

Pathology and Imagination:
Ingres's Anatomical Distortions

by
Danya Epstein

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Julie Codell, Chair
Anthony Gully
Betsy Fahlman

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I investigate the anatomical excesses represented in the works of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres. In recent years, art historical scholarship on Ingres has multiplied after being quiescent for much of the twentieth century, as contemporary scholars perceive the unusual contradictions in his works. I introduce the concepts of pathological versus imaginary distortions. Pathological distortions are distortions that represent diseased bodies, such as the goiters in many of Ingres's female figures, whereas imaginary distortions are not anatomically possible, such as the five extra vertebrae in the *Grande Odalisque*. Ingres employed both of these types of these distortions in his bodies, and I discuss how these two types of distortions can be read differently.

My thesis is that Ingres employed extended anatomical variations-in his paintings, most notably in his female figures, for several reasons: to reconcile his anxiety about originality while remaining within the tradition of Classicism and "disegno," to pay homage to his predecessors who were also the masters of line, and to highlight his command of line and drawing. Though Ingres has never been a strictly Neoclassical artist in the Davidian tradition, the Romantic elements of his work are underlined further by these anatomical variations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts and the members of my committee for their instruction and aid: Dr. Julie Codell, my chair and mentor, for her expertise, dedication to excellence and unwavering support; Dr. Betsy Fahlman for her thoughtful commentary; and Dr. Anthony Gully for his discerning judgment and erudition. I also wish to thank my mother, Charlotte Epstein, for her patient and insightful editorial assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 TUMID THROATS: INGRES'S ANGELICA AND FRANCESCA	11
3 BEGUILING BACKS: THE GRANDE ODALISQUE	34
4 RAPHAEL REDUX: INGRES AND HIS FORNARINA	57
5 CONCLUSION	76
REFERENCES.....	81

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Roger Freeing Angelica</i> , 1819	88
2. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Study for Roger Freeing Angelica</i> , c. 1818	89
3. J.A.D. Ingres, Helmets for <i>Roger Freeing Angelica</i> , c. 1818-1819	90
4. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Study for Roger Freeing Angelica</i> , 1818	91
5. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Virgil Reading the "Aeneid,"</i> c. 1814.....	92
6. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Roger Freeing Angelica,</i> " 1819-1839.....	93
7. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Roger Freeing Angelica</i> , 1859	94
8. Raphael, <i>La Velata</i> , 1516	95
9. Michelangelo, Detail from <i>The Story of Creation</i> , 1508-1512.....	96
10. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Francesca da Rimini</i> , 1814	97
11. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Paolo and Francesca</i> , 1814	98
12. M.P. Coupin de la Couperie, <i>Les amours funestes</i> , 1812	99
13. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Paolo and Francesca</i> , 1855-1860	100
14. Raphael, Detail from <i>The Mass at Bolsena</i> , 1512.....	101
15. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>La Belle Zélie</i> , 1806	102
16. J.A.D Ingres, <i>Portrait of M. Bertin</i> , 1832	103
17. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Grande Odalisque</i> , 1814.....	104
18. J.A.D Ingres, <i>Vénus Anadyoméne</i> 1808-1848.....	105
19. J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Oedipus and the Sphinx</i> , 1808	106
20. E.E. Amaury-Duval, <i>The Birth of Venus</i> , 1862.....	107

Figure		Page
21.	E. Delacroix, <i>Women of Algiers in Their Apartment</i> , 1834	108
22.	A. Correggio, <i>Jupiter and Io</i> , c. 1532-1533	109
23.	A. Correggio, <i>Danäe</i> , c. 1531	110
24.	D. Velázquez, <i>Rokeby Venus</i> , c. 1647-1651	111
25.	J. van Loo, <i>Young Woman Going to Bed</i> , c. 1650	112
26.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Bather of Valpinçon</i> , 1808	113
27.	J.A.D Ingres, <i>Reclining Odalisque</i> ,	114
28.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Odalisque with Slave</i> , 1830-1840	115
29.	Antonio Canova, <i>Venus Victrix</i> , 1808	116
30.	J.L. David, <i>Madame Récamier</i> , 1800	117
31.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Portrait of Queen Caroline Murat</i> , 1814	118
32.	F. Gérard, <i>Caroline Murat and Her Children</i> , 1808	119
33.	Raphael and G. Romano, <i>Portrait of Doña Isabel</i> , c. 1518	120
34.	J.A.D Ingres, <i>Apotheosis of Homer</i> , 1827	121
35.	Raphael, <i>The Fornarina</i> , 1518-1520	122
36.	Raphael, <i>Madonna of the Chair</i> , 1513-1514	123
37.	J.A.D Ingres, <i>Raphael and the Fornarina</i> , 1813	124
38.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Raphael and the Fornarina</i> , 1814	125
39.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Madame Moitessier</i> , 1856	126
40.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Madame de Senonnes</i> , 1814	127
41.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>The Martyrdom of Saint Symphorien</i> , 1824-1834	128

Figure		Page
42.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Madame Ingres</i> , 1814	129
43.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Study for Raphael and the Fornarina</i> , c. 1814	130
44.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Madame Ingres</i> , c. 1818	131
45.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>The Turkish Bath</i> , c. 1862	132
46.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>The Betrothal of Raphael</i> , 1813-1814	133
47.	Raphael, <i>Marriage of the Virgin</i> , 1504	134
48.	Raphael, <i>Portrait of Cardinal Bibbiena</i> , c.1516	135
49.	Raphael, <i>Portrait of Bindo Altoviti</i> , 1512-1515	136
50.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Self-Portrait at Age Twenty-Four</i> , 1804	137
51.	S. del Piombo, <i>Portrait of a Woman (The Fornarina)</i> 1512	138
52.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Raphael and the Fornarina</i> , c. 1830s	139
53.	J.A.D Ingres, <i>Raphael and the Baker's Daughter</i> , 1840	140
54.	Raphael, <i>Transfiguration</i> , 1516-1520	141
55.	P.N. Bergeret, <i>Honors Rendered to Raphael on His Deathbed</i> , 1806	142
56.	J.A.D. Ingres, <i>Raphael and the Fornarina (Unfinished)</i> , 1860s	143

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I investigate the anatomical excesses represented in the works of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres. In recent years, art historical scholarship on Ingres has multiplied after being quiescent for much of the twentieth century, as contemporary scholars perceive the unusual contradictions in his works. I introduce the concepts of pathological versus imaginary distortions. Pathological distortions are distortions that represent diseased bodies, such as the goiters in many of Ingres's female figures, whereas imaginary distortions are not anatomically possible, such as the five extra vertebrae in the *Grande Odalisque*.¹ Ingres employed both of these types of these distortions in his bodies, and I discuss how these two types of distortions can be read differently.

My thesis is that Ingres employed extended anatomical variations in his paintings, most notably in his female figures, for several reasons: to reconcile his anxiety about originality while remaining within the tradition of Classicism and “disegno,” to pay homage to his predecessors who were also the masters of line, and to highlight his command of line and drawing. Though Ingres has never been a strictly Neoclassical artist in the Davidian tradition, the Romantic elements of his work are underlined further by these anatomical variations. The paintings I analyze to support this thesis are the troubadour paintings *Roger Freeing Angelica* (1819-1839), *Paolo and Francesca* (1814-1856), and *Raphael and La Fornarina* (multiple versions, 1813-1860s) and the harem genre *Grande Odalisque* (1814). Moreover, both the troubadour and harem genre deviated from classical ideals.

Ingres viewed himself as a conduit for the great artists in his perceived lineage--Raphael, Poussin, and David. Throughout his long lifetime, he despaired about how he could be original when preceded by such greatness. Indeed, some models of anatomical "deformations" can be seen in the paintings of Raphael which Ingres may have consciously or unconsciously copied. He used such deformation across all the genres of his paintings, including history paintings and portraits.²

In addition to pathological and imaginary distortions, two other distinctions can be made about Ingres's types of anatomical distortions--those used to evoke emotion and those used to solve aesthetic problems. Thus, in the same way Rosalind Krauss created a schema for new forms of sculpture in her seminal essay "Sculpture in the Expanded Field,"³ I suggest a schema for analyzing these four types of distortion in the works of Ingres: the pathological-emotional (*Roger Freeing Angelica*), pathological-aesthetic (*Raphael and La Fornarina*), imaginary-emotional (*Raphael and La Fornarina*), and imaginary-aesthetic (*Grande Odalisque*).

