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“It seems I must do a nude,” the young Edouard Manet remarks in Antonin Proust’s “Souvenirs”: “The nude seems to be the first and last word in art.” The female nude held pride of place in the works of Manet’s early maturity—from the voluptuous Nymphé surprise to the series of red chalk drawings, to the heroic Déjeuner sur l’herbe and Olympia. “Faire un nu,” of course, would place Manet in the company of Titian and Rubens, masters whose female nudes the young artist studied and plainly measured his own work against. But neither of them was necessarily the painter most closely associated with the bare female form in mid-nineteenth-century Paris; for as the brothers Goncourt would ask in their 1862 study of François Boucher, “Who has undressed a woman better than he?” At the time the most readily available and widely celebrated of Boucher’s femmes déshabillées would have been Diane sortant du bain (fig. 1), painted
François Boucher (French, 1703–1770). Diane sortant du bain (Diana Leaving Her Bath), 1742. Oil on canvas, 22 × 28 ¾ in. (56 × 73 cm). Musée du Louvre, Département des Peintures, Paris (2712)
in 1742 and acquired by the Musée Impérial in February 1852. It was the first picture by Boucher ever purchased for the Musée du Louvre, Paris, and its acquisition reflected a change in the critical fortunes of eighteenth-century French painting already well under way. Owing to Theodore Reff’s survey of Second Empire copyists at the Louvre, it has long been widely known that Manet copied _Diane sortant du bain_ almost immediately after its acquisition by the museum. Indeed, this is the earliest of the copies the young artist painted at the Louvre for which any documentation survives: having registered as a student copyist on January 29, 1850, Manet set to work after Boucher’s picture on February 25, 1852. Although the resulting copy is lost, the tender, plein-air sensuality of Boucher’s Diana finds an echo in Manet’s _Nympe surprise_ (fig. 2), first exhibited in 1861. This article, however, proposes that Boucher’s picture served as a still more literal source for another large-scale female nude, perhaps Manet’s first essay at the genre, abandoned incomplete sometime before 1862 and today concealed beneath a painting in The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Manet’s _Mademoiselle V. en costume d’espada_ (Mademoiselle V. . . in the Costume of an Espada; fig. 3) is signed and dated 1862; an etching of the same composition was published in October of that year. An X-radiograph of the painting reveals an upside-down seated nude painted under the female

---

**fig. 2** Edouard Manet (French, 1832–1883). _La Nympe surprise (The Surprised Nymph)_, by 1861. Oil on canvas, 56 ¾ × 44 ¼ in. (144.5 × 112.5 cm). Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes, Buenos Aires

**fig. 3** Edouard Manet. _Mademoiselle V. . . in the Costume of an Espada_, 1862. Oil on canvas, 65 × 50 1/4 in. (165.1 × 127.6 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, H. O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929 (29.100.53)
fig. 4 X-radiograph of Mademoiselle V... in the Costume of an Espada (fig. 3). The canvas appears upside down in the X-radiograph.
Juliet Wilson-Bareau has pointed out a close relationship between this overpainted figure and the nude depicted in a reversed engraving of David and Bathsheba by Jean-Baptiste Corneille (fig. 5) after a fresco by Giulio Romano in the loggia of the Palazzo del Te, Mantua (fig. 6). Manet copied the print in a swift pencil sketch, today in the Musée d’Orsay, Paris (fig. 7). The presence of a fountain at lower left in the X-radiograph of *Mademoiselle V.* seems to confirm this connection; though absent from Manet’s pencil drawing, a similar fountain appears in Giulio Romano’s composition and in Corneille’s subsequent engraving. The Romano/Corneille Bathsheba, however, does not fully account for the pose of the nude hidden beneath the Metropolitan Museum painting. Unlike the tense and active Bathsheba, who turns sharply, casting an anxious glance over her shoulder, Manet’s figure directs her attention downward and to the left, imparting a

**fig. 5** Jean-Baptiste Corneille (1649–1695), after Giulio Romano (Italian, 1499?–1546). Bathsheba. Etching. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Estampes et de la Photographie, Paris

