The Epic and the Intimate

FRENCH DRAWINGS from the JOHN D. REILLY COLLECTION
Acknowledgments

The Snite Museum of Art, University of Notre Dame, takes pride in presenting sixty French highlights from the John D. Reilly ’63 Collection of Old Master and Nineteenth-Century Drawings. The entire Collection of more than 500 sheets was developed over the past twenty-six years through close collaboration between Reilly and Emeritus Curator Stephen Spiro. As a major collection strength of the Museum, it is the basis for ongoing exhibition, teaching, research, and publication.

This particular exhibition, organized by Curator of European Art Cheryl Snay, represents a turning point, as yet another scholar with keen eye, fine connoisseurship skills, and incisive knowledge of European art history begins to mine the Reilly Collection. Her thoughtful drawing selection, elegant installation design, provocative exhibition theme, and insightful labels bode well for continued exploitation of riches to be found within the Collection.

Dr. Snay and I are deeply grateful to Snite Advisory Council Chair John D. Reilly, the hero of this visual epic. With characteristic quiet humility, he generously shares wisdom, time, and resources with his alma mater. Not only is the Snite Museum of Art a beneficiary of his generous spirit and business acumen, but he has also established at Notre Dame the James Reilly Endowment for Excellence in Engineering and the James Reilly Material Production Lab within Stinson-Remick Hall. He has also funded the Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values, which features the John J. Reilly Scholarship and the Reilly Scholars Program.

We also thank the Museum’s exhibition team for overseeing the exhibition installation: Chief Preparator Gregory Denby, Associate Director Ann Knoll, Exhibition Designer John Phegley, and Exhibition Coordinator Ramiro Rodriguez. ND alum, Snite Advisory Council member, and award-winning graphic designer Michael Swoboda has once again designed an elegant exhibition publication. It benefited greatly from the services of Photographer and Digital Archivist Eric Nisly and Editor Sarah Tremblay. Former graduate intern Sophia Meyer was instrumental to the collection and recordkeeping of data essential to this project; we appreciated her precision and good-natured persistence.

In closing, I invite the reader to utilize this publication within the gallery, as a waymarker for the intimate journey Snay has plotted through French drawings of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Bon voyage!

— Charles R. Loving
Director and Curator, George Rickey Sculpture Archive
Before drawing gained its autonomy from painting, sculpture, and architecture in the twentieth century, it was regarded as a means of ordering reality. It was understood to be the fundamental basis of all creative activity. People learned to draw in order to be able to see, to analyze, and to know. Thus, the study of drawings offers us insights into material culture and the history of ideas, including attitudes toward originality, authenticity, and virtuosity.

French drawings are especially revelatory. In 1648 the French government founded the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture (Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture) to control the production and consumption of art, largely for political purposes. The Academy opened schools, appointed instructors, and formed pedagogy. It organized competitions, gave awards, and offered stipends. By holding government-sponsored exhibitions and commissioning large-scale projects, it monopolized the art market. Ultimately, it became the model for many other academies in Europe and North America, ensuring France’s influence on material culture into the early 1900s.

The Snite’s holdings of French drawings comprise about five hundred works, over half of which come from the John D. Reilly ’63 Collection of Old Master and Nineteenth-Century Drawings. The selection on display here offers a concise survey of the history of French drawings, from before the establishment of the Royal Academy through the French Revolution in 1789 and subsequent political upheavals, which led to a new modernity that glorified the individual and the local.

This exhibition introduces the visitor to the range of drawings produced in France, from the grand “machines” that narrate epic history, such as Dorigny’s Sacrifice to Juno or Girodet’s Christ Led from Pilate, to the celebrations of singular, quiet moments, such as Watteau’s seated figure or Daumier’s observation of a woman putting bread in an oven.

— Cheryl K. Snay
Curator of European Art
Michel Dorigny
† 1616 – 1665 Paris

Sacrifice to Juno
ca. 1650–51
red chalk on paper with watermark: Grapes (cf. Heawood 2099)
Promised gift of Mr. John D. Reed, ’63
L1988.010.009

Dorigny is best known for his work in the studio of Simon Vouet (1590–1649). After Vouet’s death, Dorigny did establish his own studio and enjoyed much success, although many of his decorative projects have not survived subsequent wars and the vicissitudes of time. No work related to this drawing has yet been identified.

The subject may give us a clue as to date. Images of sacrifices to Juno often feature Dido (the Queen of Carthage) and the slaughter of a sacrificial animal. Because Juno is the goddess of marriage and childbirth, women are sometimes shown making sacrifices to her on the occasion of their weddings. In the Snite drawing, a large group of women and a few older men celebrate before a sculpture of Juno and her peacock, recessed into a niche. This may be an illustration of a scene from the Thebaid, an epic poem explaining the mythology of the ancient city of Thebes. It is a story of civil war, and the scene shown here may refer to the wives’ celebration in anticipation of their husbands’ return, after news of a successful battle.

If the drawing is by Dorigny, or is at least French, the subject may allude to the conclusion of the Fronde, the French civil war, in 1650/51.
In this intimate bust-length portrait of an old man, spectators can examine in detail the wrinkled brow, thin lips, and frizzy curls of the sitter’s hair and beard. His clothes here give no indication of his status; but a smaller sheet of the same sitter depicted as younger, which is currently on the art market, suggests someone of modest means. This kind of realistic portrait, sensitively observed with no idealization, represents a type of early (before the foundation of the Royal Academy in 1648) French drawing uninformed by Italian or classical models. Rather, the style of this artist, about whom very little is known, has more in common with that of artists from Flanders or The Netherlands, and exhibits an independence and idiosyncrasy unseen in his more cosmopolitan contemporaries.
Vouet is credited with introducing Italian art into the French court before the establishment of the Royal Academy. A gifted portraitist, he traveled to England, Turkey, and later Venice. By 1614 he was in Rome, supported by a pension from the King of France, Louis XIII (reigned 1610–1643). In Rome, Vouet received commissions for both portraits and religious paintings. He journeyed through Italy studying the works of his Italian contemporaries and assimilating the newest trends, including the highly dramatic lighting effects of Caravaggio (1571–1610). In 1627 Louis XIII called him back to Paris to work on decorations for the many new royal residences then being built. Vouet returned to France with an understanding of the grand scale, wild perspectives, dramatic compositions, illusionism, and lively color harmonies he had seen during his fifteen-year stay in Italy.