From the artist's own era forward, scholars and critics have employed various approaches to comprehend Ingres's distortions. In 1929 article in the French medical journal *Aesculape*, physician Paul-Marie Maxime Laignel-Lavastine noted the striking clinical accuracy of Ingres's depictions of thyroid pathology in his female figures and posed the question of whether Ingres was copying these abnormalities from nature. Laignel-Lavastine also remarked on the lack of evident pathology in his male subjects; he thus surmised that the morphology of the hypothyroid female was a particular type that Ingres favored.⁴

In the mid-twentieth century, Robert Rosenblum reevaluated the positioning of Ingres as a strict upholder of the tenets of the Academy in opposition to the stirrings of Romanticism. Rosenblum assessed Ingres as an artist consistent with his contemporaries, who adapted his style to suit his subject matter:

In viewing Ingres not as a Classical artist, whose frequent excursions into un-Classical regions are puzzling aberrations from a fixed norm, but rather an artist who wishes to seek out appropriate means of rendering a wide variety of themes, whether Greek or Turkish, thirteenth-century Italian or nineteenth-century French...a diversity which was in fact hardly unique to Ingres, but was characteristic of many Western artists from the late eighteenth century down to Picasso.⁵

Later in the twentieth century, Norman Bryson considered Ingres's work through a psychoanalytic lens. In *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix*, Bryson addressed the problem of "the anxiety of influence" in the works of David, Delacroix, and Ingres. He analyzed David's struggle to inject new life, or what Bryson calls "presence," into the classical models. As David's student, Ingres extensively quotes classical art, such as Pompeian frescoes and the works of Raphael. Ingres's solution to the problem of tradition and "desire"--his own desire for "presence," as well as libidinal desire--is a distortion of anatomy, according to Bryson: "the body can be a place where tradition and the individual talent are mediated and united."⁶ For Bryson, all of these bodily deformations are signs of sexuality. Yet, he argues that this deformation found in *Grande Odalisque* makes her unreal and unattainable and thus exemplifies desire deferred.

In *Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line*, Carol Ockman examines Ingres's anatomical distortions--what she calls the "serpentine line"--through feminist methodology. Her analysis seeks to dismantle the view that Ingres's paintings are simply for male visual pleasure, to argue instead that the paintings undermine the binary oppositions that have been read into them. She does this by finding contradictions in Ingres's paintings, such as *Achilles Receiving the Ambassadors of Agamemnon* (1801), where Ingres has used the serpentine line on male bodies. She points out that the *Grande Odalisque* was commissioned by a woman, thus complicating the traditional narrative about male versus female spectatorship.

Andrew Shelton's study of the critical reception of Ingres's work during his time, *Ingres and His Critics*, sought to distill the social and cultural climate in France in which Ingres worked during his lifetime.⁷ Shelton regards Ingres as an artist who was constantly engaged in negotiating the conflicting demands of the changing cultural climate. Ingres struggled to work within the framework of his academic training while living in an era in which academic art had become increasingly irrelevant. In analyzing the reception of Ingres's work, Shelton argues that Ingres's break with the Salon in 1834 led to his self-formulation as an autonomous "Author-God," the concept put forth by Roland Barthes.⁸ Therefore, the unusual elements of Ingres's work began to be recognized from this date forward not as errors, but rather as the essence of Ingres's oeuvre.

In her comprehensive monograph, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined*, Susan Siegfried argues that Ingres reinvented narrative painting. She contends that Ingres chose to represent unusual moments in the narrative which forced the viewer to interpret the paintings individually. In reinventing narrative painting, Ingres also used objects in the

painting as a motif to represent emotions and events. Her final conclusion is that Ingres's misfit status challenged the classification of nineteenth-century movements of art.

In my first chapter, I analyze Ingres's painting *Roger Freeing Angelica* as an example of a pathological distortion used to evoke emotion. This painting belongs to the troubadour genre, an early nineteenth-century movement which treated medieval and Renaissance themes, often in an intimate setting. The pathological distortions that Ingres deploys in *Roger Freeing Angelica* relate to the emotional themes of this genre's subject matter--forbidden love and sadism. Based on the Renaissance epic poem by Ludovico Ariosto, *Roger Freeing Angelica* recounts the moment when the knight Roger rescues the princess Angelica. Despite his noble intentions, Roger becomes so aroused by the sight of Angelica's naked body that he decides to rape her, momentarily forgetting about his love for another woman, Bradamante. However, Roger is unable to complete this violation since he does not manage to remove his armor expediently. Angelica escapes thanks to a magic ring that was given to her by Roger.

Angelica's naked body is notable for the swelling her in her neck, a peculiarity which been noted in previous scholarship but has not yet been fully examined. Angelica's tumescent neck is, in fact, a realistic depiction of the medical disease of goiter, an enlargement of the thyroid gland, often caused by hypothyroidism. Ingres's realistic depictions of pathological thyroid glands in several of his paintings, including *Paolo and Francesca*, the *Turkish Bath* (1862), and *La Belle Zélie*, were recognized as early as 1929 in the French medical journal *Aesculape*.⁹ In *Roger Freeing Angelica*, Angelica's swollen neck becomes an eroticized accessory, a female counterpart to the lance with which Roger kills the dragon. From the myth of Leda and the Swan, a swanlike neck can be

read as a phallic symbol, which in the body of Angelica becomes a hybrid sign of desire. Notably, in his studies for *Roger and Angelica*, Ingres has drawn a normal, goiterless woman's body. The realism found in Ingres's drawings invokes his famous declaration, "Le dessin est la probité de l'art."¹⁰ I analyze the contrast between this realism and the distortions he added to his painting.

As goiter was an endemic illness throughout history until the global public health movement to iodize salt, its representation in art is unsurprising. For example, *La Velata* (1515) by Ingres's idol Raphael has a subtly enlarged thyroid. Indeed, iodine deficiency and goiter were common ailments in Tuscany during the Renaissance.¹¹ Yet the enlargement of the throat can also be interpreted as having a metaphoric and erotic component. The motif of the goiter occurs in other paintings in which Ingres treated themes of eroticism and danger. Indeed, this motif can be seen in another series in the troubadour genre: in *Paolo and Francesca*, Francesca's large goiter seems to "kiss" the outstretched chin of her brother-in-law Paolo, who kneels to kiss her. As in *Roger Freeing Angelica*, the scene is ripe with the smoldering eroticism of the forbidden love between Paolo and Francesca, and the imminent tragedy about to unfold as Giovanni lurks in the wings before surprising and murdering the lovers.

In my second chapter, I discuss the *Grande Odalisque* (1814), Ingres's iconic painting of a nude woman in a lush, Orientalist setting. This painting exemplifies Ingres's use of a distortion that is both imaginary and a solution to an aesthetic problem. From its initial debut, criticism of this painting has focused on the addition of extra vertebrae to create the especially long back of the odalisque, a distortion that has equally perplexed and delighted viewers from the nineteenth century to the present day. In particular, these

distortions have intrigued modern painters who viewed Ingres as a proto-modernist. Scholarship of the past forty years has variously interpreted *Grande Odalisque* as a prime example of both Orientalist fantasy and the objectifying power of the male gaze. In *Ways of Seeing*, John Berger likens the *Grande Odalisque* to a pin-up photograph. Feminist scholarship, such as Ockman's work, has revised this view in light of the possibility of female pleasure in viewing this work. Indeed, the *Grande Odalisque* was commissioned by Caroline Murat, Napoleon's sister, as a gift to her husband Joachim. Ockman further argues that her commission was an example of a powerful woman employing art as a form of self-fashioning, in the same way that Caroline Murat's sister Paolina Borghese had herself immortalized herself as Venus by Antonio Canova in his sculpture *Venus Victrix* (1808).