**fig. 6** Giulio Romano. Bathsheba, ca. 1530. Fresco. Palazzo del Te, Mantua

**fig. 7** Edouard Manet, after Corneille. Seated Nude, ca. 1850s. Graphite, 7¼ × 5¼ in. (18 × 13.4 cm). Musée d’Orsay, Paris (RF 11970 recto)
comparatively serene bearing to her whole form. In other words, although the fountain confirms Manet’s engagement with the seventeenth-century print after the Renaissance fresco, certain particulars of his concealed figure’s pose may point to a quite different source. The curvature of the woman’s neck and proper left shoulder, the placement of her ear: these details seem to correspond more closely to the pose of Boucher’s bathing Diana. Manet’s copy after Diane sortant du bain is lost, but this overpainted figure may point to the crucial role played by the eighteenth-century master in the young artist’s first experiments with the monumental female figure, his early imagining of what it might mean to “faire un nu.”

The nude now submerged beneath Mademoiselle V. should not be mistaken for the missing copy or a fragment thereof. Painted at lifesize, the figure is substantially larger than Boucher’s Diana. Although sizable copies painted in situ at the Louvre were not unheard of in the period,14 no copy of comparable scale by Manet is known.15 There is, moreover, no evidence to suggest that he ever intended to include in his composition the attendant who appears at left in Boucher’s picture or that the Metropolitan Museum canvas was cut down along that edge.20 Finally, although such details are difficult to parse in the X-radiograph, the naturalistic treatment of this figure’s proper left breast and of the tendon that stands out from her neck suggests that she was painted directly from a model rather than from an old master source. Manet would follow a similar procedure for his monumental nudes of the late 1850s and early 1860s, posing Suzanne Leenhoff as Rubens’s Susanna for the picture that eventually became La Nymphe surprise,21 Victorine Meurent as Raphael’s naiad for the Déjeuner sur l’herbe, and the same model as Titian’s Venus (fig. 8) for Olympia (fig. 9).22 Olympia is of particular interest here, since a small copy in oils (fig. 10), made in the galleries of the Uffizi in the mid-1850s,23 interceded between Titian’s original and Manet’s restaging and reworking of it with a flesh-and-blood model—an approach Manet may already have taken when he copied Boucher’s composition.

But while Manet’s recourse to Titian for the Olympia is well known, celebrated even, his seeming recourse to Boucher in this earlier case has gone unremarked. Indeed, the modern art historian most attentive to eighteenth-century references in Manet’s work has passed over the one eighteenth-century French picture we know for certain that the artist copied from the original. In his groundbreaking reassessment of Manet’s pictorial sources, Michael Fried placed particular emphasis on the French eighteenth century but, for reasons that will emerge below, privileged a proto-Realist current in art of this period, scouring the oeuvres of Watteau and Chardin for potential inspiration while virtually excluding Boucher.24 Of course, Fried is not the only scholar to have shown this inclination. While most art historians today are comfortable considering Watteau’s Gilles as a source for the melancholy boy in white in Manet’s Vieux musicien,25 Chardin’s work as a basis for Manet’s still lifes of fruit and dead game,26 and indeed even Fragonard’s portraits de fantaisie as the inspiration for late works like the airy, luminous Liseuse,27 we are less comfortable on the whole imagining Boucher’s unabashedly sweet, sensuous Diana as a
skill and grace, such a true feeling for the form and curves of women.” Here it is worth recalling that Manet produced his own group of sanguine drawings about 1860 (see, for example, fig. 12), turning to a then rather unusual medium to trace the curves of nude female models. As Louis-Antoine Prat has explained, the young artist’s interest in sanguine seems to date from his travels in the mid-1850s to Italy, where he copied various sixteenth-century works in red chalk, a medium he may then have associated with Andrea del Sarto. But as Manet returned to Paris and moved on to other media, he came back to red chalk again and again for the specific purpose of drawing the female nude. Sanguine’s unique ability to capture “the glow of blood beneath skin” may have informed this choice, but Manet also must have been aware of Boucher’s great achievement in the medium. With their heavy reliance on contour and their light, judicious use of hatching, Manet’s red chalks seem to invite comparison to those of Boucher. Like the figure in the X-radiograph, Manet’s red-chalk nudes may offer a glimpse of the eighteenth-century master through mid-nineteenth-century eyes.