Vouet established a large studio to help him complete the many commissions he received in Paris for decorating châteaux, townhouses, and churches. In this way, his influence was not only widespread but long lasting. Among his many students and assistants were François Perrier, Pierre Mignard, Michel Dorigny, and Eustache Le Sueur. Perhaps most significant among his followers was Charles Le Brun (1619–1690), who was one of the founders of the Royal Academy in 1648.

The sheet in the Snite Collection may be a study for the figure of Saint Anne for an altarpiece showing an entombment, now lost and known only through an engraving by Pierre Daret (ca. 1604–1678) dated 1639.
Born in the semi-autonomous district of Burgundy in 1594, Perrier was not regarded as French by his peers. In 1624 he traveled to Rome, where he joined the studio of Giovanni Lanfranco (1582–1647), remaining there until his return to France—this time, Lyon—in 1628. Two years later, he was in Paris working as Simon Vouet’s chief assistant on several major commissions. He returned to Rome around 1635. Perrier earned commissions from wealthy Italian families and produced several important print series, including one after antique Roman sculptures. About ten years later, he went back to Paris, where his style shifted once again to accommodate the changing tastes of his clients. It is during this last Parisian phase of his career that the Snite drawing was likely produced.

Perrier is recorded as having addressed the subject of Polyphemus and Galatea on many occasions. This drawing, for which there is no known closely associated painting, is informed by Annibale Carracci’s (1560–1609) composition of the same subject in the Palazzo Farnese, dated 1596–97. Perrier emulates the frontal, leaning positioning of the Cyclops Polyphemus in the left of the composition, and similarly frames the sea nymph Galatea, supported by other nymphs, with a billowing sash. He adds a merman and more nymphs in the lower right corner of the composition and orients it horizontally. In 1645–50 Perrier produced a painting of the subject, now in the Musée du Louvre, reversing the groupings of figures and elaborating on the composition.
Having worked in Florence and Rome early in his career, in 1634 Stella went to France, where he was made painter to the king. He was awarded an overwhelming number of commissions, especially for frontispieces, book illustrations, drawings, and paintings. Stella was a close friend of Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665), with whom he worked while he was in the Eternal City, which has resulted in a confusion of the two artists’ drawings. He also worked with Vouet for a time. Stella’s contribution to French draftsmanship is his synthesis of native northern realism and Italian classicism, and its dissemination in Paris through his many prints and drawings.

This drawing of the Apparition of the Resurrected Christ to the Virgin was once thought to be by the Italian artist Francesco Albani (1578–1660), who completed a commission of just such a subject for the Oratory of San Colombano in Bologna. Guercino (1591–1666) also treated the theme in 1628–30 (Pinacoteca Civica Cento). A painting on alabaster by Stella, now in the Musée du Louvre, reverses the composition of this drawing and has been brought to bear on the problem. That work, however, is more correctly Christ Receiving the Virgin into Heaven, iconographically distinct from his appearance to her after his resurrection, where a book and chair suggest an interruption of her reading. What is also notable is that in all these works, the Virgin and Christ actually embrace. The conventional depiction of this subject kept mother and son apart.
Mignard represents an amalgam of several different trends prevalent in the seventeenth century. Trained in the provinces, he made his way to various art centers to develop his skills. First, he traveled to Fontainebleau to study the work of the Italian mannerists who decorated the château for François I and Henry IV in the sixteenth century. In 1635 he went to Rome and fell under the influence of Bolognese artists. The mannerism of his early style became rounder, more solid and classical. He returned to France and worked in Avignon, steadily producing religious paintings for surrounding churches and monasteries. The figure studies at the Snite were made for an Assumption of the Virgin in the parish church of Mormoirson, seventeen miles northeast of Avignon. After visiting Avignon in 1660, Louis XIV summoned Mignard to Paris, where the artist eventually joined the ranks of the Royal Academy. As a close colleague of Charles Le Brun, First Painter to the King, and one of the founders of the French Academy, Mignard adopted a more severe form of classicism. He focused on portraiture, rather than on the history and religious paintings of his earlier provincial career.

Mignard’s figure and drapery studies are a good example of their type. The limbs are firm and muscular yet retain their grace. The contours are first described in black chalk, then repeated in heavy red chalk. The modeling is articulated with delicate crosshatching, made on the diagonal to follow the contours and then softly blended. The foreshortening of the legs on the recto is well observed and accomplished.
Like many of the other eleven co-founders of the Royal Academy, Le Sueur spent considerable time in the studio of Simon Vouet. Although he came to be known as the “French Raphael” because of his geometric compositions, clear treatment of light, and harmonious use of color, he never traveled to Italy and knew of the Italian renaissance master’s work primarily from prints.

The present drawing is a study for the main figure in *Saint Louis Washing the Feet of the Sick* (ca. 1654, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Tours), painted for the Benedictine Abbey of Marmoutiers near Tours. Figure studies working out the details of proportion, scale, volume, and modeling were an integral part of the creative process, addressed after the composition had been approved. Studies for two other figures in this painting are now in the Musée du Louvre and the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris. Generally, such studies served as guides either for the artists themselves or for their assistants, as they worked on the final canvas.

It was the custom of French kings to wash the feet of the poor on Holy Thursday. In 1609 the Counter-Reformation bishop Francis de Sales (1567–1622) published a book entitled *Introduction to the Devout Life*, which described the tradition in detail.
When Bourdon arrived in Rome in 1634, he worked for a picture dealer. One of his tasks was to copy the work of other popular artists, including Andrea Sacchi (1599–1661), Claude Lorrain (1604–1682), and Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione (1609–1664). Throughout his career, he had a reputation for being stylistically diverse, making it difficult to identify his drawings with any certainty. He worked with Charles Le Brun on a ceiling decoration around 1642, and later in the decade he became one of the co-founders of the Royal Academy. Like Jacques Stella, his manner betrays a northern tendency toward detail and realism, tempered by the classicism of Italian art informed by a study of antique sculpture.