I interpret *Grande Odalisque* as Ingres's solution to the challenges of originality in upholding the conventional image of the Academic female nude. As a counterpoint, Ingres's *Vénus Anadyomène*, painted between 1808 and 1848, is an instance in which Ingres's attempt to render an entirely undistorted, conventional female nude produces an uninspiring work. A comparison between these two works provides evidence that the distortions of the *Grande Odalisque* were precisely what made the painting aesthetically successful.

Moreover, the fantasy element of the painting--its Orientalist setting--is served well by the unreality of the odalisque's distortions. The Orientalist setting creates an experience of synesthesia heightening sensuality; yet it, too, remains in the realm of the imaginary and, thus, out of reach. Though Ingres never visited Muslim-dominated North Africa, the hyperrealism and precision of style displayed in *Grande Odalisque* seemingly

convey empirical exactitude. This effect is broken, however, by the impossibly long back of the odalisque; thus the fantasy is maintained.

In my third and last chapter, I discuss how Ingres's iterative painting Raphael and La Fornarina is key to understanding Ingres's anxiety about originality and distortion. The anatomical deformations in the subtly varying series of five versions of this painting are notable for containing both imaginary and pathological distortions that serve dual purposes. La Fornarina sitting on Raphael's lap has both an impossibly curved back and shoulder, as well as a goiter among her neck folds. Her distortion is especially underlined by the unfinished painting upon which Raphael gazes which is a remarkable likeness of Raphael's *La Fornarina* (1518-1520). In contrast, the face of the woman on Raphael's lap does not look like Raphael's *La Fornarina*, but instead bears a striking resemblance to Ingres's first wife Madeleine Chapelle. Moreover, Madeleine's face recurs in many of Ingres's works throughout his life, including the *Grande Odalisque*. The series *Raphael and La Fornarina* contains numerous allusions to, and quotations from, Raphael's life and work. This is also true of the only other Ingres painting treating the life of his idol, the singular *Betrothal of Raphael and the Niece of Cardinal Bibbiena* (1813-1814), which provides an enlightening comparison to *Raphael and La Fornarina* in its composition, mood and subject matter.

By placing, in the fictive studio of Raphael, a female figure whose face and pathological distortions have become a typically Ingresque trope, Ingres figuratively inserted himself into Raphael's oeuvre. In *Raphael and La Fornarina*, he paid homage to his spiritual mentor by replicating his forms but also Ingres displayed his own imaginative faculties that distinguished him from Raphael. As the series evolves from

Ingres's early career until his twilight years, La Fornarina and the fictive Raphael, a stand-in for Ingres, become ever entwined closer, representing the union of artist and inspiration.

Notes

¹ Scientists from the Royal Society of Medicine demonstrated that, in fact, Ingres's odalisque has five extra vertebrae. This is opposed to the early pronouncement by critic Auguste-Hilarion de Kératry to Ingres's pupil Amaury-Duval, "Son odalisque a trois

² A notable example of distortions in Ingres's history paintings included the oversized bodies in the critically panned *Martyrdom of Saint Symphorien* (1834). Anatomical distortions are also very pronounced in the portraits *Venus à Paphos* (c.1852) and *La Belle Zélie* (1806).

³ Rosalind Krauss, "Sculpture in the Expanded Field," *October* 8 (Spring 1979): 30-44.

⁴ Paul-Marie Maxime Laignel-Lavastine "La Glande Thyroïde Dans L'Oeuvre De M. Ingres," *Aesculape* 3 (March 1929): 69-72.

⁵ Robert Rosenblum, *J. A. D. Ingres* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1967), 10.

⁶ Norman Bryson, *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1984), 132.

⁷ Andrew Carrington Shelton, *Ingres and His Critics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 11.

⁸ Ibid., 8.

⁹ Paul-Marie Maxime Laignel-Lavastine, "La Glande Thyroïde Dans L'Oeuvre De M. Ingres," *Aesculape* 3 (March 1929): 69-72.

¹⁰ "Drawing is the probity of art." Adrian Rifkin, *Ingres Then, and Now* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 71 (translation mine).

¹¹ Lennart Bondeson and Anne-Greth Bondeson, "Michaelangelo's Divine Goitre," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 96 (December 2003): 609-11.

CHAPTER 2

TUMID THROATS: INGRES'S ANGELICA AND FRANCESCA

In this chapter, I analyze the pathological deformation--the goiter--which Ingres deploys in many of his paintings. This remarkable pathological motif appears prominently in Ingres's large-scale troubadour painting, *Roger Freeing Angelica* (1819-1839), as well as in his smaller work *Paolo and Francesca* (1814-1856). As I demonstrate, the goiter, a pathological anatomical deformation, provided a symbolic representation of the anti-Classical themes of eroticism, forbidden love, and its attendant dangers. Ingres's placement of these deformities in his troubadour paintings is fitting given this genre's departure from Neoclassical themes and association with Romanticism and its troubling of the Classical heroic model. This model is exemplified by David's heroes--Brutus, Socrates, the Horatii--who put honor and duty before personal and sentiment. By departing from this example, Ingres also distinguished himself from David, both stylistically and thematically.

Ingres's choice of the goiter as a potent symbol in his troubadour paintings necessitates a discussion of this genre and its moment in French art history.¹² The troubadour painting--the use of medieval and Renaissance themes in history painting--had its origins in France in the late eighteenth-century and flourished in the nineteenth. One impetus to the development of troubadour style was the opening of the Musée des monuments français in 1795. Founded as an attempt to preserve French cultural heritage after the destruction of the 1789 Revolution, the museum contained an important collection of French Romanesque and Gothic sculpture and architecture. Artists were inspired by the museum's endorsement of France's medieval patrimony and they then

appropriated medieval and Renaissance subjects as an alternative to Classical themes taken from Homeric texts or Virgil's *Aeneid*. Unlike Classicism's appeal to universal and timeless qualities, the troubadour themes treated by these late eighteenth-and nineteenth-century artists emphasized anecdote and popular themes from the lives of Renaissance artists.

Ingres treated the lives of two such artists, Leonardo and his idol Raphael. Ingres's painting *The Death of Leonardo da Vinci in the Arms of Francis I* (1818), provided Ingres an opportunity to glorify France's contribution to the Italian Renaissance by positioning King Francis I as an important patron of Leonardo. In his series *Raphael and La Fornarina*, (five versions from 1813-1860s), which I discuss in depth in the third chapter, Ingres paid homage to, and aligned himself with, Raphael, considered the apex of Renaissance art and "disegno." At the same time, Ingres's use of the anecdotal theme of artists at work placed him among his contemporaries, disciples of David, such as Pierre-Nolasque Bergeret and François-Marius Granet, who had tired of hackneyed neoclassical themes.¹³ Indeed, Ingres's foray into troubadour painting was undoubtedly propelled by the experiments of Bergeret and Granet. The latter a close friend of Ingres who had lived with him in the former Couvent des Capucines while Ingres was waiting to embark on his delayed sojourn in Rome after winning the Prix de Rome in 1801.¹⁴

Troubadour paintings also treated scenes from medieval and Renaissance literature, departing from overworked stories of Classical mythology and antiquity that had fueled Neoclassicism. The rediscovery of medieval and Renaissance literature such as Teutonic and Gaelic myths, Arthurian legends and the works of Dante and Shakespeare, furnished fresh and unconventional themes for artists.¹⁵ In their work, the

treatment of love was often inextricably associated with death, an influence from the tombs housed in the Musée des monuments français.¹⁶ The story of forbidden love with its tragic and ignoble fate was a staple in Romanticism.

