pictorial tradition. Right behind her, a more literal Charity amplifies the positive meaning of the image; she wears the typical open blouse of a lactating woman, exposing her



Figure 3.8: Marcantonio Raimondi, *Il Morbetto*, after Raphael, 1515–16

left shoulder and chest. Germanicus is presumably in the act of asking his friends to avenge his death, so the hopeful expectations associated with the use of charity figures can only consist of his friend's promise to do so. His raised arm and pointed finger seem to indicate a positive response. Germanicus's young son imitates this gesture by cautiously raising his left pointer finger as well; in addition, he wears the same blue mantle as his dying father's avenger, coming across as an interesting mix of nude nursling and prospective general.

Poussin's most creative, but also shocking and provocative, use of a charity figure consists of his integration of a dead nurse in *The Plague of Ashdod* (1630–31). Many art historians have written about this piece, starting with André Félibien, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, and Joachim von Sandrart, who all agree that this painting rendered Poussin famous through its overwhelming effect of beautifully rendered horror.<sup>62</sup> The most forceful expression of such abomination is the dead woman in the foreground from whose poisoned breasts a young infant is about to suck before being held back by a man who protects his nose against the stench emanating from her corpse. Another man approaching from the right, likewise, covers his nose with his hands, and the observer figure to the left balks at the smell and bends away.<sup>63</sup> He cannot even look at this scene of terror and dread, endowing the painting with an interesting iconoclastic implication.<sup>64</sup> The picture is a close illustration of the Philistines'

theft of the Arc of God and their punishment as narrated in I Samuel 5.<sup>65</sup> Poussin has placed the Arc of the Covenant right in front of the fallen statue of Dagon further back in the painting, in front of a crowd of people who are deeply agitated by the destruction of their god. While they are investigating the extent of the damage, the unbearable sight of the infant about to suckle from a corpse mirrors God's horror of idol worship, symbolizing and doubling the Philistines' iconoclastic punishment. Alexandra Woolley and Elisabeth Hipp have called the dead mother and her infant an "anti-Charity" that expresses the Philistines' reversal of values and the destruction following God's punishment.<sup>66</sup>

The dead mother's iconographic "pedigree" could not be more exalted: her bodily posture recalls both the *Dead Amazon* (150 BCE) and the *Laocoon* (ca. 100 BCE–100 CE);<sup>67</sup> the lactation scene goes back to a lost painting by Aristides (4th century BCE) described by Pliny the Elder; ultimately, the image is inspired by the *Morbetto* (1515/16), a print from Raimondi after a lost painting by Raphael (Figure 3.8).<sup>68</sup> This complex mixture of biblical, ancient, and modern sources anticipates the rhetorical virtuosity that Poussin would display again in the *Gathering of the Manna*.<sup>69</sup> The various configurations of charity in these two paintings are proof of Poussin's strategy to produce meaningful novelties through the imaginative and densely layered refashioning of well-known, highly regarded images in the context of somewhat arcane, and carefully quoted textual sources. Variations on the theme of charity assume an almost talismanic importance in Poussin's rise to fame. Already in the *Death of Germanicus* (1627), a Charity-like group of mother and son plays an important role in the painting's emplotment of death and revenge, grief and hope, present and future. The dual importance of Poussin's Charities as narrative elements and allegorical embodiments of deep historical significance rendered them particularly good to "think with," or, in this case, paint with. They became emblematic for Poussin's invention of highly expressive "Pathosformeln."<sup>70</sup>

Both of Poussin's idiosyncratic Charity groups inspired numerous copies by subsequent artists. Most of these copyists used Poussin's images in analogy to Manfredi's "method" of quoting Caravaggio, i.e., by isolating them from the complex surroundings of the paintings that hosted them. In his sketch for an ex-voto fresco during the plague of Naples in 1656, Mattia Preti cites Poussin's dead mother and suckling infant for a very specific purpose, namely, to depict the horrors of the then-raging plague and a range of heavenly intercessors to mitigate God's wrath (Figure 3.9).<sup>71</sup> Preti's work, in turn, inspired Giovan Tommaso Fasano (ca. 1646–1723) to produce a similar votive painting dedicated to the Madonna del Carmine,<sup>72</sup> and it sparked wax artist Gaetano Zumbo (1656–1701) to complete a disturbingly live-like relief of the dead mother and suckling infant in a sculpture of plague victims (Figure 3.10). In all three of these later adaptations, Poussin's "anti-Charity" was used for its pure shock value, in an instrumental approach that suggests what viewers liked the most



Figure 3.9: Mattia Preti, *The Plague*, 1656–57

about the *Plague of Ashdod*. In France, Poussin's painting found more ambitious imitators. As Alexandra Woolley has shown, François Perrier (1594–1649) was the first to quote the group in his *Plague of Athens* (1635), including the man who, protecting his nose, keeps the infant away from his dead mother's poisonous breast.<sup>73</sup> Fifteen years later, Charles Le Brun integrated the dying



Figure 3.10: Gaetano Zumbo, *The Plague*, Wax Relief, before 1701

mother and her baby in his depiction of *The Brazen Serpent*, and Sébastien Bourdon completed a painting of the *Plague of Ashdod* in direct reference to Poussin's original in 1670.<sup>74</sup>

The afterlife of Poussin's Roman Charity in the *Gathering of the Manna* resembles the fate of Caravaggio's Pero and Cimon from the *Seven Works of Mercy* even more closely. Like Manfredi, who isolated Caravaggio's breast-feeding father-daughter couple and turned it into a gallery painting (1610–14) (Figure 2.24), Charles Le Brun produced a painting of just *Charity* (1642–48) in direct analogy to Poussin's composition (Figure 3.11).<sup>75</sup> While Caravaggio's provocative rendering of the nursing scene on a busy street corner was given up in favor of a more canonical placement in Maximus's dungeon, Le Brun normalized Poussin's same-sex lactation by replacing the suckling old mother with an infant. However, he preserved the association with Maximus's anecdote by adding a half-naked old man, who is presumably awaiting his turn, in a supplicant position right underneath the nursing baby. This gender swap of the needy parent and the substitution of a baby for the woman's mother amount to a deliberate "correction" of Poussin's original. Le Brun, who two decades later would praise the *Manna* for its ingenious sequencing of plot elements and expressive qualities, might have found his master's breastfeeding group



Figure 3.11: Charles Le Brun, *Charity*, 1642–48

too provocative and idiosyncratic to imitate in isolation. His alterations suggest that an all-female lactation scene was bearable to a seventeenth-century audience only in the midst of a convoluted array of erudite references and ethical purposes. Other than Poussin, only Guercino (1590–1661) dared to represent the female couple in a drawing (Figure 3.12). What reminds of Poussin's Roman Charity is Le Brun's triangular composition, which he achieved by rotating the Cimon-like figure by 180 degrees and substituting the old woman for an infant, leaving intact the interaction between the nurse and the pre-school-age

child approaching from the left. His corrective “reading” of the *Manna* definitively suggests that viewers recognized Maximus’s starving father in the old man who opens his arms in supplication. A few years after his completion of *Charity*, Le Brun reused the configuration by placing it virtually unchanged into his *Moses Striking the Rock* (1648–50), a further indication of how much he admired Poussin’s breastfeeding group in a celebration of Moses’s food-related miracles.<sup>76</sup>

Independently of Le Brun’s adaptation, dozens of more traditional representations of *Pero* and *Cimon* appeared in the second half of the seventeenth century that included an infant. Already Rosso Fiorentino had added *Pero*’s child in an attempt to desexualize the scene and render it more verisimilar (Figure 1.49). Poussin is very likely to have seen this relief during his stay at Fontainebleau, or else knew of Reverdy’s accompanying prints. Also, in early Flemish renderings of *Roman Charity*, a baby would appear on occasion.<sup>77</sup> After Poussin’s inclusion



Figure 3.12: Guercino, *The Daughter Who Breastfeeds her Mother*, before 1661

of a pre-school-age boy who complains about his grandmother's consumption of his milk, a veritable rush of imitations set in, starting with Niccolò Torniola (1598–1651) (Figure 3.13). Cecco Bravo (1607–61), Artus Quellinus the Elder (1609–1668), Louis Boullogne (1625–74), Jean Cornu (1650–1710), Johann Carl Loth (1632–98), Carlo Cignani (1628–1719), Adrian van der Werff (1659–1722), Gregorio Lazzarini (1657–1730), Francesco Migliori (1684–1734), and Johann



Figure 3.13: Niccolò Torniola, *Roman Charity*, before 1651

Peter Weber (1737-1804) followed suit with their respective paintings, prints, and sculptures.<sup>78</sup> In distinction to Poussin, all of these artists depicted “family scenes” that centered on Pero’s nursing of her father.