A NEW BOUCHER

Manet was not alone in his attraction to Boucher or to the Louvre’s newly acquired example of his work: other progressive artists of the period admired Diane sortant du bain. Henri Fantin-Latour painted a copy of it,
and Paul Cézanne owned a photograph of it. James McNeill Whistler copied it for an American collector (fig. 13), and Auguste Renoir adapted it for a decorative motif on a dessert service. As Renoir’s monumental Diane of 1867 (fig. 14) and Grandes baigneuses of 1884–87 (fig. 15) attest, Boucher’s picture would exercise a particular fascination over him throughout his career. Indeed, near the end of his life, Renoir confided to the dealer Ambroise Vollard:

I will say, more specifically, that Boucher’s Diana at Her Bath was the first picture that grabbed me, and I’ve continued to love it all my life, as we do our first loves… Boucher remains one of the painters who understood a woman’s body best. … Someone may say to you, “I like a Titian better than a Boucher!” Egad, me too! But, in the end, Boucher made his little women quite pretty! A painter, you see, who has a feeling for bosoms and bottoms is a man saved.

Coming from Renoir, the Impressionist circle’s most devoted painter of the female nude, these (rather vulgar) sentiments may not surprise us; his interest in Boucher’s pictures was unabashedly carnal. Although, like Manet’s copy after Diane sortant du bain, Renoir’s has disappeared, we have less trouble imagining him painting it than we might have imagining Manet painting his. Why this is so has much to do with Boucher’s modern reputation for frivolity and sensuality. These “feminine” qualities are apparently at odds with our understanding of Manet as the painter of heroic Salon pictures, the interrogator of European tradition, the herald of Modernism. But in the 1850s, when Manet made his copy after Boucher—and, most likely, his abortive scaled-up exploration of Diana’s pose—the eighteenth-century master’s modern reputation was still in flux. As a lately “rediscovered” painter of the female nude, Boucher offered a fresh alternative to Titian and Rubens. Diane sortant du bain might have been more than a century old, but, as the first example of its author’s work to hang in the Grande Galerie, it would have seemed to Manet and his friends quite new.

Their enthusiasm for the picture at the time of its acquisition predicted a broader popular success, which
would prove a mixed blessing for Boucher’s art historical fortunes. By 1859, *Diane sortant du bain* was one of the most-copied French paintings in the Louvre, second only to Jean-Baptiste Greuze’s sentimental *Cruche cassée.*44 Such copies, most often executed by modestly paid (and today wholly forgotten) female artists, did not add luster to Boucher’s reputation, contributing instead to an association with superficiality, commercialism, and femininity.45 In their 1867 art-world novel *Manette Salomon,* the Goncourt brothers described their protagonist—the young painter Anatole Bazoché, a character partly based on Manet—observing female copyists at the Louvre:

> He slaked his malice on these living ironies, tossed before masterpieces by hunger, destitution, need, or stubborn persistence in a false vocation. . . . Old ladies, with gray ringlets, stooped over their pink, nude copies after Boucher, with the look of Electo illuminating Anacreon. . . .

What could be further from our heroic vision of Manet, squaring off against Titian and Rubens, than these pitiful creatures, hunched over their copies after Boucher?

### A Painter of Women

By the time Manet, Fantin-Latour, Renoir, and other members of the Realist vanguard flocked to the Louvre to copy *Diane sortant du bain,* critics—both progressive and conservative—had already begun to cast its author as, at best, a minor character in the story of French painting and, at worst, a kind of art historical deviant. In an important series of articles on the French eighteenth century published in 1844, Arsène Houssaye offered what would become a commonplace assessment of Boucher: “Painters of women are liars . . . [and Boucher is] the liar par excellence, the most faithful portrait of his time.”47 Here the artist was made to stand for those aspects of an imagined eighteenth century that Houssaye and his contemporaries found at once most titillating and most morally objectionable. Even as he lamented the absence of a single Boucher from the Grande Galerie—*Diane sortant du bain* would not arrive there for another eight years—Houssaye breathed new life into the Diderotian stereotype of this painter as trivial, mendacious, quintessentially feminine.48