Bourdon treated the subject of the Holy Family with Saint Elizabeth and the infant John the Baptist dozens of times in paintings, drawings, and several prints. The Snite Collection includes just such a painting by the artist. Most of his renditions are in a horizontal format, usually seen from a low vantage point and organized in a pyramidal composition. The Castel S. Angelo, shown in the background of the Snite drawing, appears in several other works by Bourdon, including a painting in the Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection and a print (Robert-Dumesnil L.157.3). No related work has been found for this sketch.
Sébastien Le Clerc, the elder
Metz 1637 – 1714 Paris

Saints Quiricus and Julitta Led to Martyrdom
red chalk and red wash on laid paper, laid down
Promised gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, ’63
L1991.083.005

Le Clerc was a brilliant printmaker. Producing over 3,100 engravings and etchings, he was renowned for the quality of his draftsmanship, execution, and impressions. When he arrived in Paris in 1664/65, he joined the studio of Charles Le Brun. By 1672 he was accepted into the Royal Academy, where he taught drawing, geometry, and perspective. His *Traité de géometrie théorique et pratique* first appeared in 1668, was published in subsequent editions throughout the eighteenth century, and was translated into English in 1727.

This drawing could have been made in preparation for one of Le Clerc's many book illustrations, print series, or a tapestry, although a related work has yet to be found. The subject shows the fourth-century mother and son in Tarsus (south-central Turkey) before their martyrdom.
This drawing was made in preparation for a cycle of paintings decorating the bedroom ceiling of Queen Anne of Austria’s winter apartments at the Louvre. The subject of Juno, the queen of the ancient gods, was an apt allegory for the Queen of France, who had survived France’s civil war, the Fronde. Queen Anne ended her regency of France in 1651, when her son Louis XIV reached the age of majority and assumed the throne.

The drawing is squared for transfer, a technique artists used to transfer a design from a small sheet of paper, where the composition has been determined, to a larger support (either canvas or a wall of fresco). After creating a grid on the painting surface with the same number of squares but in a larger scale, assistants copied each section exactly, thereby ensuring the accuracy of the master’s design in the final product.
Charles de la Fosse represents a notable shift in style from the strict geometry and classicism of his predecessors Charles Le Brun and Nicolas Poussin. La Fosse worked with Le Brun on the extensive decorations for the château at Versailles and earned the favor of many aristocratic patrons. The present drawing is a study for one of a pair of pendant paintings commissioned by the Duke of Montagu, the British ambassador to the French court from 1675 to 1699. The duke later called La Fosse to London to decorate his home there.

In La Fosse's drawing style, color becomes more important than line for his conception of form. This is well demonstrated in the Snite piece, where the artist uses blue paper and three colors of chalk (black, red, and white) to articulate rhythm and movement even more so than structure. Even in repose, the figure communicates an energy and dynamism that signals the dramatic narrative unfolding in the sixteenth-century poet Tasso’s epic *Jerusalem Liberated.*
This is an early version of the composition for a painting that was commissioned by Louis XIV for the Grand Salon at the Château of Marly. It differs from the final painting in some of its details, but the inscription of the size at the bottom confirms that it was part of this project. The drawing shows a continuing development toward lightness and color. While still idealized, the figures are less classically influenced than in earlier works, with rounded features and tapering limbs that will become a hallmark of the subsequent rococo style inspired by La Fosse’s art.
When it came into the Museum's collection in 1993, this drawing was attributed to François Boitard (ca. 1670–ca. 1715), Louis-Philippe’s father. A similar fan-shaped drawing by Louis-Philippe depicting putti making wine is in the collection of the British Museum; that piece is signed “Boitard 196” in the lower left corner and inscribed “3097” in graphite on the reverse. The Snite sheet is in keeping with the more frivolous subject matter and lighter touch associated with Louis-Philippe and his rococo contemporaries William Hogarth (1697–1764) and Hubert François Bourguignon Gravelot (1699–1773), rather than with the somber content and firm handling of his father’s generation.

Louis-Philippe Boitard was an engraver and illustrator based in London, whose first prints can be dated to the mid-1730s. He is known to have worked with British artist Joseph Baudin (ca. 1691–1753), supplying him with fan designs such as the Snite example and the sheet in the British Museum—work that Baudin is recorded as having given up by 1742.
Verdier represents the second generation of academic artists. He attended classes at the Royal Academy and worked with Charles Le Brun on decorations for the Louvre, among his many other official commissions. In 1684 he was appointed professor at the Royal Academy. Based on the antique, his compositions are heroic and grand, if formulaic, befitting the royal and church commissions he received.

No related work for the scene depicting the loaves and fishes has been found. However, a print of the Ascension, albeit in a different arrangement, engraved by Jean-Baptiste Haussard (1679/80–1749) records a design by Verdier of that subject. Whether the Snite drawing is directly linked to the print is unclear.
This is an early sketch for the composition of Bacchus and Ariadne commissioned by Philippe I, Duke of Orléans, for a private chamber in his St. Cloud château. In the final painting (now at the Philadelphia Museum of Art), the two main groups of figures—Bacchus and Ariadne to the left, and a satyr and nymph seated on the ground to the right—remain intact, but most of the other putti and nymphs have been rearranged significantly. The function of this drawing is to set the rhythm and movement and to identify the placement of the major characters. Coypel also uses the red chalk to help map out the color blocks, further developing the dynamism of the finished work. While the details are obscure, the drawing nevertheless communicates the energy and tension inherent in the subject.
As the son of a director of the French Academy in Rome, a division of the Royal Academy where students studied at the government’s expense, Antoine Coypel grew up among artists and studied the riches of ancient and renaissance art found throughout the city. When his family returned to Paris after his father’s tenure as director ended, Antoine entered the Royal Academy himself.

This drawing is a preliminary sketch for an overdoor decoration for the Grand Trianon at Versailles.
Gillot was accepted into the Royal Academy in 1715 based on his religious painting *The Death of the Virgin* (now lost). However, he is best known for his prints and drawings of the theater, fairs, and other leisure activities of the well-to-do, not for serious subjects from religion, history, or mythology. His most famous students were Antoine Watteau and Nicolas Lancret, both of whom are represented elsewhere in the galleries.