The debates that Poussin’s paintings of the *Plague of Ashdod* and the *Gathering of the Manna* initiated, about the aesthetics of horror and suffering and the purpose of history paintings in capturing the passage of time, had deep resonance until at least the middle of the eighteenth century. Poussin’s lactation imagery was at the center of these debates because of the emotions they aroused in the spectators and because of the narrative, temporalized function Poussin attributed to those modified allegories of Charity. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing never saw Poussin’s paintings, but his essay on “Laocoon, or the Limits of Painting and Poetry” (1766) reads as if he implicitly referred to them as counter-examples of the classicizing aesthetic he proposes. He admires the *Laocoon* precisely because of its muted expression of pain and horror. In contrast to Vergil’s poetry, which describes Laocoon as crying out loud, the visible arts and theater need to be mindful not to overwhelm the spectator with their demands of empathy. Lessing places great importance on the correct choice of moment to be depicted. In his view, it is more suitable to depict the moment that immediately precedes or follows an outburst of anger and violence rather than the incident itself. Medea, for example, should be shown right before she murders her children, and Ajax after he kills and rapes.<sup>79</sup> Lessing advises restraint and caution in visibly representing pain and horror because of the dialectic relationship between external and internal images: “The more we see, the more we need to be able to add through our imagination. The more we add through our imagination, the more we need to be able to believe what we think we are seeing.”<sup>80</sup> Lessing would have found the image of the dead nurse with her infant not only repulsive but also inefficient, because it would have deadened rather than stimulated his imagination. Artists should refrain from painting corpses too “realistically” and should at all times observe proper decorum.<sup>81</sup>

Lessing would not have appreciated the Roman Charity in Poussin’s *Gathering of the Manna* either, because of the intensity of the suffering it depicts and because of his skeptical attitude about history paintings in general. In contrast to poetry and prose, which in his view are good at representing successive moments in time, paintings should stick to the representation of one action alone. Even though he praises Raphael for his method of rendering successive moments in time by using the folds of a garment to suggest a figure’s motion, Lessing advises the visual arts to concentrate on what is visible in the immediate present; artists should not sequence different actions, as Poussin did by portraying the Israelites as both starving and gathering food.<sup>82</sup> In Lessing’s opinion, great art is about timelessly laying out beautiful bodies in space. True beauty requires the non-verbal skills of a visual artist – writers are better apt at



Figure 3.14: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Septimius Severus and Caracalla*, 1769

detailing ugliness. Both the degeneration of matter and writing evolve in time, in opposition to the eternal ideal of perfection that classic beauty represents.<sup>83</sup> Likewise, artists should refrain from expressing mixed emotions, as Poussin did by showing the nurse torn between the mutually conflicting demands of her mother and her son.<sup>84</sup> Least of all, one might add, should they depict lactating women to arouse horror and compassion; Poussin's use of the *Laocoon* and the *Dead Amazon* as models for his breastfeeding daughter and dead mother, respectively, appears in Lessing's essay as a complete oxymoron.

In France, the debates surrounding classicism had less to do with theorizing the ideal beauty of – male – Greek statues and the narrative potential of Homer's epics than with the hierarchy of genres in imitation of Aristotle's aesthetic.<sup>85</sup> Since at least the adoption of Poussin as the French academy's poster-child, history paintings were regarded as superior to all other forms of painting, analogous to Aristotle's preference for tragedy over comedy. This hierarchy led to a strict division between history and genre painting, which even the Enlightenment fondness for paintings of – bourgeois – “sentiment” and “morality” did little to disturb. The scandal surrounding Jean-Baptiste Greuze's *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* (1769) is proof of the rigidity with which even “enlightened” art lovers such as Denis Diderot (1713–84) defended the hierarchy of genres (Figure 3.14). Greuze's audacity



Figure 3.15: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Roman Charity*, 1767

consisted of aspiring to be admitted to the academy as a history painter, even though it was generally felt that his true and only talent was for painting genre scenes. Incidentally, Greuze (1725–1805) painted a *Roman Charity* in 1767 to announce his burgeoning interest in the “noble” genre (Figure 3.15), in imitation of Noël-Nicolas Coypel (1690–1734), Jean-Baptiste Deshayes (1729–65), Giuseppe Baldrighi (1722–1803), Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée (1725–1805) and Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806), who in 1724, 1757, 1759, and 1765, respectively, exhibited their portrayals of Pero and Cimon at the Salon and other venues.<sup>86</sup> The discussion surrounding the six painters’ *Roman Charities* is thus intimately tied up with a debate about the ranking of genres, at a time when concepts of paternity and their political implications underwent close scrutiny.

Because of his canonical status within the academy, Poussin’s shadow loomed large over this debate, but so did Rubens’s. Ever since Roger de Piles’s “Treatise on the most famous painters” in 1681 had advanced the Flemish master’s style in direct and open contrast to Poussin’s, the importance of “fertile” coloring and a more flexible understanding of design had come to rival Poussin’s more austere achievements. De Piles criticized Poussin for privileging the study of ancient statuary over the observation of nature, which is why his nudes resemble “painted stone ... and [are like] ... the hardness of

marble rather than the delicacy of flesh, full of blood and life.”<sup>87</sup> Rubens, by contrast, “gives his nudes the true resemblance of flesh, which is what he liked to represent according to age, sex, and condition.”<sup>88</sup> To a large extent, these distinctions hinge on the two painters’ different approaches to design. While most painters – including Poussin – limit design to measuring and the observance of geometric rules, only very few of them understand the art of “spiritual” design, which consists of “imprinting on painted objects the truth of nature, and to collect in them the idea of what we have in front of our eyes, observing the rules of proper choice, decorum, and variety.”<sup>89</sup> De Piles distinguishes Rubens not only from Poussin but also from Caravaggio, who neglected design of any sort, did not choose his objects properly, and violated decorum.<sup>90</sup> However, both Rubens and Caravaggio agreed on the importance of coloring, because “the painter who is a perfect imitator of nature ... knows ... that ... [nature] is imitable to him only because it is visible, and that it is visible only because it is colored.”<sup>91</sup> Poussin, by contrast, “neglected coloring ... [and] knew nothing of ... *claro oscuro*.”<sup>92</sup>

As an example of Rubens’s skill in rendering flesh and skin in their appropriate colors, de Piles praises his *Drunken Silenus* (1616–17) (Figure 2.28), in which “the complexion of the female satyr and her two children appear so verisimilar that one can easily imagine to feel the heat of blood upon touching it: ... it is of a surprising freshness.”<sup>93</sup> In fact, he continues: “I am convinced that in this work, Rubens wanted to carry the art of painting to its highest degree: everything is full of life, of a correct design, and of an extraordinary sweetness and force.”<sup>94</sup> In this masterpiece, the naked satyress, whose complexion Rubens painted so truthfully and whose skin de Piles wished he could touch, is engaged in breastfeeding her two cubs, Charity-like, while Silenus is “dazed by the vapors of wine.” He is a nude old man whose fat flesh and empty view characterize him as completely undone.<sup>95</sup> In this slightly disturbing picture, Silenus is ensnared by various companions who keep on offering him grapes and wine, while the satyress suckles her offspring in the manner of animals, with her two extended breasts dangling to the ground. De Piles, usually so concerned with the observance of decorum, overlooks the fact that the nursing satyress fondles the penis of one of her obese children, as if to mirror the excess of Silenus’s sensuality and consumption. Svetlana Alpers observes how Rubens depicts the “physical satisfactions of what is usually described and painted as maternal nurture,” turning the breastfeeding satyress into an anti-Madonna Lactans, or better: anti-Charity.<sup>96</sup>

In analogy to his various versions of *Roman Charity*, Rubens’s *Drunken Silenus* combines lactation imagery with the depiction of a pathetic, naked old man whose suffering and anti-heroic fleshliness dominate the scene. These milk scenes suggest that male flesh is the result of female nurture and that loss of boundary threatens the male self through drunkenness and regression.<sup>97</sup>



Figure 3.16: Peter Paul Rubens, *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars*, 1629–30

Other paintings, such as *Juno and Argus* (1610), associate milk with the creative act of coloring.<sup>98</sup> In this latter painting, taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Rubens employs a milk-squirting Iris to turn Argus's hundred eyes into colorful peacock feathers.<sup>99</sup> Both fleshliness and coloring, which in de Piles's view are indicative of what is visible, and imitable, in nature, are the result of feminine nurture and creativity. This accounts for Rubens's association of paint with milk, the androgynous nature of many of his male nudes, and his view of artistic creativity as maternal generation.<sup>100</sup> Since flesh and fleshliness are cause and effect of nurture and nourishment, their representation demands correct coloring. Painting understood as the application of colors re-enacts the process by which words become flesh (on canvas). Lactation imagery is sign and symbol of such creative fleshliness – and of the painterly skill in using colors – which is why, perhaps, de Piles lauds the complexion of the breast-feeding satyress and her cubs over that of Silenus. In fact, the blue-veined engorged breasts of this white-skinned mother earth-goddess are surprisingly life-like, and they suggest the excess and “copia” of pleasure that comes with breastfeeding, and with emphasizing the materiality of color over the abstraction of the line.<sup>101</sup> As Régis Michel has observed, the pure line of painters like Ingres – but also Poussin, we might add – signifies guilt and male honor, “whereas color, in every sense, is a stain.”<sup>102</sup> Such stains of pleasurable coloring that no clear line hems in are often expressed in Rubens's œuvre through drops or squirts of milk, whether in *The Origin of the Milky Way*, *Venus*, *Mars*,



Figure 3.17: Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée the Elder, *Roman Charity*, 1765

and Amor, Minerva Protects Pax from Mars (Figure 3.16), Juno and Argus, or the Drunken Silenus (Figure 2.28).<sup>103</sup>

Rubens's vision of Cimon as a suffering male nude who depends on a colorful Pero's white breast for sustenance inspired not only Greuze but also, two years prior to him, Lagrenée (Figure 3.17). Rubens's Amsterdam version of *Roman Charity* was a famous painting of which multiple engravings existed, but Lagrenée might have seen it in actuality, since the resemblance of his piece to the Flemish master's work extends to its colors.<sup>104</sup> As in Rubens's version, Cimon is seated to the left with angled knees. In slight deviation from his source, Cimon crouches on a bunch of straw, while in the original, Cimon sits on a rectangular block of wood or stone. Pero is seated, slightly elevated, on a stone bench to the right. Like Ruben's Pero, she bends her head away from her father, but unlike her model, she does not offer him her breast with a V-hold, nor are her nipples visible. A further alteration is the lack of a fully visible window through which the guards are peeking in. This omission shifts the depicted moment to that of the couple's intense absorption before their discovery rather than the very scene of interruption. Diderot and the reviewer for the *Mercure de France* interpreted the scene differently, probably because they were hyper-

aware of Rubens's original. The anonymous reviewer detects signs of Pero's "inquietude ... in noticing a prison guard who watches her ... through the bars,"<sup>105</sup> while Diderot even sees both father and daughter staring "fixedly at a barred window of the prison ... through which we see a soldier who watches them."<sup>106</sup> In reality, only the frame of the window – and certainly no guard – can be seen on Lagrenée's painting, and Pero stares at a dark spot in the lower right-hand corner of the painting. She does seem to feel uneasy and embarrassed but not yet frightened at having been watched.