This troubadour genre and its concept of doomed love tinged with sadism furnished Ingres with a certain liberty in representing anatomy. *Roger Freeing Angelica* (Fig. 1) is troubadour in subject matter, but the large dimensions (1.47 m x 1.90 m) that its commission necessitated is on the scale of history painting. The Comte de Blacas, who purchased Ingres's *The Death of Leonardo da Vinci in the Arms of Francis I* and *Henry IV Playing with his Children* (1817), spotted *Roger Freeing Angelica* during a visit to Ingres's studio. Ingres may have been working on the painting since 1815, but had left it unfinished. The Comte de Blacas recommended the purchase to Louis XVIII. Ingres was paid 2000 francs in November 1817 for its completion and acquisition.¹⁷ The work was installed as part of a decorative program for the château de Versailles in 1817. It was intended to decorate the overdoor of the Throne Room, a pendant to a painting by Bergeret which treated the related theme of Rinaldo and Armida by Tasso, another popular text for troubadour painters.¹⁸

The deliberate selection of these medieval subject for monarchic patronage was meant to demonstrate the regime's openness to Romantic themes. Troubadour paintings, in their evocation of medieval Christian themes, had a certain conservatism in their nostalgia for "le bon vieux temps" and glorification of Catholicism aligned with the values of the Bourbon restoration. The administration's overture to the gothic troubadour style was short-lived, however. Despite the placement of these two paintings in 1820 at

Versailles, they were removed in 1823 and subsequently placed in the Musée du Luxembourg in favor of paintings that depicted Roman subjects.

Roger Freeing Angelica depicts a scene from Ludovico Ariosto's highly influential 1511 epic poem *Orlando Furioso* (Canto X, stanzas xcii ff.), which is a sequel to the unfinished epic poem *Orlando Innamorato* by Matteo Maria Boiardo. Edmund Spenser, Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott paid homage to Ariosto in their works, and Antonio Vivaldi, George Frideric Handel and Joseph Haydn composed pieces inspired by the poem, with which Ingres was undoubtedly familiar as a violinist.¹⁹

Orlando Furioso recounts the story of Charlemagne's war with the Muslim Saracens. Charlemagne's faithful paladin Orlando is torn between his loyalty to his king and his love for Angelica, a princess from Cathay in an imagined medieval European China. Angelica does not return his affection, and in running away from him finds herself off the coast of Ireland where, she is drugged by a hermit and left as a sacrifice for the sea god Proteus, who has been tormenting the island with the monsters he commanded. In order to satiate Proteus, a new beautiful maiden must be sacrificed each day to his orc, a ferocious sea-monster. Angelica is captured by the islanders, but her captors hold off sacrificing her until other maidens have been consumed because she is so beautiful. When Angelica is finally chained to a cliff to become the orc's next meal, Ruggiero spots her as he is riding on his hippogriff. Enchanted by her beauty and moved by her plight, Ruggiero rushes to rescue her, giving her a magic ring that his beloved Bradamante had given to him, a talisman which had originally been in Angelica's possession and was stolen from her. Ruggiero futilely attempts to kill the orc with his lance, but his efforts only succeed in antagonizing the orc, and Angelica urges him to simply free her. Once

they are at a safe distance from the orc, Ruggiero decides that he will take his own reward for his good deed by raping her. However, his dishonorable intentions are thwarted as he is unable to swiftly remove his armor. Meanwhile, in an ironic twist, Angelica places the ring in her mouth, rendering her invisible, and thus escapes from both threats.²⁰

In the painting, Ingres depicts the moment when Ruggiero is focused on killing the orc, a hapless attempt, by stabbing it in its poisonous mouth, which Susan Siegfried calls a “floating vagina dentata,”²¹ Angelica’s static pose, neck thrown back and eyes rolled up in her head, is oddly unengaged with her immediate situation. Ruggiero’s phallic lance only crosses her lower leg, unlike in an early sketch in which the lance crossed Angelica’s pelvis (Fig. 2). The composition is simplified and flattened, like a stage set, as Ingres has placed three distinct figures on the same middle plane, with limited foreground or background in the picture. Ruggiero’s golden armor is rendered in minute detail. Yet in his studies, the presentation of the armor was developed even further; Ingres’s remarkable charcoal on brown paper study for the helmets (Fig. 3), shows an interest in presenting the sculptural qualities of the helmets and the reflective effects of metallics. However, in the final painting, the effects are minimized and Ruggiero and his armor seem only two-dimensional. The wings of his hippogriff and the folds of his cape are well observed in a typically Ingresque fashion. Ruggiero’s profile with its delicate features and creamy complexion appears oddly feminized.

Ingres’s deviation from normative bodies is particularly striking given that his *Study for Roger Freeing Angelica* (1819; Fig. 4) shows a well-proportioned woman’s body, whose form is convincingly contoured and three-dimensional. The study figure, who looks remarkably different from the final Angelica, has her head downcast, bending

her goiter-less neck with an expression of quiet contemplation on her face. This figure is also striking for its pubic hair that Ingres would censor in the final painting, evidence that Ingres altered his bodies to accord with societal moeurs. Behind her is another study of a woman lifting her head, which more closely approaches the pose of Angelica in the final painting, as the figure's neck begins to show hints of goitrous swelling. Christopher Riopelle remarks on the similarity between these sketches and the other key works in Ingres's oeuvre:

In the sketch, however, the beautiful and vulnerable figure Ingres depicts relates much more closely to the deeply sensual and highly naturalistic nudes he painted during his early Roman years, such as the *Dormeuse de Naples* and the *Reclining Nude (Madame Ingres)*, both now lost. It also anticipates such paintings as the *Vénus Anadyomène*, which he had begun in 1808 but finished only forty years later (Musée Condé, Chantilly), and *La Source* of 1856 (Louvre).²²

Instead, in the final result, Ingres's departure from realism in Angelica's body undermines the raw sensuality of the painting, trading the sensuality of real bodies for the more cartoonish, conventional eroticism.

Moreover, Ingres's sketch demonstrates the sculptural qualities of representing form for which Ingres was renowned, a style most prominently deployed in his *Virgil Reading the "Aeneid" to Augustus, Octavia and Livia* (c. 1814; Fig. 5), with its rounded shapes and shaded contours. Ingres, as a pupil of David, was trained by learning painting from sculpture.²³ Adapting his style to the troubadour genre in his evocations of the forms of early Renaissance art, *Roger Freeing Angelica* is bereft of the tonal modulations

that characterized his sculptural forms.²⁴ The painting's flattened figures, especially Angelica, seem oddly modernist.

Angelica's milky white and luminous body is the focal point of the painting, and departs stylistically from the rest of the picture: her unblemished flesh contrasts strikingly with the craggy surfaces of the rocks and the rough texture of the sea. Her arms appear boneless and curving in an anatomically impossible way, contrasting with the sharp angles of Ruggiero's bent arm which holds the lance. Angelica displays other anatomical oddities as well--a left shoulder that appears too high and a boneless juncture from hip to waist. Her backward angled neck looks broken; ironically, her goiter, a sign of disease of the thyroid gland, makes her body of this earth. Characters from mythology and epic poems do not normally suffer from the humiliation of chronic disease that plague ordinary humans.

From the Greek myth of Leda and the Swan, in which Zeus, transformed into a swan, seduces (or, depending on the version, rapes) Leda, a swanlike neck can be read as a phallic symbol. In the body of Angelica, this distorted neck becomes a hybrid sign of desire. Popularized by a brief mention by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*, the subject of Leda and the Swan was often treated by Italian Renaissance artists. Leonardo and Michelangelo both reportedly produced paintings of Leda and the Swan, which have been lost, but their disappeared works inspired drawings by Raphael and il Rosso Fiorentino and paintings by Giuliano Bugiardini and Francesco Melzi.²⁵ Angelica's tumescent neck becomes an eroticized accessory, analogous to Ruggiero's lance. Her body has been called "disgracieux au possible et presque tuméfié"²⁶ by nineteenth-century art critic Paul Mantz. The tumescent swelling of her neck provides a female counterpoint to Ruggiero's

lance, a corporeal sign of the normally hidden female desire. Angelica's face is thrown back, eyes rolled up in her head in a pose and expression that could be read as ecstasy or abject fear. The threats to Angelica's body--the orc monster and Roger's lust--infuse the static scene with rape fantasy. Yet, as the rape is ultimately thwarted by Angelica's quick thinking and Roger's fumbling ineptitude, the scene's dénouement undermines this forbidden fantasy.