Upon Gillot’s death in 1722, an inventory of the artist’s belongings listed a “carton of drawings for the *Life of Jesus Christ*,” among other drawings. The series of sixty scenes was published as prints by Gabriel Huquier (1695–1772) before 1740. The Snite drawing was the source for the print showing John the Baptist pouring water over Christ’s head, while the Holy Spirit descends from above, surrounded by angels and cherubs.
Antoine Watteau
Valenciennes 1684 – 1721 Paris

A Man Leaning against a Pillar
ca. 1709-10
red chalk on laid paper, laid down
Gift of Mr. John D. Rockey, ’63
2006.069.034

Seated Woman
ca. 1717
red chalk on laid paper
Gift of Mr. John D. Rockey, ’63
2004.053.003

Nicolas Lancret
Paris, 1690 – Paris, 1743

Study of Magistrates
ca. 1724
red chalk on laid paper
Gift of Mr. John D. Rockey, ’63
2004.053.009

Working well within the academic paradigm established in the seventeenth century, Watteau began a trend away from classicism and toward delicacy and light, apparent here in his treatment of the individual figure. Gone are the heavy limbs and heroic gestures of antique sculpture. Instead, fashionable men and women lounge and lean casually, often in park-like settings or sumptuous domestic interiors. They rarely look directly at the spectator, but tilt their heads coquily or demurely to the side, their gaze averted. Rather than the geometric handling of form and the planar arrangement of space embraced by artists such as Vouet and Dorigny, we see broken contours, short jagged strokes, and uneven modeling of light and shade.

Watteau studied with Claude Gillot when he arrived in Paris, and he was clearly influenced by his master’s interest in the theater and other leisure-time activities. Although he had only one student, Nicolas Lancret, he had many imitators, making it difficult to distinguish the work of different artists.

The three figure studies on exhibit here were all made for prints or paintings. They became highly collectible among wealthy amateurs, who delighted in their display of elegance and grace.
Best known as a painter of animals, hunting scenes, and still lifes, Oudry started his career as a portraitist in the vein of his master, Nicolas de Largillière (1656–1746), with whom he began studying in 1705. Like many of his peers, he followed the trend set by Antoine Watteau of creating elegant fêtes galantes, scenes of the well-to-do frolicking outdoors.

This is a design for a tapestry produced by the Gobelins factory. It depicts three richly dressed couples playing the game of hot cockles, in which one player kneels with his head in the lap of another, covering his eyes, while he holds his hand behind his back. Another player slaps or touches the outstretched hand, and the object is for the kneeling player to guess who has struck him. The game is rife with flirtation and sexual tension. Scenes such as these would become the subject of much criticism by later generations of artists, who saw in them decadence and a lapse of morals associated with the court of Louis XV (reigned 1715–1774).
François Lemoyne  
Paris 1688 – 1737 Paris  

The Goddess Pallas  
ca. 1737  
black chalk with white heightening on blue laid paper, laid down  
Gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, 63  
1996.070.026  

Diana the Huntress  
red and black chalk heightened with white on tan laid paper  
Promised gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, 83  
L.2001.057.001  

Although he adopted the figure style and color harmonies made fashionable by Watteau, Lemoyne eschewed the light-hearted subject matter of the fête galante, aspiring instead to the elevated themes of history, mythology, and religion. In fact, he was one of two winners in a competition held by Louis XV’s administration in 1727 to promote history painting. The king subsequently awarded him commissions to decorate rooms in the château at Versailles, and finally, in 1736, Lemoyne was appointed First Painter to the King. Despite these successes, the artist committed suicide in what was described as a fit of depression.

The Snite drawing of the goddess Pallas (Athena) was produced in anticipation of a commission to decorate the Hôtel de Soubise, a mansion in Paris belonging to the Rohan family that became the paragon of the rococo style. The design was never executed, however, as the project ultimately went to another artist.

Despite the abstraction and mannerism characteristic of eighteenth-century style, the human figure remained the basis for all art. Nude figure studies drawn from life, such as Lemoyne’s Diana the Huntress, continued to be an integral part of the creative process.
Restout was the nephew and student of Jean-Baptiste Jouvenet (1644–1717), and his work has long been confused with that of his uncle. This sheet was once attributed to the elder artist, but has since been reconsidered in light of new evidence. Unlike many of his peers, Restout never traveled or studied in Italy. Any connection with Italian art came by way of his uncle. A member of the Royal Academy, Restout occasionally taught there. In 1755 he read his essay *The Principles of Painting* at the Academy.

Restout's draftsmanship, while accomplished, displays the lighter and gentler manner associated with the mid- to late eighteenth century. While his contemporaries were developing this new style in smaller easel paintings focusing on erotic or lighthearted subject matter, Restout continued in the tradition of a serious history painter, focusing instead on religious commissions, ancient history, and mythology. Although a specific project related to these figure studies has not yet been identified, it is clear from their dramatic foreshortening and perspective that they were meant for a ceiling painting, altarpiece, or overdoor.
Natoire was appointed director of the French Academy in Rome in 1751, and was one of its longest-serving directors. He had significant influence on many artists who passed through the Academy during his tenure, including Jean-Honoré Fragonard and Hubert Robert. Within a few years of becoming director, Natoire gave up painting almost entirely and focused on reforms to drawing pedagogy.

One of the first commissions he received upon arriving in Rome to assume his new position was for the Apotheosis of Saint Louis XIII for the church of Saint Louis des Français. As has been observed in earlier studies of this drawing, it does not seem to correlate to the finished project, as the composition is quite different. Whether this was an early and ultimately rejected proposal is unclear. Natoire did not treat the subject again, and this drawing does not seem to be a copy after anyone else’s work.
A student of François Lemoyne and a rival to Natoire, Boucher was the primary proponent of the erotic, light-hearted, frivolous style that dominated the eighteenth century. In 1723 he won the Grand Prix de Rome—the coveted student prize awarded by the Academy, which allowed the winner to train in Rome. After a delay of several years, Boucher finally claimed his scholarship and studied there for four years.