In an influential review of the 1847 Salon, Paul Mantz advanced a similar view. Whereas, he believed, “a few exceptional artists” (notably Watteau and Chardin) had “resisted the evil influences of their time” and persevered in portraying “truth,” Boucher and
Carle Vanloo belonged to a degenerate school; they were the painters of “lies.” Mantz went on to excoriate the contemporary artist Thomas Couture as the leader of a group of supposed “disciples of Vanloo and Boucher,” who shared “a common fault. They wish to please, no matter by what means, they chase after seduction.” Couture’s portrayals in subsequent years of Pierrot, Harlequin, and other characters from the commedia dell’arte would deepen his association with the eighteenth century, but the specific picture Mantz invoked in his 1847 review was the Romain de la décadence, the giant canvas, now in the Musée d’Orsay, that was the talk of that year’s Salon. As the Couture scholar Albert Boime pointed out, this picture’s orgiastic subject alone may have sufficed to invite comparison to Boucher. A supposed penchant for “seduction” and eagerness to please, inherited from Boucher, are hardly qualities we associate with Manet, the famous refusé and teller of hard truths. But here it is surely worth noting that Manet was still the pupil of Couture—Mantz’s modern Boucher—when he painted his copy of Diane sortant du bain in 1852, and conceivably still when he embarked on the seated nude today concealed beneath Mademoiselle V. Did Couture, an artist closely associated with the Rococo revival, encourage his pupil to copy this picture?

Both Houssaye and Mantz were, in their different ways, proponents of the Rococo revival, champions of once-forgotten eighteenth-century artists. But their selective taste in eighteenth-century art helped set the precedent for Boucher’s ultimate exclusion from the Modernist canon. Their writings rehearse a now familiar distinction between the good and truthful eighteenth century—that of Watteau and Chardin—and the bad, deceitful eighteenth century—that of Boucher. It is a distinction deeply inflected with gender, of course, but it was also one soon invested with republican politics: progressive critics lighted upon this distinction as a way to segregate Watteau and Chardin from the supposed aesthetic and political decadence of their contemporaries. Thus, in 1860, when the Galerie Martinet (which would host Manet’s first monographic show three years later) mounted an epochal exhibition of French masters, the ardent republican Théophile Thoré remarked: “Boucher wasn’t much good at the masculine—but his little girls, more or less divine, are delightful. . . . If in the end he is no more than a secondary painter, that is also somewhat the fault of his time. Not everyone, amidst the wild dissolution of the eighteenth century, could have the placid humor and the solid simplicity of Chardin.”

Poor Boucher, it seems, was more to be pitied than censured. Born into an age of “wild dissolution,” what could he do but paint naked “little girls”? A future proponent of Manet’s work (and the key figure for Fried’s stylistic genealogy), Thoré extended special status to Boucher’s sanguine drawings and to his early works, singling out Diane sortant du bain in particular as painted from nature and therefore exempt from the frivolity of its maker’s mature oeuvre. Nevertheless, by the early 1860s, Boucher’s reputation for vacuous, feminine sensuality was already congealing into the stereotype immortalized by the Goncourt brothers in their 1862 monograph: “Le joli: in that lighthearted hour of history, this was the sign & the seduction of France; the essence & formula of her genius; the tone of her morals; the school of her fashions. Le joli: this was the soul of the time—and the genius of Boucher.” Even to these writers—his most ardent nineteenth-century admirers—Boucher was merely the genius of the joli, a painter of fashion and female flesh.

A SOURCE CONCEALED?
Manet was aware of the Goncourts; he almost certainly visited their collection, and by the end of his life he was in possession of their L’art du dix-huitième siècle. He would surely have seen the 1860 exhibition at the Galerie Martinet, in any case, and could well have read Thoré’s review. But at what point might Manet have realized that Boucher’s lately reborn star was already in critical decline? Could the eighteenth-century master’s curdling reputation about 1860 explain the young artist’s decision to paint over the monumental nude? Of course, we do not know precisely when Manet...
began, abandoned, or painted out the figure under Mademoiselle V., though he surely made his lost copy after Boucher first (in February 1852) and then scrapped the whole project before embarking on the bullfighting scene (signed and dated 1862). Several important events took place in the intervening decade of the artist’s life; among them were at least two trips to Italy, where he saw and copied Titian’s Venus of Urbino. The role of that composition in the development of the Olympia suggests that, by the early 1860s, Titian had edged out Boucher as the dominant painter of the nude in Manet’s estimation. Another key event in these years, however, was Manet’s falling-out with his teacher, Couture, so closely associated with Boucher in particular and with the Rococo revival more generally. Manet left Couture’s studio in February 1856—not on the friendliest of terms. If Couture had, in fact, encouraged his pupil to copy Diane sortant du bain, then effacing a nude borrowed from that picture could have been a gesture of renunciation.