Siegfried reads an element of sadomasochism into the picture, noting how Ingres exploits Angelica's distress for the pleasure of the viewer. She explains:

...it is especially *Roger Freeing Angelica* that suspends the representation of erotic pleasure in a context of pain. Beyond the obvious sadomasochistic overtones of the manacled female nude, there is the voyeurism involved in the exposure of Angelica's body. The painter again keyed off the poet. Ariosto lingers over the sensual description of Angelica's body, most vividly when Roger first inspects her, and the poet describes her tear-stained sobbing nakedness and futile attempts to hide her face from the scrutiny of a stranger. In Ariosto (as in Ovid, his model) her gesture of shame is presented comically, as incongruous, because she is already stark naked, a joke told at the woman's expense. Ingres picked up on this sadistic element in the poem by showing Angelica twisting away from Roger only to expose herself to the viewer.²⁷

By minimizing the importance of Ruggiero, who blends into the brown gold tones of the background, and twisting Angelica towards us, Ingres has made the viewer Angelica's savior, and her body our reward. Riopelle, in contrast, theorizes that Angelica's awkward pose was essential to the painting's proposed location as part of an

overdoor and the worm's-eye view of its viewer.²⁸ Whether Ingres redid Angelica's pose for this purpose, or whether it was the original composition of the painting is unknown.

However, in later iterations of this painting, such as the smaller (47.6 x 39.4 cm) 1839 version in the National Gallery, London (Fig. 6), Ingres did not modify the pose or perspective of her body in the painting. The 1859 version in the Museu de Arte de São Paulo (Fig. 7) is framed as a tondo and has eliminated the feckless Ruggiero from the scene, while diminishing the orc to an indistinguishable khaki lump at Angelica's feet.²⁹ In the São Paulo painting, Angelica in chains, fleshed out with a more mature physique, fills up the entire picture, reducing narrative almost completely. Moreover, the use of the tondo, "analogue au champ visuel et au trou de serrure cher à l'érotisme littéraire"³⁰ according to Stéphane Guégan, heightens the erotic quality of the painting while reducing the importance of the story, which has become a pastiche of mythological narratives. Indeed, in this final version, the sparkling shield is more appropriate for the story of Perseus and Andromeda; indeed, critics often confused Ingres's first *Roger and Angelica* with this story, much to Ingres's chagrin.³¹ In all the versions of the painting, Angelica's awkward twisting into a pose of maximal exposure flattens her body, thus emphasizing the swelling in her neck.

Angelica's enlarged neck is, in fact, a realistic depiction of the medical disease of goiter which is an enlargement of the thyroid gland. This pathology, a sign of thyroid disease, was widely present in Europe until the iodization of salt in the early twentieth-century, though it was recognized that iodine played a role in goiter in France as early as the 1830s.³² Because of this widespread pathology, the presence of goiter in art could be a painter's attempt at realism. Baudelaire noted that Ingres did not shirk from

representing ugliness or oddity, unlike Raphael who favored the idealized over the particular: “L’audace de celui-ci est toute particulière, et combiné avec une telle ruse, qu’il ne recule devant aucune laideur et aucune bizzarerie.”³³ Baudelaire continues in this passage to cite Ingres’s placement of a one-eyed man, a hunchback, and a blind man in his *Apotheosis of Homer* (1827), approving of the painter’s willingness to represent pathology and the ravages of disease.

Indeed, Ingres’s study of the Renaissance masters may have provided him with the precedent for this pathological anatomical distortion. Raphael’s *La Velata* (1515; Fig. 8), with her full neck, has a subtly enlarged thyroid. More dramatic is Michelangelo’s Creator (Fig. 9) in the Sistine Chapel. The Creator’s lumpy, outstretched neck is a textbook depiction of multinodular goiter. Indeed, Michelangelo himself suffered from this affliction, describing his condition in a letter to a friend, and comparing himself to goitrous cats in Lombardy; goiter was endemic in Northern regions of Italy during the Renaissance, blamed on the water of the Po River.³⁴

Yet goiter could also be appreciated for its own aesthetic and metaphoric meaning. In *Roger Freeing Angelica*, the goiter becomes a signifier for a painting that does not follow history painting’s rules of narration. Siegfried argues that this painting is a prime example of Ingres’s use of his “non-narrative” painting style, a departure from David’s emphasis on depicting the pregnant moment in classical history paintings, a technique used since the Renaissance. The pregnant moment is the dramatic moment that occurs directly before or after the main action and that combines hints of past and future action. This technique allowed the painting’s implied narrative to be “read” by the viewer,

who would have been familiar with the signs and symbols of body language and expression. Siegfried explains:

The pregnant moment led the viewer to think about the antecedents and consequences of an event, bringing into the representation something of the temporal flow of literary narrative. Instead, Ingres suspended his subjects in time (and sometimes in space). This allowed the still of painting to be put to use. He gave clues about what transpired before or after the event depicted, but the viewer was required to know the story in order to make sense of those clues since he did not employ the pictorial language of interconnected gestures and expressions that indicate the dramatic development. His paintings demand to be decoded.³⁵

If we follow Siegfried's analysis, Ingres's use of the goiter was one such "clue" that Ingres employed to inform his viewers of the action. Angelica's goiter--with its phallic symbolism and reference to rape--refers to the actions and emotions of the characters that take place beyond the slice of time depicted. The frozen and anti-dynamic quality of the painting is supplemented by the oversized lance, the goiter, and the cartoonish orc hovering in the still moment before the comic and anti-heroic action takes place.

Rosenblum noted the "grotesque prurience,"³⁶ in *Roger and Angelica*, a reference to its uncomfortably squelched eroticism.

The motif of the goiter recurs in Ingres's series *Paolo and Francesca* (1814-1856), troubadour paintings which treat a moment from another medieval text, Dante's *Inferno* (1317). Siegfried argues that Ingres's sadism recurs here in his interest in female suffering. In the text, Francesca da Rimini had been forced to marry the hideous Giancotto Malatesta, though she subsequently falls in love with his handsome brother

Paolo. In Ingres's painting, Paolo and Francesca have been reading together the story of the forbidden love between Queen Guinevere and Sir Lancelot, a narrative template which mirrored and kindled their illicit love. Their embrace is captured as a moment suspended in time, as represented by the book in mid-air falling from Francesca's fingers. But their happiness is short-lived, as Giancotto, lurking in the wings, surprises the two lovers and kills them in one blow.

Like *Roger Freeing Angelica*, these paintings were repeated, the first in the series most closely adhering to its literary precedent and the later paintings shaving away the narrative details. Ingres intended to create a cycle of paintings beyond his representation of the lovers' first moment of recognition of their love. He also intended to show Giancotto standing remorsefully over the dead bodies of the two lovers and the couple in the Inferno's Second Circle.³⁷ Yet Ingres never advanced beyond the first stage in his cycle, preserving the lovers eternally in the blissful moment before their murder.

Ingres's first study for the painting (Fig. 10) presents his Paolo and Francesca undistorted, yet lacking in passion. The first oil painting on canvas (Fig. 11) was commissioned by Queen Caroline Murat, whose most famous commission, the *Grande Odalisque*, I examine in the next chapter. As Siegfried points out, Ingres again employed similar "dominant lines" in his painting as he did in *Roger Freeing Angelica*--a vertical female and a diagonal line lunging towards her.³⁸ In this case, the diagonal is Paolo, the analogue of Roger's lance. Francesca's swollen neck mirrors the tumescent neck of Angelica.