By 1759, when this drawing was made, Boucher had been named director of the Gobelins tapestry factory and was the favored artist of Mme. de Pompadour (1721–1764), the mistress of Louis XV. It was she who asked Boucher to design a frontispiece for a new edition of Pierre Corneille’s play Rodogune, which she subsequently tried to etch herself. This etching was finished by Charles-Nicolas Cochin II (1715–1790) and published in 1760. The Snite drawing is a figure study in reverse for the group at the right of a scene taken from act 5 of the play. After drinking the poison cup she prepared for her son and his new bride, Rodogune, Queen Cleopatra collapses into the arms of her servant, Laonica. Another drawing showing the composition is at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, along with the finished print.
The subjects of these drawings are taken from Ovid’s epic poem *Metamorphoses*. In one scene, Mercury has decapitated Argus, the giant with a hundred eyes. Juno holds the severed head and transfers his eyes to the tail of her peacock, giving it its distinctive plumage. The subject of Juno and Argus was a popular one throughout the renaissance and baroque periods. Boucher’s treatment of the subject, however, bears none of the conventional sobriety of those earlier depictions; instead, it seems light and buoyant, with fluttering putti animating the scene. Although Boucher depicted many versions of this story throughout his career, this drawing has not been related directly to any of them, making it difficult to date.

In the second drawing, Boucher’s fascination with Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* is again on display. Here, the wind god Boreas abducts the nymph Oreithyia, who has rejected his amorous advances. Boucher produced both a tapestry (1749) and a painting (1769) of the subject, but the Snite drawing does not correlate closely to either of these projects.
Arriving in Paris about 1751, Greuze studied drawing at the Royal Academy with Natoire, before the latter left to take the directorship of the French Academy in Rome. Greuze earned his fame (or infamy, depending on the critic’s point of view) for combining the moralizing narratives characteristic of history painting with the lowly subject matter of genre painting, using the dynamic, light style made fashionable by artists such as Boucher.

Bordering on melodrama, Greuze’s stories teaching life lessons were much admired by the philosopher, critic, and author of the *Encyclopédie* Denis Diderot (1713–1784). The Snite sheet is a study for a finished drawing called *The Reconciliation*, which is a pendant to another drawing entitled *The Angry Wife* (*The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York*). The serial treatment of the subject, the frieze-like arrangement of the figures across the picture plane, and the exaggerated gestures and facial expressions remind the spectator of the thin line between the pictorial arts and theater. Greuze’s oeuvre, of which the Snite drawing is a good example, signals a debate unfolding among eighteenth-century philosophers over Horace’s dictum ut pictura poesis (As in art, so in poetry).
Jean-Honoré Fragonard
Grasse (Alpes-Maritimes) 1732 – 1806 Paris

Orrilo Retrieves His Own Head
ca. 1780
black chalk and brown wash on laid paper with watermark: RM
Gift of Mr. John D. Reddy, 63
1991.053

Fragonard studied with François Boucher. He entered and won the Grand Prix de Rome in 1752, but did not go to the city until 1756. In 1765 he was made a member of the Academy, and the painting he exhibited that year in the Salon made him an overnight sensation. Instead of pursuing a career as a history painter, however, Fragonard focused on decorative paintings of love and happiness. Critics lamented his rejection of the system and felt he had betrayed his talent. But Fragonard’s freedom of execution, loose and dynamic brushwork, and bright color harmonies appealed to his middle-class patrons.

The Snite piece is characteristic of the artist’s invention, verve, and facility. This is one of 160 drawings Fragonard produced to illustrate the sixteenth-century author Ariosto’s epic poem Orlando Furioso. It depicts canto 15, verse 71, the battle among Aquilante, Grifone, and Orrilo.
A contemporary of Fragonard, Doyen followed the career path expected for the younger artist. When Doyen went to Rome to study, he was inspired by the large mural paintings of the Italian artists Raphael and Domenichino, and he aspired to become a history painter in the grand manner. He produced many large-scale canvases depicting momentous scenes from history and mythology. During the French Revolution, he became involved in trying to save many works of art from destruction, and he helped to found the first museum in the convent of the Petit Augustins. On receiving an invitation from Catherine II of Russia to work for her in St. Petersburg, he left Paris in 1792.

The Snite drawing may be an early compositional study for a painting now in the Musée de Cambrai. It appears fully conceived and rendered, but there are significant differences between this work—with its compact and vertical arrangement—and the finished painting, which adopts a horizontal orientation and spreads the action more liberally across the picture plane.
Pajou was a sculptor and draftsman of considerable note in the eighteenth century. He was awarded the Grand Prix de Rome in 1752 and spent much of his time there, as did all the pensionnaires, copying the antique. In 1777 he was appointed Keeper of the King’s Antiquities. After the French Revolution and the establishment of the First Republic, he was made a member of the commission overseeing the conservation of monuments. In 1795 Pajou resumed his post as keeper of antiquities.

This highly finished drawing of an antique sculpture signals its importance to the Academy. The process for teaching artists to draw the human figure involved a series of steps. First, artists were asked to draw using a print as a model. After becoming proficient at that exercise, they copied antique sculptures or casts of sculptures. Only after mastering that step were they allowed to draw from the live model. From antique sculpture, students were meant to learn proportion, harmony, and ideal beauty, so that when they were confronted with a live model, they could identify what was essential and ignore superfluous details and flaws.
David's impact on art in France cannot be overemphasized. Along with François-André Vincent, he was a student of Joseph-Marie Vien, and his name became synonymous with neoclassicism. His years as a student at the Royal Academy were troubled, and he failed on several attempts at the Grand Prix de Rome. Eventually he won, and he traveled to Rome with Vien in 1775, when the latter replaced Natoire as director of the French Academy there. David was also active politically during the French Revolution and its aftermath. In 1792 he served as a Deputy to the Convention and aligned himself with Maximilien Robespierre (1758–1794). His earlier experiences with the Royal Academy led him to join with others in calling for its dissolution, replacing it with the Institut de France, which essentially served the same function but was reorganized to reflect the new democratic principles of the Republic.