Finally, the painting out of the Boucherian nude might also reveal Manet’s early attentiveness to his own place in the story of art; a desire to disassociate himself from the lady copyists of the Louvre and their minor eighteenth-century master; and a determination to establish a nobler pedigree for his own work. Perhaps he had come to recognize that it would no longer do for his explorations of the monumental nude to have begun with Boucher, and, so, while preserving his copy after the Venus of Urbino and enshrining his competitive admiration for Titian in the Olympia, he effectively buried his adaptation of Diane sortant du bain under an emphatically different painting. Mademoiselle V., of course, orient’s author’s practice toward another eighteenth-century artist altogether. Chasing the success that his Hispanophile Chanteur espagnol had achieved at the Salon of 1861, Manet portrayed Victorine Meurent in the costume of a bullfighter, a choice that points straight to Goya. The subject of bullfighting was, in itself, already intimately linked to the Spanish master, and Manet’s various sources for the Metropolitan Museum composition include plate 5 from Goya’s celebrated series of etchings the Tauromaquia, copied verbatim into the right background of the painting.

It was, however, above all Manet’s manner of applying paint to this canvas that invited critics to regard him as Goya reborn. In a review of the 1863 Salon des Refusés—where Manet’s Mademoiselle V. and Majo flanked the Déjeuner sur l’herbe—Thoré asserted, “M. Manet loves Spain, and his favorite master seems to be Goya, whose lively, strident colors, and whose free, spirited touch he imitates.” We cannot know, of course, how the handling and surface of the suppressed nude originally appeared. As models for paint application, however, two hands more different than those of Boucher and Goya can hardly be imagined. Boucher (most especially in early works such as Diane sortant du bain) built up glowing flesh tones with patientl applied glazes; Goya relied more heavily on opaque color, often broadly applied. It was no accident that the nineteenth century’s great Boucher amateur Edmond de Goncourt identified Manet’s new manner, “borrowed from Goya,” of “opaque painting, matte painting, plaster painting” with “the end of oil painting” itself. What might Goncourt have made of the femme déshabillée lurking beneath the opaque surface of the Metropolitan Museum picture?

As an act of art historical camouflage—if it was so intended—Manet’s painting out of this nude would prove extraordinarily successful. Mademoiselle V. is quite obviously a picture about disguise, a scene in which a female model poses en travestie as a male bullfighter. But the canvas itself on which this scene appears may likewise be in some crucial sense en travestie, its sensuous female nude disguised beneath a boldly painted transvestite performer: Diana dressed up as Victorine. Boucher dressed up as Goya. When we see the canvas hanging in the Metropolitan Museum, we think of the virile painterly lineage that Manet plainly wanted us to remember (Titian, Rubens, Velázquez, Goya), not the feminine Rococo one that he may have hoped we would forget.
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NOTES