Both interiors show signs of classical architecture – a rusticated arch in Rubens's version, an Ionic pillar in Lagrenée's. In each painting, light falls onto Pero's naked bosom and shoulder, but the coloring of the figures' garments is reversed: while Rubens's Pero wears a red dress and her father a green blanket, Lagrenée's Pero is dressed in green, with her father draped in red. Lagrenée's Cimon is less exposed than Rubens's, but he does show his right nipple erect. Due to the white cloth that covers his lower trunk and genital area, less of his ailing body is exposed, and what is visible is less marked by wrinkles and aging muscles. Lagrenée's Pero is less life-like than both her father and Rubens's Pero; she is rather poised and statuesque, in contrast to Rubens's bouncy, perky, rosy-cheeked young lady with a blond contemporary coiffure.

Lagrenée's interest in Rubens had precedents. Already Giuseppe Baldighi's *Roman Charity*, which debuted at the Salon of 1757 to great acclaim, was modeled after Rubens's Amsterdam version (Figure 3.18). All three major literary journals of the time express their pride in the Italian painter's formation at the French academy, while neglecting to mention the Flemish master's *Roman Charity* as his source. The *Journal Encyclopédique* attributes to this painting the "good taste of the Roman school," while the *Mercure de France* imagines even "seeing a piece by Guido [Reni]."<sup>107</sup> *L'année littéraire*, finally, lauds his "firm and decided manner and exact design" as well as the absence of any "servile imitation."<sup>108</sup> While Baldighi's placement of Cimon's head right in front of Pero's bosom does, perhaps, recall Guido Reni's assumed Marseille version of the theme, the rest of the composition points unambiguously to Rubens's piece, a resemblance that goes unnoticed by contemporary critics (Figure 2.42). Cimon's posture and angled knees, Pero's bent head and slightly elevated placement, and the artist's choice of – somewhat muted – hues of red and green suggest that also Baldighi might have seen the Flemish master's original, or at the very least prints of it. Lagrenée was obviously quite impressed by Baldighi's work, since he imitated not only the Italian master's classical poise and muted coloring but also Pero's turban and left-hand gesture. Both eighteenth-century artists mitigate the stark contrast between Cimon's dark complexion and exaggerated wrinkles, on the one hand, and Pero's bright white skin and soft flesh, on the other, a juxtaposition that Rubens



Figure 3.18: Giuseppe Baldrigi, *Roman Charity*, 1757

emphasized. In Baldrigi's version, the difference in coloring is given up; Lagrenée reintroduces it but downplays the effects of age and suffering on Cimon's body. The classicizing manner of the two images anchors them firmly within the aesthetic of the French school of history painting.

Salon critics reviewed Lagrenée's painting quite favorably. The *Journal Encyclopédique* remarks that its style was "not new" – probably in a tacit recognition of Baldrigi's precedent – but appreciates the beauty of Pero's head. In addition, "the fear that seems to agitate her renders her inevitably more touching."<sup>109</sup> The *Mercure de France* applauds his *Roman Charity* in the context of his other works on display, whose "precious touch and finish" are hard to describe. "In this little painting of the 'Roman Charity' there is an engaging expression on

the face of the daughter ... that we should not omit to notice."<sup>10</sup> In contrast to these lukewarm expressions of approval, Diderot's highly critical remarks are perplexingly passionate. Apart from his insinuations of pornographic associations – “if this young woman doesn't watch out he [Cimon] will end up getting her pregnant” – Diderot objects to the classicizing beauty and statuesque poise of the couple. Cimon “doesn't seem to have suffered for an instant”; he is “as hardy looking as if he had two cows at his disposal.” Everything about him is too perfect and idealizing. Diderot would have liked “to see his hunger reflected in his gestures, and his body betray some effects of his suffering.” In his imagination, Cimon is chained to the wall by his wrists and hurls himself at Pero's breasts at the mere sight of her, “his chain stretching his arms out behind him.” Pero, likewise, should give up her classical restraint; she should be “a woman of at least thirty, of an imposing, austere, and seemly character ... she should be coiffed rather carelessly, her long, loose hair falling out from beneath her headscarf.” Most importantly, “she shouldn't have beautiful, rounded breasts but hardy, large ones that are full of milk.” In other words, Pero should resemble a peasant wet-nurse, while Cimon's suffering ought to be depicted with greater



Figure 3.19:  
Jean-Baptiste Deshayes,  
*Roman Charity*, 1752

“common sense,” immediacy, and realist intuition, producing the spectator’s empathetic understanding of the “terrible effects of ... hunger.”<sup>111</sup>

Lagrenée’s and Baldighi’s imitations of Rubens’s Amsterdam *Roman Charity* responded to Jean-Baptiste Deshayes’s interest in Dirck van Baburen’s London version of the theme (Figure 2.31). Painted in 1752 but exhibited at the Salon only in 1759, Deshayes’s oval painting is a classicizing mirror image of the Utrecht master’s painting (Figure 3.19).<sup>112</sup> Like Baburen’s Pero, Deshayes’s daughter stands behind her father, offering him milk from an uncovered



Figure 3.20: Noël-Nicolas Coypel, *Roman Charity*, 1735

Figure 3.21: Jacques-Philippe Le Bas, *Roman Charity*, after Coypel, ca. 1735



bosom, nipples clearly visible. Both women wear complicated, nicely folded turbans and turn their heads away from their fathers, probably in response to the prison guards, whose presence they have noted. Baburen's *Pero* seems to emit a shout of fear, while Deshay's daughter is fairly composed, drawing a blanket over herself and her father to cover up their forbidden act. Deshay's *Cimon* faces the viewer; his right hand is chained to the wall, the only indication that the couple find themselves in a dungeon. No window or architectural detail is visible in either version; the breastfeeding couple is immersed in darkness, despite the sharp light that illuminates the couple from an invisible source above.

Deshay's painting was not much commented upon by contemporary art critics, in contrast to Noël-Nicolas Coypel's earlier version, exhibited during the *Fête Dieu* in Place Dauphine in 1724, one year before regular Salon shows resumed (Figure 3.20).<sup>113</sup> Inspired by Rubens's Amsterdam painting, it shows *Pero* with a fully bared chest, both nipples visible, in the act of offering her father milk with splayed fingers. *Cimon* sits on a bunch of straw on the ground, chained by his hands and feet. In a slight variation on the Flemish master's copy, it is *Cimon* who detects the prison guard barging in through a door, while *Pero* continues to tenderly look at *Cimon*, embracing him with her right hand. Coypel's original painting is lost; the painting preserved in Bremen seems to be




Figure 3.22: Jean Jacques Bachelier, *Roman Charity*, 1765

a copy produced after an engraving of the original by Jacques-Philippe Le Bas, which between 1728 and 1747 went through five separate editions (Figure 3.21). In 1765, at the height of the mid-century craze for renderings of *Roman Charity*, Jacques Claude Danzel produced yet another print. The *Mercure de France* faithfully documents the popularity of Coypel's painting and Le Bas's many prints: In 1724, the reviewer notes how the painting was "much applauded, and much

liked;”<sup>114</sup> in 1728, the journal quotes the explanatory verses that accompany Le Bas's print, composed by art critic Étienne La Font de Saint Yenne no less, and remarks that it appeared in tandem with an engraving of Coppel's painting of a nymph;<sup>115</sup> in 1735, it lauds, again, the “very beautiful” engraving done after “one of the best paintings by the recently deceased M. Noël-Nicolas Coppel;”<sup>116</sup> in 1737, 1740, and 1747 it positively mentions three new editions of the print.<sup>117</sup> Modern art historians have called Coppel's *Roman Charity* one of the “most Rubensian” of his works.<sup>118</sup>

Jean Jacques Bachelier's *Roman Charity*, presented at the Salon of 1765 at the same time as Lagrenée's picture, shows none of his colleagues' preoccupation with Rubens and Baburen, or any aspiration at a classicizing aesthetic (Figure 3.22). It is quite a unique work of art that attempts to give a non-idealizing, “realistic” description of the scene and radically re-envisions the positioning of the two figures. Cimon's back and shoulders are lodged between Pero's thighs, his head bent backwards, resting on her left knee. His body shows exaggerated signs of aging and starvation; his complexion is cast in yellow hues; his hands



Figure 3.23:  
Adolf Ulrich  
Wertmüller,  
Portrait of Jean  
Jacques Bachelier  
with *Roman  
Charity*, 1784

are chained and raised in prayer as he sucks from the ample bosom of his daughter. Pero has bared her entire upper torso, with a white scarf or blouse loosely draped around her back. The nipple of her right breast is clearly visible; her face, covered in shadow, is directed at her father's head below. She watches him intently as she offers Cimon her left breast with splayed fingers. The couple is in a dark interior, in front of a wall composed of huge slabs of stone. The source of the light that illumines Pero's head and bosom is invisible – perhaps it is natural light falling through an imagined window to the left of the viewer, located outside the picture plane opposite the couple. This trick would cast the viewer in the role of the two guards, making explicit the voyeuristic pleasure of watching the couple's absorption.