The earliest drawing by David in the Snite's collection is from a sketchbook the artist used during his first trip to Rome, from 1775 to 1780. The inscription at the bottom identifies the model as an antique sculpture in the Stanza del Tore, in the Palazzo Farnese. The other two drawings relate to a painting celebrating revolutionary fervor entitled *The Triumph of the French People*. In these figure studies, the evolution of David's approach to the human form is evident. He reverts to the conventional technique of defining contours and then suggesting weight and form by modeling. In the later drawings, the figure is reduced to its geometric essence.
Prud’hon was, and continues to be, most admired for his draftsmanship. His works tend to be less heroic than his contemporaries’ neoclassical machines. They also display a greater interest in and sensitivity to psychological states and relationships. The subtlety of his modeling is both well observed and seductive, owing something to his studies of Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), after whom Prud’hon named himself, and Pietro da Cortona (1596–1669).

The rendering of the nude human figure from life was so foundational to an artist’s education and subsequent career that it became synonymous with the Academy itself; drawings such as this are known as ‘academies.’ The Snite study is a stunning example by the premier draftsman of the romantic era. Prud’hon starts with a confident, unbroken contour—more emphatic around the arms and shoulders, and softer around the ribcage. Light and shade are controlled with a variety of techniques: marking definitive strokes with black chalk; blending the chalk with a stump; erasing or removing some of the chalk, as around the collar bone; and adding white chalk as a highlight in the figure’s arms.
Guérin was an admirer of Jacques-Louis David and a second-generation neoclassicist. He won the Prix de Rome in 1797 but did not claim his prize until 1801, by which time he had already established himself as a successful artist through the Salons. After only twenty-two months in Rome, he returned to Paris, where he produced paintings glorifying the regime of Napoleon I (reigned 1801–1814/15). In 1822 he was appointed director of the French Academy in Rome, and in 1828 he returned to Paris. Among his most influential and successful students were Eugène Delacroix and Théodore Géricault.

Unlike the figure drawing by Prud’hon, Guérin’s academy is severe in its approach. With it, Guérin displays his extensive knowledge and understanding of anatomy, which came from the dissections students were obligated to attend in school. Any attempt to depict a psychological state of mind is reduced to the formulaic tête d’expression (expressive head) that had been codified by Charles Le Brun in the seventeenth century, upon the foundation of the Royal Academy.
A student of Charles-Joseph Natoire in Paris, Vien won the Grand Prix de Rome in 1743. After one unsuccessful attempt to join the Royal Academy, he was accepted in 1751; later in the decade, he became a professor there. He is best known for having taught Jacques-Louis David, the primary proponent of the neoclassical style at the end of the century. It was, in fact, Vien who wanted to revive the classicism of the previous century’s masters. He did so inconsistently, though, alternating between a severe, archaeologically informed style and a more robust and dynamic baroque manner.

Produced at the height of the French Revolutionary Wars (1793–95), this is one of twenty drawings Vien made depicting the consequences of armed conflicts. Contemporary events are disguised as ancient history: With the archaeological excavations that had begun in the 1740s and ’50s in Herculaneum and Pompeii, among other sites, an interest in details of armor, costume, and buildings grew. Vien has not yet simplified his composition in the frieze-like arrangement characteristic of neoclassicism; his figures overlap one another in a confused jumble, although the pyramidal platform in the center serves to organize the space. Light is spread fairly evenly across the surface.
Along with Jacques-Louis David, Vincent studied under Vien. He won the Grand Prix de Rome in 1768, and spent the years 1771–75 under the tutelage of Natoire. Although his early work is sometimes confused with that of Fragonard, his contribution to the development of style in the eighteenth century was as a proponent of neoclassicism, and in this respect he became a rival of David. Vincent’s objective was to revive history painting in a grand and serious manner, and to do so he focused on scenes of ancient history rendered in a severe style reminiscent of Raphael and Charles Le Brun.

The present drawing, which is squared for transfer, is all that remains of one of Vincent’s most important commissions, negotiated by the Comte d’Angiviller in 1782 on behalf of Louis XVI. Exhibited at the Salon of 1783, the finished painting was later on deposit at Lons-le-Saunier until 1900, when it was destroyed. A tapestry after the same design was never executed.
This is a charming example of the neoclassical portrait drawings made popular at the turn of the century by Jacques-Louis David. The nondescript background and the chair inspired by ancient antiquities, in addition to the hairstyle à la grecque and the diaphanous dress, signal a fashionable woman enjoying a tender moment with her child.

Pierre Guérin
Paris 1774 – 1833 Rome
A Mother and Child
ca. 1800
black chalk, heightened with white chalk, on brown paper
Promised gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, ’63
L2007.014.001
Auzou became a student of Jean-Baptiste Regnault (1754–1829), a neoclassical artist and a rival of David, before 1793. She first exhibited in the Salon of 1793 and continued to do so until 1817. Despite getting married and having children, she continued her career, even maintaining a studio for women for twenty years. She was best known as a portraitist, but later expanded her portfolio to include sentimental genre and history scenes. In the early 1800s, she fell under the influence of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres’s flat and linear style.

The Snite drawing retains the sfumato of Auzou’s early style, before her discovery of and admiration for Ingres. This, in addition to the distinctive scarf and bodice of the sitter’s costume, suggests a date of circa 1790.
Having first studied with the architect Étienne-Louis Boullée (1728–1799), and later joining David's studio in 1783/84, Girodet immediately responded to the neoclassical style. He won the Prix de Rome in 1789 but could not claim his prize until 1790, when the turbulence of the Revolution subsided and travel became less dangerous. Like David, Girodet was an avid republican, and he recorded the events of the Revolution in a series of drawings. Nevertheless, he also executed a commission for a religious painting for a Capuchin convent in the same year—an oddity, considering the anticlerical attitude of most republicans.