Remarkable in Ingres's addition of the goiter to his female figures is their absence in his early studies and sketches, despite their persistence in all final versions of his

replicas. Ingres's reproduction of his own works is a fundamental aspect of his artistic practice that has intrigued scholars and critics. Marjorie Cohn argues in the exhibition catalogue *Ingres: In Pursuit of Perfection* that Ingres's penchant for redoing his paintings was not simply a means to generate income from popular paintings, but was rather a singular monomania, a quest for the perfection of his art. Cohn argues that Ingres's self-reproduced paintings have been long misread as tired replications. She explains:

In particular, the replicas Ingres made of his own compositions, which he made obsessively throughout his career, which he made in a great variety of techniques, which he sometimes valued above his first realization of a motif, which are often changed, greatly or subtly, from their prototypes--these replicas, because they are not the originals, have been given short shrift.³⁹

Ingres's paintings were long decried by nineteenth-century critics such as Baudelaire and Théophile Silvestre as evidence of the sterility of French academic art in contrast with the abundance and originality of Romanticism and its artistic vanguards Delacroix and Géricault.⁴⁰ Ingres's copies were seen as doubly dry and unoriginal since they were derived from classical prototypes, and thus were replications from replications. The genesis of this practice has been attributed to his practice of tracing. Continuing a habit from his Academic training well into his mature artistic career, Ingres's practice of tracing engravings and Greek pottery designs on *papier calque* was a lifelong routine that has left an impressive legacy of drawings at the Musée Ingres. Tracing was his method of distilling the essence of an image to its purest forms of linearity.⁴¹

Thus Ingres's iterative paintings can be seen as a practice of refining the theme to its essential. With regard to *Paolo and Francesca*, Cohn argues that Ingres's unique vision becomes increasingly refined as he works through the different versions:

Ingres' first version (1814) of *Paolo and Francesca* (Chantilly, Musée Condé) smacks of its prototype, a painting exhibited in the 1812 salon by Coupin de la Couperie and known to Ingres through an engraving; but the replicas increasingly display Ingres' unique conception of the relation between the silhouettes of the illicit lovers.⁴²

Ingres quoted extensively from the 1812 "prototype" *Les amours funestes de Françoise de Rimini et Paolo Malatesta* by Coupin de la Couperie (Fig. 12) in the composition of his painting, especially the positioning of the two figures, Francesca erect and Paolo lunging. Paralleling the cropping that Ingres employed in his last version of *Roger Freeing Angelica*, Ingres eliminated Giancotto in his later versions of the painting, emphasizing the lovers, their adjoined hands and the focal point of the painting: the two chins and Francesca's goiter meeting in a triangle. In the Glen Falls version (1855-1860; Fig. 13), Ingres has flattened the space further, dispensing with architectural depth. He has also reversed the figures' positions: Paolo's lunging diagonal is overwhelmed by the blood red mass of Francesca's dress.

Ingres paid homage to the style of early quattrocento Florentine painting, such as the work of Fra Angelico, in the simplicity and shallowness of the composition of *Paolo and Francesca*. Hans Naef argues that Ingres, continuing his practice of copying, appropriated a figure from his idol Raphael as well. Naef contends that Ingres's Paolo is a quotation from the turbaned male figure at the bottom left of Raphael's fresco in the

Apostolic Palace in the Vatican, the *Mass at Bolsena* (1512), providing a prototype for an entreating male figure (Fig.14).⁴³

Indeed, in the case of *Paolo and Francesca*, it is not just Francesca's neck that commands attention. Outstretched, entreating and exaggerated, Paolo's neck extends to kiss his beloved, in a surprising display of male vulnerability. Olivier Merson, an early biographer of Ingres, viewed the exaggerated necks as signifiers of the passion between the two lovers: "Paolo allonge un cou démesuré pour atteindre les lèvres de Francesca, autre exagération flagrante. Mais précisément, grâce à ce cou de cygne amoureux, l'élan passionné du personnage se traduit avec une caressante énergie."⁴⁴

The exaggeration that Merson refers to heightens the tension; the figures' enlarged necks are swollen with a desire that will imminently lead to their doom. Cohn notes how Ingres exploits the swollen outline of Paolo's neck to mirror the negative space of Francesca's clavicle, another vaginal reference:

Paolo's throat, swollen with desire, is indeed a copy from Raphael, as has been observed; but as the motif is developed in later replicas, its engorged contour nestles exactly against--without overlapping--the hollow of Francesca's clavicle.⁴⁵

Siegfried reads a typically Ingresque technique in *Paolo and Francesca*--the ability to convey emotions and meaning through outside appearances--the motif representing the feeling--which Siegfried describes as, "his ability to imply an interior sense of meaning, incidentally and unintentionally, via the exterior forms of things, while at the same time those exterior forms and surfaces distract from the story and from an interiorized sense of character."⁴⁶ In this instance, Siegfried refers to Paolo's lunging figure, yet the same

commentary could equally be applied to the figures' swollen necks as metonymically displaying their interior passion.

If Ingres's addition of the goiter to his troubadour paintings provides a metaphoric representation of female desire mixed with sadism, how do we read the appearance of this pathology in other genres of painting? In the case of portraiture, the question of whether the goiter is a fanciful addition or realistic depiction of pathology remains open. Ingres's *La Belle Zélie* (1806; Fig. 15) is the artist's most dramatic depiction of a goiter in the portrait genre.⁴⁷ With its simple sketched background of clouds and sky, the painting has more in common with Florentine Renaissance portraiture than the complex hyperrealistic portraits with their elaborate costumes and highly observed settings for which Ingres became celebrated later in his career. Indeed, whether this unknown sitter had goiter or whether Ingres added goiter as an artistic affectation in homage to Renaissance precedents is uncertain. Several other female portraits by Ingres have thick and awkward necks, but none possess the pronounced pathology of *La Belle Zélie*.

In addition to her goiter, the unknown woman also has several other well-observed pathologies, which were noted in 1929 by Dr. Paul-Marie Maxime Laignel-Lavastine, a renowned French psychiatrist. Writing about Ingres's clinically accurate depictions of goiters in his female figures in the medical journal *Aesculape*, he described two other pathologies in *La Belle Zélie*: "Vous y notez l'hypertrophie de la thyroïde si chère à Ingres, une asymétrie faciale très nette et un léger strabisme divergent."⁴⁸ Her strabismus, a pathology of numerous etiologies in which the eyes do not converge, makes her walleyed; he also notes the asymmetrical curling of her lip but does not speculate on a particular pathology that would explain these findings. These observations led Laignel-

Lavastine to conclude that Ingres was faithfully recording nature; the doctor recognized in Ingres a clinician's trained eye in observing the subtleties and varieties of anatomical pathology. It was not just Laignel-Lavastine who noted the keen physician eye--Baudelaire, commenting on Ingres's female figures and citing Angelica specifically, called Ingres a "surgeon" in his precise handling of female curves: "il s'attache à leurs moindres beautés avec une âpreté de chirurgien; il suit les plus légères ondulations de leurs lignes avec une servilité d'amoureux."⁴⁹ Baudelaire did not recognize in Angelica pathology; rather, he saw nothing but sinuous undulations painted by a lover of women.

The genesis of strabismus that Ingres depicted in *La Belle Zélie* may have its roots in an earlier precedent. As Rosenblum notes, many of Bronzino's portraits have the same strabismus, creating a potent, yet subtle shift in the effect of the sitter's gaze. Bronzino's elongated and enigmatic Mannerist portraits, such as *Portrait of a Young Man* (1530s, Metropolitan Museum of Art) provided a template for Ingres's portrait work. Rosenblum explains:

Even the walleyed gaze, so common in Bronzino, recurs constantly in Ingres's painted and drawn portraiture, a disquieting device that rebuffs in psychological terms, the spectator's efforts to penetrate too closely behind the sitter's masklike composure, and that also creates, in formal terms, a shifting of surface activity away from what might otherwise be too intense a point of a visual focus.⁵⁰

Tracing the origin of the artistic representation of strabismus further, Bronzino may have been quoting the work of Albrecht Dürer, whom he very much admired. Dürer's own walleyed gaze in *Self-Portrait at 26* (1498, Museo del Prado, Madrid), is a result of the artist's need to look at both the mirror and his painting while adopting a three-quarter

pose. Therefore the question of whether a spate of ocular maladies occurred in the Renaissance or during Ingres's time, or whether these artists were deploying strabismus for artistic effects and homage to their predecessors remains uncertain.

In contrast to the fetishizing of the neck in female portraiture, Ingres eliminates necks entirely in most of his portraits of men. In the famous *Portrait of Monsieur Bertin* (1832; Fig. 16), Bertin's large head sinks directly into his swollen, corpulent frame, almost as if his head were superimposed upon his body. Indeed, a survey of his male portraits from *M. Philibert Rivière* (1805), *Lorenzo Bartolini* (1820), *François-Marius Granet* (1807), and *Napoleon on His Imperial Throne* (1806), is a panorama of neckless heads sinking into torsos. Though male fashions of the early nineteenth-century emphasized a high collar, Ingres's neckless portraits are exaggerated in their liberty at eliminating the neck.