Bachelier regarded this *Roman Charity* as his masterpiece. In 1764, he successfully petitioned the French academy to register it as his official acceptance piece, after having been admitted a year prior as a history painter on the basis of his *Death of Abel*.<sup>119</sup> His promotion to history painter was quite a feat; until 1763, he was regarded as a genre painter with a specialty in plants and animals. After the Salon of 1765, Bachelier produced a slightly modified and enlarged version of his *Roman Charity*, improving the rendering of Pero's left hand and the curvature of Cimon's chains in response to Diderot's critique.<sup>120</sup> This is the version that appears behind Bachelier in Adolf Ulrich Wertmüller's portrait of him in 1784 (Figure 3.23), while Gertrude de Pélichy's copy is done after his acceptance piece from 1764. A third copy by Bachelier, likewise dated to 1765, is done in pastel colors.<sup>121</sup> The multitude of these copies suggests that Bachelier and his admirers were quite unfazed in their appreciation for the piece, despite the devastating reaction of Diderot and other art critics to his *Roman Charity* in particular and his aspirations as a history painter in general.

In its review of the Salon of 1765, the *Journal Encyclopédique* points out that Bachelier's lighting is wrong, producing a shadow on Pero's face, and that Cimon's figure is poorly designed and positioned. Most importantly, the reviewer patronizingly deplores the "tragic ambition" of artists who "renounce their manifest talents to run after those that are less natural to them." He doubts "whether Bachelier has gained by taking up the role of history painter" but is very certain "that the public and the academy have lost a painter of flowers of the highest merit."<sup>122</sup> The *Mercure de France* neglects to mention Bachelier's *Roman Charity* altogether but is full of praise for Lagrenée's version.<sup>123</sup> *L'année littéraire* does appreciate Bachelier's "manner of painting, large and facile," but criticizes his choice of model and wishes for more "agreeable aspects."<sup>124</sup>

Diderot, finally, unleashes a most vitriolic attack against Bachelier. In his contributions to Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire*, which was "published" in the form of manuscript copies and destined for a very exclusive audience although in reality it circulated among salon goers as well, Diderot bullies the artist into submission: "You're wasting your time. Why don't you go back to your flowers

and animals?" and: "You don't know how to paint historical pictures." He accuses Bachelier of pursuing "singular, bizarre effects, something that always signals conceptual sterility and lack of genius." He does not like Bachelier's "lighting, ... the placement of ... [his] figures, ... [his] draftsmanship, characterization, passions, expression, heads, flesh, color, and drapery." He points out that Pero has "the bizarre features of a child born of a Mexican mother and a European father," and calls Cimon "a monster ... thin, dried out and fleshless, near death ... so hideous he inspires fear." Most importantly, as already with Lagrenée, he wants Pero to have bigger breasts: "Your woman isn't the woman with ... large ample breasts that I'd want her to be."<sup>125</sup>

Diderot's unabashedly elitist, racist, and sexist attacks on Bachelier and his painting were the product of a culture of secrecy that characterized eighteenth-century art criticism.<sup>126</sup> In 1767, the complaint of painters against anonymous Salon reviews reached the ear of the government, which demanded that critics sign their articles – with little success.<sup>127</sup> Diderot's polemics were particularly scathing because in theory, they were accessible only to a small circle of subscribers to Grimm's *Correspondance Littéraire*.<sup>128</sup> Nonetheless, Bachelier must have known of his venomous review. In his second rendering of *Roman Charity* in 1765, he changed the position of Pero's left hand, against which Diderot raised strong objections.<sup>129</sup> Diderot's repeated assertions that Bachelier should limit himself to the depiction of flora and fauna might have contributed to his decision not to produce history paintings any more, and to stop exhibiting at the Salon altogether after 1767. Especially after the *Journal Encyclopédique* amplified on Diderot's views in 1765 for the sake of maintaining proper boundaries between history and "genre" paintings, Bachelier must have realized his failure to gain public approval for his promotion at the academy.<sup>130</sup> Already in 1759, in his review of Bachelier's *Resurrection of Christ*, Diderot demanded that he "go back to his tulips."<sup>131</sup> Two years later he cried out in disgust at Bachelier's *Milo of Croton*: "Have you ever seen anything so bad and so pretentious? ... My dear Bachelier, go back to your flowers and animals."<sup>132</sup> And in 1767, Diderot expresses relief at Bachelier's withdrawal of his painting of *Psyche and Zephyrs*: "So much the better for the artist and for us." Diderot later insinuates that Bachelier's decision to leave the academy and open a school of design was due to improper, i.e., pecuniary, motives: "He renounced his title and his functions as member of the academy to become a school master; he has preferred money to honor."<sup>133</sup>

After spewing so much poison, Diderot's favorable opinion on one aspect of Bachelier's *Roman Charity* comes as a surprise: "The only thing you've been able to do well, without knowing it, is to avoid making your old man and your woman nervous about being observed."<sup>134</sup> He adores Bachelier's emphasis on absorption, which casts the spectator in the role of undisturbed voyeur, in contrast to Lagrenée's painting, in which he – who knows why – detects a rival in

the form of a prison guard: “I absolutely reject the notion of having this unfortunate old man and this benevolent woman suspicious of being observed; this suspicion impedes the action and destroys the subject.”<sup>135</sup> The demand for the figures’ total oblivion to being watched is in sync with his illusionist theories on theater and the cultivation of empathy in the spectator. Diderot’s proposal that the spectator’s pleasure go unnoticed by the painting’s figures furthermore mirrors his demands for secrecy in writing Salon reviews. However, fully aware of the iconography’s need of a barred window through which the guards can watch the couple – as in Rubens’s painting – he engages in an ekphrastic digression:

“Which isn’t to say one shouldn’t open a barred window onto the dungeon, and even place a soldier or a spy at this window; but if the painter has any genius, the soldier will be perceived by neither the old man nor the woman giving him suck; only the spectator will be able to see him and the astonishment, admiration, joy, and tenderness registering on his face.”<sup>136</sup>

In Diderot’s mind, the pleasure of the spectator as voyeur should not be limited to watching the breastfeeding scene without interruption; it should extend to the – unobserved – observation of the observer. Once again, Luhmann’s distinction between first- and second-order observers as a mark of differentiated systems of communication appears useful – in this case, for the purpose of understanding Diderot’s excitement about an aspect of a painting which he otherwise loathed. According to Diderot, the depiction of the prison guard as if he were unobserved not only prolongs the nursing couple’s absorption but also endows the spectator with the double pleasure of watching the voyeur in his decision-making process: Is it or is it not a scene of charity? What if it were pure sex?

In 1767, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, who was hitherto known and loved as a genre painter with a focus on middle-class family scenes, produced a *Roman Charity* as well (Figure 3.15). Unfortunately, he was not allowed to exhibit at the Salon that year, which is why the painting remained unnoticed by Paris’s art-conscious public. The academy pressured him to produce an acceptance piece, but Greuze shied away from presenting his *Roman Charity* as such, probably because of Bachelier’s precedent and the unhappy trajectory of his artistic career after the Salon of 1765.<sup>137</sup> Greuze’s painting is inspired by Rubens’s Hermitage version of the scene, which he most likely saw when it was auctioned off during the Julienne sale in 1767 (Figure 2.27).<sup>138</sup> It shows Cimon at the center, seated on a slightly elevated slab of stone, legs stretched out, and naked except for a red blanket and white cloth that cover his genital area and upper legs. His body is emaciated and wrinkled, his complexion of a darker hue than Pero’s. Unlike in Rubens’s painting, he is depicted not in the very act of breastfeeding but, presumably, right before he starts suckling, with his hands raised in gratitude. He is not chained, but the dark interior is recognizable as a dungeon, with a barred lower window to the left. Pero kneels to the left, offering her breast to Cimon



Figure 3.24: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Roman Charity*, 1767

with a V-hold, but her nipple is chastely hidden behind her father's bushy beard. She stares intently at a spot outside the picture frame to the right, but nothing indicates that she has detected the prison guards. She is very poised and beautiful; her profile is that of an ancient statue, her skin is soft and white, and her garments are producing elegant folds. Despite its formal resemblance to Rubens's *Hermitage* version, Greuze's painting is less graphic in its rendering of the lactation scene; however, the body of Cimon is shown in a more pathetic, presumably more "realistic," manner than in Rubens's painting, which endows the starving father with a beautifully muscular torso and shapely legs.<sup>139</sup>