The present drawing, which has not been linked to any finished work by the artist, demonstrates the principles of neoclassicism convincingly. Although the scene is crowded, the figures are arranged in a frieze-like composition, with a pyramidal structure roughly in the center. Girodet’s confidence in rendering the human figure in its infinite variety is admirable. The lack of nobility in the central figure of Christ may be due to the revolutionaries’ ambivalence toward religious figures. This was a period in French history when churches were desacralized and the clergy persecuted.
With Ingres, we see a new trajectory of French draftsmanship. His emphatic use of line, his denial of form and weight, and his subjugation of content to the expressive potential of the graphic medium distinguish him from his predecessors. Ingres considered himself the rightful heir of his master, Jacques-Louis David, and was the archrival of Eugène Delacroix. In both of the studies shown here, he flattens the space and denies the corporeality of the figures. The subjects become an excuse to create pattern. In *Saint Symphorien*, for example, the complex of drapery folds and raised arms combine to convey the sensation of floating. Although he was a member of the Academy, Ingres received criticism for the liberties he took with anatomy and for the spatial anomalies in his compositions.
Géricault tried to mediate between the competing styles and ideologies that contemporary artists had developed in the tumultuous years of the Revolution, Empire, and Restoration. He attempted to revive a grand manner that adequately portrayed contemporary life. Géricault’s artistic training was unusual for the period. Financially secure as the result of an inheritance, he was essentially self-taught. Carle Vernet (1758–1836) briefly gave him access to his studio, but did not provide any systematic instruction. The young artist then joined Pierre Guérin’s studio, where he found the instruction too rigorous and stifling. Next, Géricault went to the Louvre, where he selected unusual (for the time) models to copy. He learned sensuous brushwork and rich color from old masters such as Rembrandt, Rubens, and Salvator Rosa.

Géricault’s attraction to baroque artists is apparent in this sketchbook page. While the anatomy is exaggerated and the foreshortening unconvincing, the sheet does show the artist’s mastery of movement and his skill at using color and light, rather than line, to create form.
Like Géricault, Delacroix passed through Guérin’s studio and subsequently went to the Louvre to copy, generally choosing more traditional models (Raphael, Titian, and Veronese) than his rebellious colleague. Delacroix was the counterpoint to Ingres and eschewed the cold, severe style of neoclassicism, although he did accept the mantle of “history painter.” Drawing remained an important part of his creative process throughout his career, and he continued to develop figure studies even as a composition progressed.

Delacroix kept many sketchbooks with figure drawings like the Snite’s. Without the notations that occasionally occur on the pages, it is difficult to determine whether the sketches are copies after other artists’ works or inventions for one of his own commissions. In the case of the Snite drawing, however, three of the figures can be related to Delacroix’s *Entry of the Crusaders into Constantinople* (1840, Musée du Louvre, Paris).
Daumier trained as a lithographer and worked for publishers of weekly journals of political satire. As a liberal, the artist took aim at King Louis-Philippe (reigned 1830–1848), producing inflammatory caricatures of the monarch. This landed him in jail and caused the regime to pass strict censorship laws curtailing criticism of the government.

Under Daumier’s vigorous and immediate draftsmanship lies a respect for traditional academic values. Contour and line are paramount, and an understanding of anatomy is obvious in the accomplished foreshortening of this peasant woman’s torso and forearms. Through an economy of means, with no modeling or hatching at all, Daumier suggests both form and weight. Despite the figure’s rough appearance, Daumier invests her with a grace and dignity rivaling the history painters of his generation.
Edgar Degas
Paris 1834 – 1917, Paris

Study of a Jockey
ca. 1866
graphite and black chalk heightened with white on brown wove paper, squared for transfer
Gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, ’63
2004.013.005

Degas was admired as a superior draftsman. His study of a jockey finds some affinity with drawings by David and Ingres of historical heroes and saints, though Degas applies their approach to scenes of modern life instead. Analytical and geometric in his treatment of the human figure, he shows deference for the power of line over color. The Snite piece is related to a painting of a steeplechase, which was exhibited at the Salon of 1866 and is now in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. The immediacy of the drawing suggests it may have been made from life.
Bonvin was a proponent of the new realist school of painting headed by Gustave Courbet (1819–1877) and Édouard Manet (1832–1883). He started his career as a decorative artist but gradually migrated to painting, where he focused on still lifes and genre scenes. His dark paintings of simple subjects were compared favorably with the eighteenth-century painter Jean-Siméon Chardin (1699–1779), and he enjoyed some early success in the Salons. Nevertheless, he and some friends, including the American artist James McNeill Whistler (1834–1903) and Henri Fantin-Latour (1836–1904), were rejected from the Salon of 1859, prompting Bonvin to organize a protest exhibition in his own studio—four years before the more famous Salon des Refusés.

The Reilly sheet is a good example of Bonvin’s finished drawings from this period. Tonally rich and volumetric, it depicts a simple subject subtly arranged in an austere setting. All things Spanish were in vogue at midcentury, partly inspired by Eugénie de Montijo, Napoleon III’s wife, who was born in Granada, Spain.
Landscapes
Before the 1600s, there was very little demand for landscape pictures in France, and what demand there was came from the lower nobility, clergy, and merchants. Claude Lorrain, who spent his entire career in Rome, contributed significantly to the genre’s increasing popularity and acceptance as a worthwhile subject matter. Landscapes fell into two categories: heroic and pastoral. Claude was a proponent of the latter, of which the present drawing is a good example. Pastoral landscapes feature expansive views populated by shepherds, nymphs, or hunters. The mythological subject of this drawing, Venus and Adonis, is taken from Ovid and is extraordinarily rare in Claude’s work. Without the inscription in the corner, the subject would have been unidentified.

Because landscapes were deemed less significant than figural narratives, there was less of an expectation that they depict “reality” or conform to any kind of artistic standards. Additionally, the medium of pen and ink was considered appropriate only for artists’ personal notations and studies, not for finished works. Thus liberated from artistic constraints, Claude was free to explore the expressive potential of the natural world. His imaginative and intellectualized compositions became highly desirable in the late 1600s.
Jean-Baptiste Oudry
Paris 1686 – 1755 Beauvais

A View of the Park at Arcueil
ca. 1745
black chalk heightened with white on blue-gray laid paper
Promised gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, ‘63
L2001.057.002

Drawn nearly one hundred years after Claude Lorrain’s Venus and Adonis, Oudry’s landscape shows a remarkable shift in the approach to nature. This is considered a "finished" drawing and could conceivably have been exhibited at a Salon, as were other views of Arcueil by Oudry. Although completed in the artist’s studio, it was initially sketched outdoors in front of the motif. It is a record of a specific place that would have been well known to Oudry’s audience, rather than entirely imaginative and intellectualized like the landscapes of Claude.