As a symbol, the exposed neck signifies vulnerability with its easy access to the jugular. Recent neuroscience research confirms that exposing one's neck is a recognized sign of vulnerability and weakness,⁵¹ and thus Ingres's disappearing male necks solidify the power he sought to convey in his male portraits. In the case of *Monsieur Bertin*, Gautier praised the portrait's keen match of the sitter's physical presentation in the painting with his moral character and self-confidence.⁵²

Ingres's own words support the view that his pathological anatomical distortions were fictive and symbolic rather than an empirical representation of the body. Ingres's pupil Amaury-Duval records his master's aversion to the study of anatomy, dissuading his students from assiduously studying their *écorchés*: "Si j'avais dû apprendre l'anatomie, moi, messieurs, je ne me serais pas fait peintre. Copiez donc tout bonnement

la nature, tout bêtement, et vous serez déjà quelque chose.”⁵³ Ingres sought a faithful representation of nature, but by nature he meant the internal emotional world of his figures.

Notes

¹² For a more thorough discussion of troubadour style, see François Pupil, *Le style troubadour ou la nostalgie du bon vieux temps* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1985), Francis Haskell, "The Old Masters in Nineteenth-Century French Painting," *Art Quarterly* 34.1 (1971): 55-85, and Nadia Tscherny, *Romance and Chivalry: History and Literature Reflected in Early Nineteenth-Century French Painting* (London: Matthiesen Fine Art, 1996).

¹³ David's early work, *Apelles Painting Campaspe in the Presence of Alexandre the Great* (Date Unknown), Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille, is an earlier example of the theme of the artist at work.

¹⁴ Despite exceptional works by Ingres, Delacroix and even Manet, the majority of the exponents of this style were artists who are considered minor today due to their conservatism, but who were well regarded in their time. Haskell, "The Old Masters in Nineteenth-Century French Painting," 75-76.

¹⁵ James MacPherson's forged epic poem, *Ossian* (1760), was another influential text in the troubadour genre. Anne-Louis Girodet de Triosson's *Ossian Receiving the Ghosts of the Fallen French Heroes* (1805) and Ingres's *Dream of Ossian* (1813) treated this falsified Gaelic legend. Girodet's painting was an early work in the emergence of Romanticism. Sir Walter Scott's work, an important source of material for the troubadour Romantics, was inspired by *Ossian*. See Rosenblum, 15, and Tscherny, 182-93.

¹⁶ The tombs of Abélard and Héloïse were housed in the museum until being transferred to Père Lachaise in 1824. Pupil, 514.

¹⁷ Christopher Riopelle, "Study for Roger Freeing Angelica," in *A Private Passion: 19th-century Paintings and Drawings from the Grenville L. Winthrop Collection*, ed. Stephan Wolohojian (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 170.

¹⁸ Daniel Ternois, "L'Éros Ingres," *Revue de L'Art* 64 (1982): 42.

¹⁹ Antonio Vivaldi's opera *Orlando Furioso* (1714), Joseph Haydn's opera *Orlando Paladino* (1782), and George Frideric Handel's opera *Alcina* (1735) were all based off Ariosto's text. Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queen* (1590) borrows heavily from *Orlando Furioso*. Lord Byron's *Don Juan* (1818) takes inspiration from Ariosto's poem as well as Cervantes's *Don Quixote* (1605). Ariosto's text also figures into the plot of Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814). Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso: A New Verse Translation*, trans. David Slavitt (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), vii-xiv.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 140-221.

²¹ Susan Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 49.

²² Riopelle, 170.

²³ Phyllis Hattis, *Ingres' Sculptural Style: A Group of Unknown Drawings* (Cambridge, MA: Garland Publishing, 1970), 28.

²⁴ Several of Ingres's studies of sculpture do have a quality of flatness. See Ariane (c. 1789-1791), Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, MA.

²⁵ For a more complete understanding of the complex history of these paintings, see Barbara Hochstetler Meyer, "Leonardo's Hypothetical Painting of Leda and the Swan,"

Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 34.3 (1990): 279-94.

²⁶ "Unsightly and almost tumid," Paul Mantz, "Salon de 1855" [*Roger et Angélique*], 222, quoted in Carol Ockman, *Ingres's Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 165.

²⁷ Susan L. Siegfried, "Ingres's Reading--The Undoing of Narrative," in *Fingering Ingres*, ed. Susan L. Siegfried (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 23.

²⁸ Riopelle, 170.

²⁹ Wildenstein notes that this painting was painted earlier than the Louvre version, but signed in 1859 at the request of Haro, as indicated by an inscription on the upper cross-bar of the frame. Georges Wildenstein, *The Paintings of J.A.D. Ingres* (London: Phaidon Press, 1956), 223.

³⁰ "Analogous to the visual field and the keyhole view so dear to literary erotica,"

Stéphane Guégan, *Ingres Érotique* (Paris: Flammarion, 2006), 67 (translation mine).

³¹ Marjorie Cohn, "Introduction: In Pursuit of Perfection," in Patricia Condon et al eds. *In Pursuit of Perfection: The Art of J.-A.-D. Ingres* (Louisville, Ky: The J.B. Speed Art Museum, in association with Indiana University Press, 1983), 98.

³² Franz Merke, *History and Iconography of Endemic Goitre and Cretinism* (Berne: Hans Huber, 1984), 22-28, 92-100.

³³ "His audacity is unique, and combined with such cunning, he does not shrink from ugliness and bizarrerie" Charles Baudelaire, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 2 (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1868) 144 (translation mine).

- ³⁴ Lennart Bondeson and Anne-Greth Bondeson, "Michelangelo's Divine Goitre," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 96 (December 2003): 609-11.
- ³⁵ Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined*, 44-45.
- ³⁶ Robert Rosenblum, "The Ingres Centenary at Montauban," *The Burlington Magazine* 109 (1967): 584.
- ³⁷ Cohn, 79.
- ³⁸ Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined*, 52.
- ³⁹ Cohn, 10.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., 10.
- ⁴¹ The artistic practice of copying and replication of works was not unique to Ingres in the nineteenth-century. For an examination of this practice, see Eik Kahng, ed, *Repeating Image: Multiples in French Painting* (Baltimore: Walters Art Museum, 2007); Patricia Mainardi., "Copies, Variations, Replicas," *Visual Resources* 15 (1999): 123-47; Patricia Mainardi, "Déjà Vu? Revealing Repetition in French Masterpieces" *19th-C. Art Worldwide*, 7/1 (2008), ONLINE journal. Patricia Mainardi "Impressionist Replication," Bakos, ed., *Artwork Through Market* (Bratislava, 2004), 155-72; Eliza Rathbone, et al., *Van Gogh Repetitions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013) (exh. cat.).
- ⁴² Cohn, 13.
- ⁴³ Hans Naef, "Paolo und Francesca: Zum Problem der Schöpferischen nachahmung bei Ingres," *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 10.1 (1956): 107.
- ⁴⁴ "Paolo extends a disproportionate neck to reach Francesca's lips, another blatant exaggeration. But precisely through this swan-like lover's neck, the passionate impulse of his character is translated with a caressing energy," Oliver Merson, *Ingres: Sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris: J. Hetzel, 1867) 72 (translation mine).
- ⁴⁵ Cohn, 13.
- ⁴⁶ Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined*, 67.
- ⁴⁷ The painting is often identified as portrait of Madame Aymon, though that attribution is uncertain. *La Belle Zélie*, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Rouen, accessed 16 December 2014. <http://mbarouen.fr/fr/oeuvres/la-belle-zelie>

⁴⁸ “You will note the enlarged thyroid so dear to Ingres, a marked facial asymmetry and slight exotropia.” Paul-Marie Maxime Laignel-Lavastine “La Glande Thyroïde Dans L'Oeuvre De M. Ingres,” *Aesculape* 3 (March 1929): 70 (translation mine).

⁴⁹ He focuses on their beauty with the harshness of surgeon; he follows the undulations of their lighter lines with the subservience of a lover, Baudelaire, 145 (translation mine).

⁵⁰ Rosenblum, 36.

⁵¹ Jaak Pansksepp, *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 191.