1 “Il paraît, . . . qu’il faut que je fasse un nu.” Proust 1897, p. 171. “Le
nu est, paraît-il, le premier et le dernier mot de l’art.” Ibid., p. 126.
2 Rouart and Wildenstein 1975 (hereafter RW), I 40.
3 RW II 360, 361, 363, 376, and 377.
4 RW I 67 and 69. On the sequence of Manet’s early nudes and their
place in his career, see “Bathers and Picnics—The Early Nudes,”
in Wilson-Bareau 1886, pp. 26–47. Wilson-Bareau’s use of
X-radiographs to trace the development of Manet’s composi-
tions provides the basis for all subsequent study of this material.
My understanding of the artist’s early interest in the nude is
also indebted to the work of Beatrice Farwell (1975 and 1981).
5 Proust (1897, p. 171) also indicates that Manet made a copy after
Giorgione’s Concert champêtre.
6 “Qui a déshabillé la femme mieux que lui?” Goncourt and
Goncourt 1862, p. 9. As discussed below, Manet eventually
owned a copy of the Goncourts’ collected essays on eighteenth-
century French artists (most likely Goncourt and Goncourt
1873–74, vol. 1, p. 210). See Manet to Georges Charpentier,
summer 1880, and Manet to Isabelle Lemonnier, July or August
1880; both letters are in Wilson-Bareau 1991, p. 253.
7 I have used the title assigned by the Louvre to this picture, which,
in fact, seems to portray the virgin goddess just about to enter,
rather than leave, her bath. See Bailey et al. 1992, pp. 390–95,
no. 45 (entry by Bailey), and Rosenberg et al. 1986, pp. 197–99,
no. 39 (entry by Laing).
8 Scholarship on the early stages of the Rococo revival has prolif-
erated in recent years. See, for example, essays in Vogtherr,
Preti, and Faroult 2014; Faroult 2007a; and Ireland 2006. The
foundational study for any understanding of the Rococo revival
is Haskell 1976, pp. 71–95.
9 Reff 1964, p. 556.
10 See ibid., p. 556n53–54. Manet would most likely have begun
copying works in the Louvre’s collection immediately after he
registered in early 1850, but surviving records of specific
French and Flemish pictures copied cover only the years 1851
to 1871, and those of specific Italian and Spanish pictures cop-
ied cover only the years 1851 to 1859. On the fragmentary
nature of these archives, see Reff 1964 and Dupuy 1993, pp. 46–
47 and 51n37.
11 On this picture’s relationship to Boucher and its early exhibi-
tion history, see Barskaya 1961; Farwell 1975; and Farwell 1981,
p. 29–30, 245–46. As Charles Sterling first demonstrated
(1932), this nude’s more explicit point of reference was an etch-
ing by Lucas Vorsterman of Susanna and the Elders, after Rubens.
Juliet Wilson-Bareau has proposed (1986, p. 30) a further rela-
tionship between La Nymphé surprise and an engraving by Jean-
Baptiste Cornelle of Bathsheba at her toilette, after Giulio
Romano. Wilson-Bareau also provides a more synthetic study of
the metamorphoses of this canvas, which began as a depiction of
the Finding of Moses and, after having been cut down, for many
years included a rather Rococo peeping faun, at right.
12 The painting is RW I 58. The print figured as no. 6 in the por-
tfolio Huit gravures à l’eau forte par Manet, published by Cadart in
October 1862. See Harris 1990, no. 35.
13 Cachin, Moffett, and Melot 1983, p. 113, fig. c, under no. 33
(entry by Moffett). A more complete photograph of the
X-radiograph appears in Wilson-Bareau 1986, p. 31, fig. 31.
16 I thank Charlotte Hale for pointing out this feature in the
X-radiograph.
17 Boucher’s original is just 57 centimeters high (and the figure of
Diana a little more than half as tall!); the canvas for Mademoiselle
V. is 165 centimeters high (with the overpainted nude, again,
slightly more than half as tall).
18 Consider, for example, Edgar Degas’s copy (ca. 1862) after
Nicolas Poussin’s Rape of the Sabines, famously painted in the
Grande Galerie over the course of a year. See Kendall 2009, no. 1.
19 His copy (RW I 9) of Titian’s Jupiter and Antiope, for example,
reduces the composition from 196 × 385 cm to 47 × 85 cm, and
that (RW I 7) of the Venus of Urbino reduces its proportions
from 119 × 166 cm to 24 × 37 cm. More faithful to the scale of
their originals are the copy (RW I 21; 46 × 76 cm) of the so-
called Petits cavaliers (47 × 77 cm), at that time attributed to
Velázquez, and the copy (RW I 6; 61 × 51 cm) of Tintoretto’s
Self-Portrait (63 × 52 cm).
20 I thank Charlotte Hale for clarifying this point.
21 Sterling 1932. On the sources and evolution of this picture, see
also note 11, above.
22 As Anne Coffin Hanson (1977, p. 59) explained, “In all these
instances Manet has apparently been inspired by a pictorial
source and then posed a model following the motif in order to
make that motif truly modern.”
23 RW I 7. Manet made at least two journeys to Italy between 1853
24 Fried 1969; see also Theodore Reff’s 1969 response. Fried’s
thoughts on the subject are explored at greater length in Fried
1996. Boucher’s name figures once in this book-length study,
mistakenly grouped, in an account of Paul Mantz’s 1847 Salon
review, with those eighteenth-century artists the July Monarchy
25 RW I 52. Fried discusses this connection (1969, pp. 29–37), but
I do not share his certainty about various other relationships
between Watteau’s pictures and those of Manet—for example,
L’Indifférérent (Louvre, MI 1122) and the Buveur d’absinthe (RW I 19).
26 On Manet’s interest in Chardin, see Shackelford 2001 and
Stevenson 2007. Foundational work on the subject appears in
McCoubrey 1964.
27 RW I 313. On this picture and its ties to Fragonard, see my entry
in Groom and Westerby 2017– , no. 19 (forthcoming); see also
Cuzin and Salmon 2007, p. 139.
28 Daniel Catton Rich (1932, p. 27) presents an interesting excep-
tion to this rule: “Manet—though he learned from other sources—
must have respected [Boucher’s] memory when he painted the
‘Olympia,’ for like Boucher’s goddesses, she is distinguished by a
fine linear sense.”
29 To borrow Alastair Laing’s turn of phrase (in Rosenberg et al.
1986, p. 199, no. 39, and p. 224, under no. 5). See also
McDonnell 2007. On Manet’s interest in Chardin, see
Shackelford 2001 and Stevenson 2007. Foundational work on the subject appears in
McCoubrey 1964.
30 As Colin Bailey has pointed out (in Bailey et al. 1992, p. 391),
Watteau’s Diane au bain (ca. 1715; Louvre) and Natoire’s
Dorothee surprise au bain (ca. 1735; Palais de Compiègne)
feature related bathers.
31 The drawing’s whereabouts in the nineteenth century are
unknown; it first surfaced in the collection of Maurice Delacre
unknown; it first surfaced in the collection of Maurice Delacre
(see Musée Royal des Beaux- Arts de Belgique 1925, no. 104; see
also Rosenberg et al. 1986, p. 199, under no. 39 [entry by Laing]).
32 “Quoi de plus charmant que ces académies de femmes de
Boucher! [E]lles amusent, elles provoquent, elles chatouillent
le regard. Comme le crayon tourne au pili d’une hanche! Quelles
heureuses accentuations de sanguine mettant dans les ombres
le reflet du sang sous la peau!” Goncourt and Goncourt 1862,
p. 13. Jules de Goncourt made etchings after two such drawings
from the collection he shared with his brother, and one of the drawings was exhibited at the Galerie Martinet in 1860 (see Burty 1860, no. 278: “Femme nue debout, vue de dos tenant une draperie”). See also Launay 1991, especially pp. 232–36, nos. 23–26.