The park at Arcueil, on the outskirts of Paris, was owned by the Duc de Guise. By the time Oudry drew his large series of landscapes there (more than one hundred were recorded in sales, although only fifty are extant today), it had begun to fall into disrepair. This romanticized view, entirely devoid of people, shows nature reclaiming the parterres, alleys, and grand staircases that suggest a passing era.
As director of the French Academy in Rome, Natoire advised his students, including Hubert Robert and Fragonard, to go out into the countryside and draw en plein air (outdoors). Although these drawings were taken back to the studio for further development, they served to inject a sense of freshness into the practitioners’ completed works.

The inscription on this sheet identifies the location and date of Natoire’s view. In a letter dated May 25, 1766, the artist mentioned that he and his sister "had just passed a few days in the country near Rome . . . which is called Valmontone on the way to Naples passing by Montecassino. . . . The vantage points there are most agreeable and very picturesque, which inspires many ideas." A very similar drawing appeared on the art market in 1996, identifying the location more specifically as the Casino of Don Maffeo Barberini at Valmontone.
Claude-Joseph Vernet
Avignon 1714 – 1789 Paris

A Wooded River Landscape
black chalk and gray wash on laid paper with countermark iv
Gift of Mr. John D. Reilly, ’63
2006.069.021

Vernet belonged to a family of artists and made his mark as a painter of landscapes and marine views. He was well known among provincial patrons, one of whom sponsored his 1734 trip to Rome to complete his education. Among the artists whom Vernet set about studying was Claude Lorrain. From Claude, he learned to make idealized and picturesque views. Vernet stayed in Italy until about 1753, building an international clientele among the many visitors on Grand Tour, who sought souvenirs of their trips.

While highly popular, Vernet’s scenes carry no moral message and make no pretense to any intellectual content. Interestingly, the architectural motifs in the Snite example are the framing device for the large tree at the center, reversing the conventional formula. In Vernet’s compositions, the weather is always calm, the light soft and even, and the requisite peasants untroubled.
When Robert arrived in Rome in 1754, initially under private sponsorship, Natoire—then director of the French Academy in Rome—described the young artist as already having a “taste for architecture.” Robert combined that interest with Natoire’s encouragement to draw from nature, creating a distinctive style of picturesque landscape images. At about the same time, the Italian printmaker Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720–1778) started publishing his popular series of monumental views—some fantastical—of Rome, which also had an impact on Robert.

These examples of the artist’s red chalk drawings are representative of his style and skill. The handling is sure and confident; the perspectives are bold; the scale is dramatic. By cropping the edges of the monuments and showing only fragments of them, Robert increases their theatricality. He heightens their internal tension by making unexpected juxtapositions—for example, the elephant head in the fountain, with the headless statue to the left; or the antique Roman column cast in shadow, with the modern domed church in full sun.
From the time of his study in Rome under Natoire, beginning in 1756, gardens—that is, controlled nature—attracted Fragonard’s interest. He returned to them for inspiration throughout his career, and they recur in many of his paintings. The present example is linked to a wash drawing in the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Besançon, although the location of this garden is not identified.

Two vigorously drawn umbrella trees dominate the foreground and, with the staircase at the right, help to frame the gate in the center of the composition. Statues on pedestals echo the verticality of the posts and form the perspective that leads to the gate. The successful synthesis of rationally organized space with an immediate and energetic response to nature reveals Fragonard’s mastery of landscape.
A student of Gabriel Doyen, Valenciennes made two trips to Italy, on the second occasion staying for about seven years. He met Claude-Joseph Vernet, who encouraged him to make many sketches out of doors. Shortly after his return to Paris in 1785–86, he became a member of the Royal Academy, submitting landscapes to the Salons until his death in 1819.

Valenciennes’ landscapes are neoclassical in nature, hearkening back to the analytical and geometric approach of Nicolas Poussin. This is an example of the heroic, or historic, landscape, which features grand architecture (in this case, Roman) and figures dressed in antique costumes. The space recedes in gradual planes from foreground to background, and natural motifs such as tree trunks and boulders are treated with geometric precision.

Valenciennes taught perspective and published a treatise on landscape painting (about 1800) that was acknowledged as a great influence on contemporary artists. In 1816 the École des Beaux-Arts established a Prix de Rome specifically for historic landscape painting, due in no small part to Valenciennes’ pedagogical contributions.
Corot never attended the École des Beaux-Arts or studied art formally, but he did work with two artists who had trained under Valenciennes and were proponents of the classical landscape. Each tree trunk, branch, and stone in this landscape is precisely delineated with a sharp contour. The light is fairly evenly distributed over the surface, and the modeling is subtle. Early in his career, Corot had articulated his concern with tone, and his mature work is characterized by a soft, hazy treatment with blended edges and tranquil, meditative settings. This drawing, however, shows his roots in the classical tradition.

In 1824 the English landscape painter John Constable (1776–1837) sent a six-foot-wide painting entitled *The Haywain* to the Salon in Paris, where it was a sensation. Its influence on French landscape artists of the period is immeasurable. It also inspired collectors to purchase landscapes that depicted local scenery, rather than the Italian countryside or imaginative, idealized views populated by nymphs and shepherdesses. Corot enjoyed success in this new market. Once the exclusive haunt of the aristocracy, the forest of Fontainebleau became a favorite site for tourists and artists alike, in a burgeoning democracy in which royal property was transferred to the public domain.
Dupré began his career as a decorative artist in the provinces and eventually made his way to Paris, where he learned to paint from minor landscapists. Unlike many other artists, he went to England rather than to Italy, coming under the influence of notable British landscape artists John Constable (1776–1837), J. M. W. Turner (1775–1851), and Richard Parkes Bonington (1802–1828). Later in his career, Dupré worked alongside Théodore Rousseau (1812–1867) and Constant Troyon (1810–1865) in the forest of Fontainebleau and the village of Barbizon, endeavoring to create more realistic landscapes. In an era of growing nationalism, the thatched farmhouses and mills of the rural French countryside replaced the antique ruins, overgrown gardens, and grand Italian architecture of the previous century. Dupré’s work was well received by the critics and at the Salons, and he earned a comfortable living from his art.