Commenting on Greuze's preparatory drawing for the painting, Mark Ledbury detects a certain "intensity" of feeling and an "over-voluptuous" manner with which the artist chose to depict this act of heroic piety.<sup>140</sup> In fact, his sketch depicts the scene with greater fluidity and emotional abandonment than the completed painting, which seems to waver between a classicizing representation of the heroic daughter and a genre-esque depiction of the suffering father (Figure 3.24). Similarly striking is Greuze's painting of *Loth and his Daughters*, another topic that exposes the charged nature of father-daughter relationships (Figure 3.25). In this oil painting, Greuze shows the father and his daughters in what has been described as "post-coital repose." One of the daughters stares blankly at the spectator, one breast exposed, while



Figure 3.25: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *Loth and His Daughters*, 1760–69

her father and sister sleep off their drunkenness.<sup>141</sup> This disturbing exploration of incestuous family relations seems to be the “morally opposite pendant” to Greuze’s *Roman Charity*, even though the latter painting is not totally devoid of erotic enhancement either.<sup>142</sup>

With his forays into history painting since 1766, Greuze started to express his complex, and increasingly bleaker, views of patriarchal family relationships with greater sharpness. His earlier paintings, exhibited to rousing applause at the Salons of 1755, 1761, and 1763, depict the utopian sentiments of “good fathers” and their various household members. Despite their idealizing content, they are rendered in the “realistic” mode of genre paintings, but not without including traces of ironic detachment. In his *Family Bible Reading* (1755), Greuze depicts a peasant father reading to his wife, six children, and a servant, an audience engaged in various levels of absorption.<sup>143</sup> While his wife, oldest daughter, and two younger children seem to be listening intently, his oldest son has an expression of resentful boredom, his second-oldest son stares at the spectator, and his youngest son plays with the dog, giving him the “horns.”<sup>144</sup>

In his *Marriage Contract* (1760–61), Greuze shows an assembly of family members, servants, and a notary organized around the head of household, who congratulates his daughter and son-in-law on the occasion of their engagement.<sup>145</sup> The groom is holding onto the sack of coins he has just received, the bride endures the signs of affection of her mother and younger sister while fishing for her fiancé's hand, a jealous older sister looks grudgingly at the couple, and the notary hands over the contract. In the foreground, a young girl feeds a hen and her chicks. This painting, which highlights the business-like manner of contemporary marriage proceedings, moved Diderot to hail Greuze as if he were Caravaggio reborn: "He is a ceaseless observer in the streets, in the churches, in the markets, in the theaters, in the promenades, in public assemblies."<sup>146</sup> Perhaps because of Diderot's strong endorsement of the piece, it was popular among playwrights and theater audiences. A few months after its exhibition at the Salon, it was put on display as a *tableau vivant* in a comedy entitled *The Marriage of Harlequin*.<sup>147</sup>

In 1763, Greuze exhibited a painting variously entitled *The Paralytic*, *Filial Piety*, or, as Diderot proposed, *Recompense for a Good Education Given [to One's Son]* (Figure 3.26).<sup>148</sup> It is another one of his domestic scenes organized around a "good father," and, incidentally, his last, because from now on his fathers would take on less agreeable character traits. In this painting, a young



Figure 3.26: Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *The Paralytic*, also called *Filial Piety*, 1763

man feeds his ailing father stretched out on an armchair in the middle of a rustic living room, which Diderot took to be a tender expression of proper reciprocity in kinship relations.<sup>149</sup> There is some confusion about the family relationships depicted, as Diderot assumed the painting to be a sequel to the *Marriage Contract*.<sup>150</sup> In this case, the young man would be the paralytic's son-in-law, and the kindness of nurture would find its origin in the sack of money he had received upon marrying the paralytic's daughter instead of the "good education" his own father gave him. The outburst of public applause for a presumably tender display of sentiment would have been somewhat misplaced, given that the young man might simply be speculating for a bigger chunk of the inheritance. After all, the daughter – alias daughter-in-law – sits right next to him with an account book on her knees. Perhaps the ambiguity was intended. The painting shows pictorial signs of irony in the form of a she-dog nursing her puppies in the right bottom corner – an anti-Charity of sorts – and a roast chicken and flask of wine that are waiting for the patient. These foods remind of Renaissance confinement room scenes, drawing an uneasy analogy between the attention paid to a mother right after delivery and the exaggerated concern for the old man, who is attended by his wife, the young couple, a servant, and five children all at once.<sup>151</sup>

Irony, however, was not what an enlightened Salon audience, least of all Diderot, wanted from Greuze. In a tone that could hardly be more patronizing, Diderot expresses great enthusiasm for his *Filial Piety*, coupled with a strong sense of identification with the painter. After all, Diderot himself invented a model father in his play *The Father of the Family* in 1758, a lenient and caring anti-patriarch who lets both son and daughter freely choose their marriage partners – an unheard-of utopia.<sup>152</sup> In his Salon review of 1763, Diderot brushes all possible ambiguities surrounding the paralytic aside and pronounces Greuze the new painter of morality:

"This Greuze really is my guy ... First of all, I love genre paintings. This is the art of morality. What now, has the paintbrush not for the longest time been dedicated to debauchery and vice? Should we not be satisfied to see it compete with drama to touch us, instruct us, correct us, and incite us to virtue? Keep it up, my friend Greuze! Turn morality into painting, and do it always like that."<sup>153</sup>

Greuze did not heed his advice, a faux-pas for which he was brutally punished when he not only presented a history painting as his acceptance piece to the academy in 1769 but also chose a parricidal son as his protagonist. Already in 1765, when he exhibited the preparatory drawings for the *Ungrateful Son* and the *Punished Son*, it became obvious that Greuze did not want to be confined to hailing "good fathers" in the manner of the "comédie larmoyante" [tear-jerking drama] that Diderot supported. Because of the vehement critiques of his drawings, he turned them into full-fledged paintings only in 1777 and 1778,

respectively, i.e., at a time when his reputation among Salon-goers had long been damaged.<sup>154</sup> In the eyes of Diderot, their “taste is so wretched, so trivial that these two sketches might never be painted,” and Charles-Joseph Mathon de la Cour found the two scenes of father-son conflict simply too “terrifying.”<sup>155</sup>

Probably as a result of this criticism in 1765, Greuze decided to shift genres. From now on, he explored problems in patriarchal relationships in the more detached form of history paintings, of which his *Roman Charity* from 1767 is a first indication. But the decision to branch out into the more elevated domain of history paintings earned him crushing critiques from the public and members of the academy alike. His *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* (1769) was not only rejected as his acceptance piece – he was admitted as a “mere” genre painter instead of being promoted to history painter – but also was torn apart by Salon reviewers.<sup>156</sup> It shows, in a classicizing style reminiscent of Poussin, Emperor Septimius Severus sitting upright in his bed, naked except for a blanket thrown over his legs and genital area, in the act of reproaching his son Caracalla for having tried to poison him (Figure 3.14).<sup>157</sup> Caracalla stands to the left with a sulking expression, possibly brooding over his failure; two councilors are positioned to the right, whispering to each other. The scene takes place in a room with fluted marble pillars, ancient Roman pieces of furniture and decor, and heavy grey drapery hung over one side of the emperor's bed as a backdrop. Contemporary observers and modern scholars have found the painting to be unconvincing, objecting to Septimius's outstretched arm as the sole pictorial element indicative of “action,” i.e., the emperor's speech in the presence of his son, and unduly burdened with holding the picture together compositionally.<sup>158</sup> Also, the gap between Caracalla's awe-inspiring military outfit and statuesque body on the one hand and the pouting expression of his face on the other, more appropriate for a scolded teenager than a parricidal successor to the throne, has been felt to be somewhat ludicrous.<sup>159</sup>

While Greuze's painting certainly exhibits shortcomings, the bulk of the contemporary critique was directed at his inappropriate ambition to be accepted as a history painter. Diderot, for example, scolds him for having tried to overcome the strict hierarchy of ranks between history and genre painters before he even starts to address the painting. In his eyes, Greuze violated a taboo:

“You do know, my friend, that one has relegated to the class of genre painters those artists who tend to imitate subaltern nature as well as pastoral, bourgeois, and domestic scenes, and that it is only history painters who make up the other class [of artists] who can aspire to the ranks of professors and other honorific functions.”<sup>160</sup>

Having thus shamed his former “friend” into submission, Diderot continues by giving an account of the embarrassing proceedings at the academy. He calls Greuze “dishonored” and affirms one more time: “Greuze has left his genre: scrupulous imitator of nature, he was unable to elevate himself to the

kind of exaggeration necessary for the painting of history.” Only then does he proceed to analyze the painting, detailing its numerous shortcomings. In the midst of his offensive verbiage, however, Diderot does make the perceptive remark that Greuze’s “Caracalla would have worked wonderfully in a pastoral or domestic scene,” comparing him to the eldest son of the Bible-reading peasant in his painting of 1755.<sup>161</sup> Modern scholars have picked up on this remark, calling Caracalla’s curious mixture between a “classical god and a frightened adolescent” indicative of Greuze’s attempts to import elements of bourgeois genre scenes into depictions drawn from Roman history, in an effort to invent a new hybrid genre.<sup>162</sup> In the eyes of Mark Ledbury, Greuze wanted to accomplish in the visual arts what playwrights had done for the bourgeois melodrama.<sup>163</sup>