33 “Dans les dessins à la sanguine ou aux trois crayons, Boucher n’a point de rival parmi ses contemporains… Il a le crayon si abondant et si lest, tant de science et tant de grâce, un sentiment si juste de la forme et de la tournure des femmes.” Thoré 1860, p. 346.


35 Self-consciously rejected by most Neoclassical draftsmen, sanguine crept back into favor in France in the mid-nineteenth century, when Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, notably, made use of it in preparations for his large-scale decorative schemes.


37 Reff 1964, p. 555.


39 Whistler applied for permission to copy in 1857; a photograph of

40 On Renoir’s early career as a decorator of porcelain, see Patry 2012.

41 On Renoir’s early and enduring admiration for Boucher and his contemporaries, see Pullins 2012.

42 “Je dirai, avec plus de précision, que la

43 Bailey has addressed these copies after Boucher as an unex-

44 See Marc-Bayeux 1859–60.

45 On the phenomenon of female copyists at the Louvre, see

46 “Il régalait ses malices de toutes ces ironies vivantes jetées au

47 “Les peintres menteurs sont les peintres des femmes… [Boucher est] le meneur par excellence, le portrait le plus fidèle de lui-même.” Houssaye 1864, p. 130.

48 Ibid., p. 177. Diderot’s complete Salons were first published in 1845, though partial editions had been in circulation since the late eighteenth century. Houssaye quoted Diderot’s Salon of 1765 liberally in his assessment of Boucher; see Houssaye 1844, p. 179. According to Proust (1897, p. 125), the Salons of Diderot were assigned reading at the Collège Rollin, and they provoked a strong reaction from the teenage Manet.