It is somewhat surprising that Diderot, who in his “Notes on Painting” (1765) seemed critical of the divisions between history and genre painters and who routinely ridiculed classicizing painters such as Lagrenée, should have closed ranks with the academy in 1769. Four years earlier, he had observed that genre painters regard “history painting as a genre of phantasy, devoid of verisimilitude or truth, in which extravagance is the norm; which has nothing in common with nature; in which duplicity betrays itself in exaggerated expressions that never existed anywhere.”<sup>164</sup> At about the time he was writing these “Notes,” several painters were engaged in blurring the lines between genre and history painting, which seems to have produced a crisis within the academy.<sup>165</sup> In 1765, Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732–1806) exhibited his classicizing *Coresus and Callirhoe* as his acceptance piece to the academy but never produced any other history painting afterwards.<sup>166</sup> In 1764, as already mentioned, Bachelier got his genre-esque *Roman Charity* accepted as a history painting and qualified for the promotion to adjunct professor at the academy, but he stopped exhibiting at the Salon altogether in 1767.<sup>167</sup> When, in 1769, Greuze tried to enter the academy as yet another “history painter” in disguise, exhibiting a “hybrid” painting that, despite its heavily classicizing aesthetic, included references to his earlier genre paintings in the form of sulking Caracalla, the academy might have felt defensive about accepting the wrong kind of painter the third time in a row. They rejected his request in order to set an example but also because they felt fooled by Greuze’s strategy to surprise them with a painting about which they had not been informed.<sup>168</sup>

Despite the rise of genre painting in the favor of collectors and Salon-attendants all throughout the eighteenth century, and despite the development of a third, hybrid genre in theater arts, the allure of “pure” classicism à la Poussin survived the crisis of the 1760s and soon experienced a rebirth with Jacques-Louis David’s painting of the *Oath of the Horatii* (1784). Ironically, it is Greuze’s vilified *Septimius Severus and Caracalla* that, according to modern art historians, initiated the neo-Poussinian style of the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary eras.<sup>169</sup> The many stylistic permutations of *Roman Charity* can serve as



Figure 3.27: Jacques-Louis David, *School of, Roman Charity*, late 18th c.

a measure of Rubens's and Baburen's popularity in eighteenth-century France, and they document the taste for history paintings that, to varying degrees, combined a classicizing style with genre-esque elements. In the Salon of 1777, a very mediocre *Roman Charity* by Jacques Antoine Beaufort (1721–84) was exhibited, the same year that Jean-Michel Moreau the Younger (1741–1814) illustrated Marmontel's novel *The Incas* with a beautiful engraving of Bartolomeo de las Casas in the guise of breastfeeding Cimon (Figure 3.2).<sup>170</sup> Sometime during the last decades of the eighteenth century, followers of Jacques-Louis David produced a *Roman Charity* that managed to defy all of its predecessors through a heavily classicizing style and a brand-new composition (Figure 3.27).<sup>171</sup> Pero, in playing with the spectator's voyeuristic demands, shows her beautiful back to the viewer, while Cimon is depicted frontally, leaning against a prison wall. Pero's silk garment throws beautiful, capricious folds, and her left arm and shoulder are of statuesque perfection. She kneels in front of her father, trying to shield him from view with the cloth of her ancient Roman dress. The couple is not currently engaged in breastfeeding but is shown at the moment of interruption – Pero has turned her head toward the dark right corner of the painting, probably in response to the prison guards' noise. Despite all attempts at novelty, Cimon's posture, muscular torso, and dark complexion remind of Rubens's *Hermitage* version of the theme.

With this neo-classical painting à la David, the fortune of *Roman Charity* came full circle since Poussin's momentous, and heavily classicizing, adaptation of the mother-daughter scene. While in the seventeenth century the

father-daughter version of the motif was useful for the expression of anti-papal dissent, it came to denote the full-fledged critique of patriarchal family relations during the Enlightenment and revolutionary period.<sup>172</sup> Especially in the work of Greuze, it appears to be situated in the middle of a spectrum that ranges from reformist, utopian images of the “good father” – as in his *Father Reading from the Bible*, the *Marriage Contract*, and *Filial Piety* – to depictions of attempted parricides such as *Septimius Severus and Caracalla*. Greuze’s *Roman Charity*, which in the hybrid manner typical of his history paintings depicts a statu-esque, classicizing Pero and a “realistically” suffering Cimon, expresses the exploitative quality and incestuous complications of contemporary father-daughter relationships, a motif the artist resumes in *Loth and His Daughters*. After the end of the ancien régime, interest in the theme of Roman Charity started to wane, probably as a result of dramatically altered family relations in bourgeois society and of narrowed views of sexuality that excluded lactation. Three paintings of the mother-daughter version – all of them lost – show how the “sisterly” relations between the mother-turned-daughter and the daughter-turned-mother occupied the French imaginary during the revolutionary period.<sup>173</sup> In the nineteenth century, the intelligibility of Catholic allegories of nursing started to wane. The confinement of breastfeeding to mothers and their infants and the slow rise of daughters’ rights in civil law are responsible for the loss of rhetorical power of an iconography that for 300 years had fascinated early modern audiences.

## NOTES

1 | Andor Pigler, *Barockthemen: eine Auswahl von Verzeichnissen zur Ikonographie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974; first ed. Budapest: Verlag der ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), vol. 2, 300–07.

2 | Artus Quellinus the Elder, *Roman Charity*, Marble Statue, before 1668, Antwerp, Royal Museum of Fine Arts; *The Mammelokker*, Relief Façade, 1741, Ghent, Belfry; Joseph Willems, *Roman Charity*, Porcelain Figure, 1765, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1927,0411.1.CR; Joseph Maucher, *Roman Charity*, Amber Statuette, 1690, Berlin, Bode-Museum, inv. no. 5927; *Roman Charity*, Bronze Plaquette, 18th c., London, British Museum, inv. no. MG 483; *Roman Charity*, Bronze Plaquette, 18th c., London, British Museum, inv. no. MG 481.

3 | Isabella Maria dal Pozzo, *Roman Charity*, before 1700, Derby, Kedleston Hall; Isabella di Borbone, *Roman Charity*, 1759, Parma, Galleria Nazionale.

4 | Jutta Sperling, "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse: Tropes of Lactation in the French Colonial Imaginary (ca. 1770–1810)," *Gender & History* 23, no. 1 (2011): 47–71.

5 | See, most recently, Alexandra Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity in *The Plague at Ashdod* and *The Gathering of the Manna* and Their Influence on Late Seventeenth-Century Art," in: *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations: Images, Rhetorics, and Practices*, ed. by Jutta Gisela Sperling (Aldershot, England; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013), 165–85; Louis Marin, "Lire un tableau en 1639 d après une lettre de Poussin," in: Louis Marin, *Sublime Poussin* (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1995; first publ. 1983), 11–34; Wilhelm Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht: Le Bruns Akademierede von 1667 über Poussins "Mannawunder"* (Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 1996); Bernhard Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie bei Nicolas Poussin: Emotionen in der Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Reimer, 2007), 113.

6 | Stumpfhaus is of the opinion that Poussin got the idea for the motif from Pliny the Elder, while Schlink thinks Boccaccio was responsible for reversing Maximus's anecdote. Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 93; Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 87–89. For Le Brun's conference talk, see André Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, ed. by Joseph Aynard (Paris: Éditions Fernand Roches, 1929; first ed. Paris: chez Sébastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1685). His first edition of Le Brun's conference talk appeared in 1669.

7 | Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, transl. by Alice Sedgwick Wohl, notes by Hellmut Wohl, introduction by Tomaso Montanari (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; first It. ed. 1672), 312–13; Joachim von Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675: Leben der berühmten Maler, Bildhauer und Baumeister*, ed. by A.R. Peltzer (München: G. Hirth's Verlag A.G., 1925; first ed. 1675), 258.

8 | Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 70 (2009), 119–46.

- 9 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 184–85.
- 10 | Sebastian Schütze, "Caravaggism in Europe: A Planetary System and its Gravitational Laws," in: *Caravaggio: His Followers in Rome*, ed. by David Franklin and Sebastian Schütze (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 26–47, especially 43.
- 11 | See, for example, the *Roman Charities* by Mattia Preti (ca. 1660–1661), Guercino (1591–1666), Andrea Celesti (1637–1711), and Antonio Zanchi (1631–1722), as well as the serial production of *Roman Charities* by Johann Carl Loth (1632–1698) and Daniel Seiter (1642/47–1705). Gerhard Ewald lists ten different versions of the motif by Johann Carl Loth. Gerhard Ewald, *Johann Carl Loth (1632–1698)* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger & Co, 1965), 104–05, catalog entries 386–95. The frequency with which he painted the motif is surpassed only by his fondness for another incestual father-daughter topic, *Drunken Loth and His Daughters*, which he painted eighteen (!) times. Ewald, *Johann Carl Loth*, 58–59, catalog entries 24–41. Matthias Kunze identifies six different *Roman Charities* by Daniel Seiter. Matthias Kunze, *Daniel Seiter, 1647–1705: Die Gemälde* (München; Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2000), 121–25, catalog entries G 82–G 87.
- 12 | Quoted after Michael Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 175; see also Jonathan Unglaub, "Poussin's Reflection," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 3 (Sept. 2004): 505–29; and Louis Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören* (Berlin: Diaphanes, 2003; first Fr. ed. Paris: Éditions Flammarions, 1981).
- 13 | Roger de Piles, *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of ... the most Eminent Painters ...* (London: printed for Thomas Payne, in Castle Street, 1706; first Fr. ed. 1699), 312.
- 14 | Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 180, 311. Bellori seems to echo Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564–1631), who claimed that Caravaggio's life style was reflected in his art. Federico Borromeo, unpublished papers; quoted after Ferdinando Bologna, *L'incredulità del Caravaggio e l'esperienza delle "cose naturali"* (Turin: Bollati Borinighieri, 2006; first ed. 1992), 377.
- 15 | Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 275, 257.
- 16 | Joseph Aynard, Introduction to Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, x–xi; Claus Kemmer, "'Expression', 'effet' und 'esprit': Rubens und die Kunsttheorie des 17. Jahrhunderts," in: *Peter Paul Rubens: Barocke Leidenschaften*; Ausstellung im Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, 8. August bis 31. Oktober 2004, ed. by Nils Büttner und Ulrich Heinen (München: Hirmer Verlag, 2004), 99–106, especially 100.
- 17 | Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 10–11.
- 18 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 137.
- 19 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 147.
- 20 | Itay Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons: Esthétique et épistémologie de la peinture ténébriste romaine 1595–1610* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 168–69.
- 21 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 223.

- 22 | Richard E. Spear, *The "Divine" Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 36.
- 23 | Sapir, *Ténèbres sans leçons*, 221.
- 24 | Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 174.
- 25 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 36; Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 224; see also Le Brun's description of the figures' gestures in *The Gathering of the Manna* in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 38–39. The French art critic Roger de Piles famously gave Caravaggio a "zero" for expressiveness. Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 101.
- 26 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 221.
- 27 | Daniel Arasse, *Le Détail: pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (Paris: Flammarion, 1992); Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
- 28 | Bologna, *L'incredulità del Caravaggio*.
- 29 | Fried, *The Moment of Caravaggio*, 3.
- 30 | Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 224.
- 31 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 89.
- 32 | Todd Olson, *Poussin and France: Painting, Humanism, and the Politics of Style* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 15.
- 33 | On Poussin's erudition and empirical approach to history, see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 27–32.
- 34 | André Félibien, quoted in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 38–39.
- 35 | Anthony Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin* (London: Pallas Athene, 2nd ed., 1995; first ed. 1967), 230.
- 36 | Marin, "Lire un tableau," 33.
- 37 | See Poussin's letters to Jacques Stella and Paul Fréart de Chantelou, in Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 76. See also the German translation in Marin, *Die Malerei zerstören*, 109.
- 38 | Spear, *The "Divine" Guido*, 36.
- 39 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 46.
- 40 | Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 78.
- 41 | Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 77.
- 42 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 86.
- 43 | Jonathan Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting: Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 5.
- 44 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 31.
- 45 | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 41, 44.
- 46 | Already Le Brun and Félibien pointed this out. Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 45.
- 47 | Tintoretto, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1579–81, Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco. Jutta Sperling, "Allegories of Charity and the Practice of Poor Relief."
- 48 | See, for example, Saint Anne's desire to breastfeed Mary in the Book of James. Jutta Sperling, "Wet-Nurses, Midwives, and the Virgin Mary in Tintoretto's *The Birth*

of *Saint John the Baptist* (1563)" in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 235–54.

**49** | On perceptions of his art as "masculine," see Svetlana Alpers, *The Making of Rubens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 91–93.

**50** | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 27.

**51** | On his privileging of Saint Paul, see Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 135–38. On his use of Josephus Flavius's books, see Stumpfhaus, *Modus – Affekt – Allegorie*, 89; Olson, *Poussin and France*, 35, 64, 66.

**52** | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 111; on Poussin's interest in syncretism, see Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin*, 152.

**53** | Olson, *Poussin and France*, 67.

**54** | Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation*, 1645, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland.

**55** | Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 134–38. Compare the apostle's features with those of Saint Peter in Poussin's *Ordination* (1636), where he is clearly identifiable through the keys that Christ hands to him.

**56** | See, for example, his version of the *Gathering of the Manna* in the church of San Giorgio Maggiore; *Moses Striking the Rock* in the Scuola Grade di San Rocco; and the *Presentation of the Virgin Mary* in the church of the Madonna dell'Orto, just to name a few.

**57** | Nicolas Poussin, *Adoration of the Golden Calf*, 1633–1637, London, National Gallery. C. Wright, *Poussin*, 126.

**58** | Nicolas Poussin, *Triumph of David*, 1628–1631, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery, inv.no. DPG 236. Wright, *Poussin*, 104.

**59** | Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 45.

**60** | Nicolas Poussin, *The Crossing of the Red Sea*, 1633–37, Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria. Wright, *Poussin*, 127.

**61** | Nicolas Poussin, *Matrimony*, 1636–1640, Leicestershire, Belvoir Castle; Nicolas Poussin, *Extreme Unction*, 1636–1640, Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum; Nicolas Poussin, *Baptism*, 1646, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland; Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation*, 1636, Leicestershire, Belvoir Castle; Nicolas Poussin, *Confirmation*, 1645, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland. Wright, *Poussin*, 152, 153, 154, 176, 177.

**62** | Félibien, *Entretien sur Nicolas Poussin*, 21; Bellori, *The Lives of the Modern Painters*, 312–13; Sandrart, *Joachim von Sandrarts Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 258.

**63** | Schlink calls him a "figure of reflection." Schlink, *Ein Bild ist kein Tatsachenbericht*, 66.

**64** | On Poussin's interest in iconoclasm, in particular the theme of the *Adoration of the Golden Calf*, see W.J.T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 130.

**65** | Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin*, 94.

- 66 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 184; Elisabeth Hipp, *Nicolas Poussin: Die Pest von Asdod* (Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Olms Verlag, 2005), 136.
- 67 | *Dead Amazon*, marble sculpture, 150 BCE, Berlin, Pergamonmuseum; *Laocoon*, marble sculpture, copy after a Hellenistic original from 200 BCE, Rome, Vatican Museum, inv. nos. 1059, 1064, 1067.
- 68 | Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 164; Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, 85; Hipp, *Nicolas Poussin: Die Pest von Asdod*, 100–03.
- 69 | Blunt, *Nicolas Poussin*, 94.
- 70 | Unglaub, *Poussin and the Poetics of Painting*, 163–64; Sybille Ebert-Schifferer, "Vom Seicento zum Grand goût," in: *Die Galerie der starken Frauen: Regentinnen, Amazonen, Salondamen*, ed. by Bettina Baumgärtel und Silvia Neysters (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1995), 79–96, especially 90.
- 71 | *Mattia Preti tra Roma, Napoli, e Malta*, ed. by Nicola Spinosa, Jadranka Bentini, Arnaud Brejon de Lavergnée, Giorgio Ceraudo, Keith Christiansen et al. (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1999), 106.
- 72 | Giovan Tommaso Fasano, "Invoking the Madonna del Carmine against the Plague," 1656, Naples, Church of Santa Maria di Donnaregina Nuova.
- 73 | François Perrier, *The Plague of Athens*, 1635, Dijon, Musée des beaux arts.
- 74 | Charles Le Brun, *The Brazen Serpent*, 1649–1650, Bristol, City Art Gallery; Sébastien Bourdon, *The Plague of Ashdod*, 1670, private collection. Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 178.
- 75 | Woolley, "Nicolas Poussin's Allegories of Charity," 181.
- 76 | Charles Le Brun, *Moses Striking the Rock*, 1650, Paris, Louvre. Olson, *Poussin and France*, 187.
- 77 | See a drawing of *Roman Charity* by Jan Gossaert, London, British Museum, inv. no. 1911,0412.2; the ceramic dish from 1601 (Figure 2.9); and a *Roman Charity* by a follower of Rubens sold at Sotheby's in 2007.
- 78 | See also the prints by Johann E. Haid after Loth, Michele Benedetti's drawing (1792) and Ignaz Krepp's print after Cignani, Pietro Peiroleri's print after Lazzarini, Eberhard Siegfried Henne's print after Rode (1784), plus a few anonymous drawings, prints, and paintings. In the nineteenth century, most *Roman Charities* included an infant.
- 79 | Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Mahlerey und Poesie," in: *Lessings Laokoon*, ed. by Hugo Blümner (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880; first ed. Berlin: bey Christian Voss, 1766), 141–349, especially 165–70.
- 80 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 165. "For what we find beautiful in a work of art, is not judged to be beautiful by our eye, but by our imagination through the eye." Lessing, "Laokoon," 194.
- 81 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 213, 324.
- 82 | Lessing, "Laokoon," 250–51, 268.

- 83** | Lessing, "Laokoon," 282, 309.
- 84** | Lessing, "Laokoon," 215.
- 85** | On eighteenth-century German debates on ancient Greek art, see Whitney Davis, *Queer Beauty: Sexuality and Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Freud and Beyond* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).
- 86** | For a first discussion of these paintings, see Robert Rosenblum, "Caritas Romana after 1760: Some Romantic Lactations," in: *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. by Thomas B. Hess and Linda Nochlin (New York: Newsweek, 1972), 42–63.
- 87** | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 309–10.
- 88** | Roger de Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages des plus fameux peintres* (Paris: chez N. Langlois fils rue de la Harpe chez M.r Fourcroy m.d Epicier, 1681; reprint Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1968), 58.
- 89** | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 48.
- 90** | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 214–15.
- 91** | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 62.
- 92** | De Piles, *The Art of Painting*, 311.
- 93** | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 103–04.
- 94** | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 104.
- 95** | De Piles, *Dissertation sur les ouvrages*, 101.
- 96** | Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, 119.
- 97** | Lisa Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory in the Art of Rubens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 102.
- 98** | Peter Paul Rubens, *Juno and Argus*, 1611, Köln, Walraff-Richartz-Museum.
- 99** | J. Vanessa Lyon, "Full of Grace: Lactation, Expression and "Colorito" Painting in Some Early Works by Rubens," in: Sperling, *Medieval and Renaissance Lactations*, 255–77.
- 100** | Alpers, *The Making of Rubens*, 133, 138, 153. Lyon, "Full of Grace," 258.
- 101** | On the connection between milk imagery, copia, and excess, see Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold*.
- 102** | Régis Michel, "Diderot and Modernity," *Oxford Art Journal* 8, no. 2 (1985): 36–51, especially 37.
- 103** | Peter Paul Rubens, *The Origin of the Milky Way*, 1637, Madrid, Museo del Prado; Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus, Mars, and Amor*, 1630–1635, London, Dulwich Picture Gallery; Peter Paul Rubens, *Juno and Argus*, 1611, Köln, Walraff-Richartz-Museum. For an excellent analysis of breastfeeding Venus in *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* (also called *Allegory of War and Peace*), see Rosenthal, *Gender, Politics, and Allegory*, chapter 2.
- 104** | Different engravings were made by Willem Panneels and Alexander Voet II. British Museum, inv. nos. S.5352 and 1917,1208.549, respectively. I am not sure how likely it is that Lagrenée might have seen this painting, as it happened to be in the collection of Jean Gillis Peeters d'Aertselaer de Cleydael in Antwerp, inventoried in 1763 and 1771.