51 Georges Jeanniot would later insist that Couture was directly descended from Boucher (if Couture’s master was Gros, then Gros’s master was David, and David’s, Boucher); see Jeanniot 1907, p. 855. The Goncourts, fittingly, admired Couture, though they often lamented his failure to live up to his potential; see Goncourt and Goncourt (1852) 1893, p. 15, where they describe his Bohémienne as “la plus belle chose du Salon.”


53 Manet had entered Couture’s studio by late January 1850, when he registered to copy at the Louvre as a pupil of Couture. He parted ways with his teacher in February 1856.

54 In his 1854 Les peintres des fêtes galantes, Charles Blanc furnished more fodder, retelling a salacious biography of Boucher as a serial womanizer and popularizing Diderot’s witticism, “Cet homme ne prend le pinceau que pour me montrer des nudités!” (emphasis original. “This man only takes up his brush to show me nudities.”). Diderot, “Salon de 1765,” cited in Blanc 1854, p. 72.

55 The exhibition included two hundred paintings and nearly one hundred drawings, among them seventeen pictures and five drawings by Boucher. See Burty 1860, nos. 2–3, 75–86, 277–79, and 290. See also Farout 2007b and Prévost-Marcilhacy 2014.

56 “Boucher n’était pas fort sur le masculin—mais les fillettes plus ou moins divines sont délicieuses…. S’il n’est en définitive qu’un peintre secondaire, ce fut aussi un peu la faute de son temps. Tout le monde n’avait pas, au milieu de la folle dissolution du XVIIIe siècle, l’humeur placide et la solide bonhomie de Chardin.” Thoré 1860, p. 344.

57 Ibid., p. 345.

58 “Le joli,—voilà, à ces heures d’histoire légère, le signe & la séduction de la France. Le joli est l’essence & la formule de son génie. Le joli est le ton de ses moeurs. Le joli est l’école de ses modes. Le joli, c’est l’âme du temps,—& c’est le génie de Boucher.” Goncourt and Goncourt 1862, p. 2.

59 In an October 20, 1880, letter to Félix Bracquemond, Manet

60 Wilson-Bareau 1991, p. 253; see note 6, above.

61 See Meller 2002, pp. 78–79.


63 Here it is worth noting that, when warned by Couture that he would never amount to more than the Daumier of his time, Manet reportedly muttered, “Le Daumier de mon temps, après tout, cela vaut bien d’en être le Coypel,” possibly referring to Charles
Manet’s Boucher

Antoine Coyet, the Rococo history painter and virtuoso pastellist; quoted in Proust 1897, p. 128.

64 RW I 32, The Spanish Singer, MMA 49.58.2.

65 On the picture’s various sources, see Farwell 1969. See also Tinterow et al. 2003, p. 491, no. 139 (entry by Wilson-Bareau); and Cachin, Moffett, and Melot 1983, pp. 110–13, no. 33 (entry by Moffett).

66 RW I 70. Young Man in the Costume of a Majo, MMA, 29.100.3.

67 “M. Manet adore l’Espagne, et son maître d’affection paraît être Goya, dont il imite les tons vifs et heurtés, la touche libre et fougueuse.” Théophile Thoré, “Le Salon de 1863 à Paris” (originally published in L’Indépendance belge, June 11, 1863), in Thoré 1870, vol. 1, p. 424. Just how many of Goya’s pictures Manet could have seen at this point, two years before his first voyage to Spain, has formed the subject of some debate. In a June 20, 1864, letter to Thoré, for example, Charles Baudelaire famously defended Manet from the charge of having pastiched Goya, insisting, “M. Manet n’a jamais vu de Goya [ . . . ].” See Baudelaire 1973, vol. 2, p. 386.

68 “Avec Manet, dont les procédés sont empruntés à Goya, avec Manet et les peintres à sa suite, est morte la peinture à l’huile. . . . C’est maintenant de la peinture opaque, de la peinture mat, de la peinture plâtreuse, de la peinture ayant tous les caractères de la peinture à la colle.” Goncourt, Journal, May 18, 1889 (see Ricatte 1956–58, vol. 14, p. 7). Although Goncourt published these lines in 1889 (six years after Manet’s death), they seem to refer to the artist’s Goyesque output from the 1860s and 1880s by Manet’s admirers in the Impressionist cohort.
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