Elizabeth McGrath, *Rubens: Subjects from History*, ed. by Arnout Balis (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1997), vol. 2, 105.

**105** | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 161, in: *Mercure de France* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.

**106** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, ed. and transl. by John Goodman, introduction by Thomas Crow (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), vol. 1, 42.

**107** | *Journal Encyclopédique* (October 1757), 106, in: *Journal Encyclopédique* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1967), vol. IV; *Le Mercure de France* (October 1757), 166, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXIII, 263.

**108** | *L'année littéraire* (1757) vol. V, 341 in: *L'année littéraire* (Genève: Faksimile Slatkine Reprints, 1966), vol. IV, 451.

**109** | *Journal Encyclopédique* (1. Novembre 1765), vol. VII, part 3, 106, in: *Journal Encyclopédique* (1967), vol. XX, 360.

**110** | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 159, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.

**111** | "Those willing to indulge the artist's lack of common sense, his ignoring the sudden, terrible effect of imprisonment and condemnation to die from hunger, will be enchanted by this work." Diderot, *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 43.

**112** | André Bancel, *Jean-Baptiste Deshayes, 1729–1765* (Paris: Arthéna, 2008), 92–93, 121.

**113** | Jérôme Delaplanche, *Noël-Nicolas Coypel 1690–1734* (Paris: Arthéna, 2004), 87–88.

**114** | *Le Mercure de France* (June 1724), 1391, in: *Mercure de France* (1968), vol. VI, 370.

**115** | "What a touching spectacle! What a wonderful painting! / Burdened by years and iron chains, Cimon, who is close to the grave, / Finds a new life at the bosom of his daughter; / O! happy old man! Whose fortune makes us envious! / You will be reborn from your blood, and your daughter, in turn, / Is the mother of who has given her the light of day." *Le Mercure de France* (May 1728), 1015, in: *Mercure de France* (1968), vol. XIV, 267.

**116** | *Le Mercure de France* (April 1735), 757, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXVIII, 207.

**117** | *Le Mercure de France* (June 1737), 1178, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXXII, 313; *Le Mercure de France* (January 1740), 111, in: *Mercure de France* (1969), vol. XXXVIII, 39; *Le Mercure de France* (December 1747), 166, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LVII, 327.

**118** | Delaplanche, *Noël-Nicolas Coypel 1690–1734*, 88.

**119** | Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806): *Peintre du Roi et de Madame de Pompadour*; exhibition catalog; Musée Lambert, Versailles, 23 Nov. 1999–19 March 2000, ed. by Hélène Mouradian, Xavier Salmon, Tamara Préaud, Danielle Rice, Ulrich Leben (Paris: Somogy éditions, 1999), 15 16, 168, catalog entry 122.

- 120** | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 170, catalog entry 123.
- 121** | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 170, catalog entry 124.
- 122** | *Journal Encyclopédique* (15. November, 1765), vol. VIII, no. 1, 71, in: *Journal Encyclopédique*, (1967), vol. XX, 402.
- 123** | *Le Mercure de France* (October 1765), 159, in: *Mercure de France* (1970), vol. LXXXIX, 261.
- 124** | *L'Année Littéraire* (1765), vol. VI, 154, in: *L'Année Littéraire* (1966), vol. IV, 495.
- 125** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 52–54.
- 126** | For a good discussion of art criticism and the role of the Salon in the emergence of a Habermasian public sphere in eighteenth-century France, see Thomas E. Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- 127** | As a result, hardly any meaningful analysis of the Salon was published that year. We know of this conflict through a note by Charles-Nicolas Cochin, high-ranking academician. Charles-Nicolas Cochin, Coll. Deloynes, pièce n. 114, quoted in: Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 48, note 102.
- 128** | Elisabeth Lavezzi, *La scène de genre dans les Salons de Diderot* (Paris: Hermann Éditeurs, 2009), 17.
- 129** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
- 130** | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 24.
- 131** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1759," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), vol. 1, 67.
- 132** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1761," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), vol. 1, 128.
- 133** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1767," in: *Salons*, ed. by Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), vol. 3, 127.
- 134** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
- 135** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 43.
- 136** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 53.
- 137** | On Greuze's prohibition to exhibit in 1767, see Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, 164; on Greuze's choice not to present his painting as an acceptance piece, see Edgar Munhall, *Greuze the Draftsman* (New York: Merrell in association with the Frick Collection, 2002), 186.
- 138** | *Jean-Baptiste Greuze, 1725–1805*; exhibition catalogue; Hartford, Wadsworth Athenaeum, 1 Dec. 1976–23 Jan. 1977; San Francisco, The California Palace of the Legion of Honor, 5 March–1 May 1977; Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, 11 June–7 Aug. 1977, ed. by Edgar Munhall (Dijon: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1976), 138, catalog entry 60.

- 139** | On the difference from Rubens's painting, see *Greuze et l'affaire du Septime Sévère*; exhibition catalogue, Hôtel-Dieu-Musée Greuze de Tournus, 26 June-18 Sept. 2005, ed. by Clémence Poivet and Annick Lemoine (Paris: Somogy éditions, 2005), 26-27.
- 140** | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2000), 170.
- 141** | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 169.
- 142** | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 169, note 29.
- 143** | Michael Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1980), 10; Munhall, *Greuze the Draftsman*, 21.
- 144** | Mark Ledbury, "Intimate Dramas: Genre Painting and New Theater in Eighteenth-Century France," in: *Intimate Encounters: Love and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century France*, ed. by Richard Rand, with the assistance of Juliette M. Bianco (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 49-67, especially 56.
- 145** | Jean-Baptiste Greuze, *The Marriage Contract*, 1760-1761, Paris, Louvre.
- 146** | Quoted after Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, 142.
- 147** | Emma Barker, "Painting and Reform in Eighteenth-Century France: Greuze's 'L'Accordée de Village,'" *Oxford Art Journal* 20, no. 2 (1997): 42-52, especially 43.
- 148** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1763," in: *Salons*, vol. 1, 233.
- 149** | Emma Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 67.
- 150** | Lavezzi, *La scène de genre dans les Salons de Diderot*, 79.
- 151** | Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
- 152** | Denis Diderot, "The Father of the Family," in: *Two Plays by Denis Diderot*, transl. and introduced by Kiki Gounaridou and John Hellweg (New York: Peter Lang, 2011).
- 153** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1763," in: *Salons*, vol. 1, 233.
- 154** | Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 207-08.
- 155** | Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 80.
- 156** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 42.
- 157** | For an analysis of Greuze's painting as reminiscent of Poussin's *Testament of Eudamidas*, see Eik Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze and the Sublime of History Painting," *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 1 (March 2004): 96-113, especially 99-100.
- 158** | Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 98.
- 159** | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 179; Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 102.
- 160** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 103.
- 161** | Denis Diderot, "Salon de 1769," in: *Salons*, vol. IV (1967), 104-06.
- 162** | Mark Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 179.
- 163** | Mark Ledbury, "Intimate Dramas," 62; Ledbury, *Sedaine, Greuze and the Boundaries of Genre*, 160-62, 182, 224-25.

- 164** | Denis Diderot, "The Salon of 1765 and Notes on Painting," in: *Diderot on Art*, vol. 1, 230.
- 165** | Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 155.
- 166** | Kahng, "L'Affaire Greuze," 97; Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 132–43; Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 168.
- 167** | Mouradian, *Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724–1806)*, 16, 24.
- 168** | In Crow's eyes, his "surprise invader strategy" simply failed. Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 164–66.
- 169** | Anita Brookner, *Greuze: The Rise and Fall of an Eighteenth-Century Phenomenon* (London: Elek, 1972), 109.
- 170** | Sperling, "Las Casas and His Amerindian Nurse."
- 171** | The attribution of the painting is insecure, but artnet recently listed this painting as authored by both Jacques-Louis David and "The School of Jacques-Louis David." On August 5, 2005, it sold for \$11,700; <http://www.artnet.com/artists/jacques-louis-david/roman-charity-V77BfGwpqpD4B3FaQlvT5g2> [accessed 3/31/14].
- 172** | Much has been written about this topic. For a first introduction, see Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992).
- 173** | The three paintings were by Jean-Charles-Nicaise Perrin (1791), Angelika Kauffmann (1794), and Etienne-Barthélemy Garnier (1801).