⁵² “No one has made portraits better than he [Ingres]. To the external likeness of the model he joins an internal likeness; beneath the physical portrait he makes the moral portrait. Isn’t an entire epoch revealed in this splendid pose of M. Bertin de Vaux [sic] supporting--like a bourgeois Caesar--his handsome and strong hands on his powerful knees with the authority of intelligence, of wealth, and a justifiable self-confidence? What a well-balanced mind! What a lucid and masculine gaze!” Théophile Gautier, “Salon de 1833,” *La France littéraire* (1833), in Michael Marrinan, *Romantic Paris: Histories of a Cultural Landscape, 1800-1850* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 244.

⁵³ “If I had had to learn anatomy, gentleman, I would not have become a painter. Just copy nature, quite simply, and you will already be something,” Eugène-Emmanuel Amaury-Duval, *L’atelier d’Ingres: Souvenirs* (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1878), 58 (translation mine).

CHAPTER 3

BEGUILING BACKS: THE GRANDE ODALISQUE

In this chapter, I discuss the inventive distortions that Ingres used in his harem paintings, most famously in the *Grande Odalisque* (1814; Fig. 17), Ingres's iconic painting of the back of a nude woman in a lush Orientalist setting. This painting exemplifies Ingres's use of a distortion as an imaginary solution to an aesthetic problem. I am arguing that the odalisque's distortions are Ingres's response to the conventional image of the Academic female nude, enhancing its allure. Her deformations, which are not limited to the length of her back, are that which make the painting, in its cold beauty, compelling and memorable. Moreover, departing from Rosenblum's assertion, examined in the introduction, that Ingres's strength lay in his ability to adapt his style to his subject matter, I argue that the odalisque's imaginary distortions accord perfectly with the wholly imaginary setting and the genre of the fictive harem painting. The odalisque's serpentine back is an accessory that complements the luxurious Oriental trappings of excess and imagination, while at the same time, this deformation undermines the reality implied by the stylistic hyperrealism displayed in the details of the setting.

Criticism of this painting from its debut has focused on the odalisque's deformation, specifically the anatomically impossible extension of her back, and its implication. Critics have fixated on the addition of extra vertebrae to create the especially long back of the odalisque, a distortion which has equally mystified and delighted its viewers from the nineteenth-century to the present day. Art historians and critics unquestionably accepted Auguste Hilarion, le comte de Kératry's pronouncement about the metrics of this distortion in Ingres's *Grande Odalisque*, without any empirical

evidence to support this measurement.⁵⁴ Kératry declared to Amaury-Duval: “Son odalisque a trois vertèbres de trop.”⁵⁵ In fact, according to a 2004 study by researchers at the Department of Physical Medicine at the Hôtel-Dieu in Paris, Ingres’s odalisque has five extra vertebrae, and a scoliotic curve of the trunk as well as a lengthening and rotation of the pelvis.⁵⁶ This finding speaks to the sustained interest that this distortion has elicited, from researchers inside and outside of art history. This empirical data provides a counterpoint to the often unscientific and speculative evaluation of Ingres’s anatomy that art historians and critics have put forth.

Though Kératry’s pronouncement implied a defect in drawing, Amaury-Duval saw otherwise. His rebuttal to Kératry’s assertion captures the aesthetic argument for this deformation: “[Kératry] avait peut-être raison. Et après? qui sait si ce n’est pas la longueur du torse qui lui donne cette forme serpentine saisissante au premier abord? Dans des proportions exactes, aurait-elle un attrait aussi puissant?”⁵⁷ Amaury-Duval asserted that these unusual proportions imbued the odalisque with a powerful fascination that distinguished her from the formulaic nude.

As a counterpoint, Ingres’s *Vénus Anadyomène* (Fig. 18), painted between 1808 and 1848, demonstrates how Ingres’s attempt to render an entirely undistorted, conventional female nude produces an uninspiring and pedestrian work.⁵⁸ Indeed, Ingres’s early abandonment of the painting only to finish it more than thirty years later may speak to his ambivalence about this particular painting, a conventional nude with an Academic-styled body within a traditional setting. The painting, whose subject is the birth of Venus, was inspired by the lost eponymous painting by Apelles described in Pliny’s *Natural History* and also paid homage to Botticelli’s prototype. Ingres envisioned

it as a pendant to his male nude *Oedipus and the Sphinx* (1808; Fig. 19).⁵⁹ *Vénus Anadyomène* was well received in its time; Gautier waxed poetically on its virtues, interpreting Ingres's delay in finishing the painting as evidence of his unwillingness to part with a beloved work: "La Vénus Anadyomène est peut-être la figure que le peintre a caressée le plus amoureuxment; il l'a quittée, reprise, comme on fait d'une maîtresse adorée."⁶⁰

Baudelaire, however, judged *Vénus Anadyomène*, like many of Ingres's other paintings which retread old Masters, as an "archaïsme."⁶¹ His justification was that the *Vénus Anadyomène* was a genre used by Renaissance enamellers; therefore the work did not accord with the *Zeitgeist*, and Ingres was retreating to his habit of merely updating old works, like his direct quotations of Raphael that I examine in the next chapter.

Kenneth Clark had doubts about the painting as well, explaining its weakness: "The Botticellian line has been substantiated by a full Raphaellesque modeling, but in a few places--for example, the outline of her left side--generalization has become too dominant over particularity..."⁶² The lack of particularity that Clark perceives in her body--a body which is a bit too generic, and moreover does not innovate the form of the nude, for it lacks that identifiable Ingresque stamp--is matched by the lack of specificity in the anemically painted backdrop.

To the contemporary eye, the painting lacks interest, seemingly indistinguishable from the Academic nudes that graced the Salon of 1863 fifteen years later. This so-called "Salon des Vénus,"⁶³ was a critical event in which doubts began to surface about whether these paintings of blandly beautiful nude women, cloaked in mythological subject matter,

were indeed fine art. Two years would pass before Manet's submission of *Olympia* which, though painted in 1863, would wholly undermine the genre in the Salon of 1865.⁶⁴

In the Salon of 1863, Ingres's pupil Amaury-Duval's entry was the *Birth of Venus* (1862; Fig. 20), a figure whose body position--arm draped over head, caressing her abundant golden hair--is the mirror image of Ingres's *Vénus Anadyomène*, but stripped of the attendant cupids. Amaury-Duval did not much improve on his master's work, beyond elongating her body to a more Botticellian proportion--perhaps his own attempt at the "serpentine form" of the odalisque--and giving his Venus a hardness that Ingres's painting lacked with her dry outlined figure. Ingres's failure to create a compelling nude with a normative, Classical female body provides evidence that the distortions of the *Grande Odalisque* are precisely the attributes which made the painting aesthetically successful, just as Amaury-Duval claimed.

By deploying the harem genre, Ingres moved beyond Venus, whose type was problematic in 1863; but even earlier in the nineteenth-century, Venus-as-nude lacked the novelty that the Orientalist genre provided Ingres. Criticism of the past forty years has variously interpreted *Grande Odalisque* as the acme of both Orientalist fantasy and the objectifying power of the male gaze. French critic Théophile Gautier recognized, long before the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979) and the advent of postcolonial theory, that the harem genre provided the pretext to paint a contemporary nude woman, though in an exotic context, flouting the European mœurs which dictated that women conceal their bodies: "M. Ingres aime ce sujet si favorable à la peinture, ce prétexte si commode de nu dans notre époque habillée des pieds à la tête."⁶⁵ Indeed, the genre is convenient for Ingres's representation of a nude woman, an energizing change

from the tired mythology of *Vénus Anadyomène*. Though Ingres could have also exploited biblical themes for representing nudes, he refrained from doing so, preferring the realm of imaginative Oriental fantasy and well-trod mythology.

Unlike Delacroix, whose 1832 trip to the Maghreb provided him with quasi-ethnographic representations of the Middle East and its women--he titled his harem scene *Women of Algiers in Their Apartment* (1834; Fig. 21), rather than employing the loaded term *odalisque*--Ingres's only contact with the Orient was through the Orientalist literature and visual culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century and his imagination. Indeed, the term *odalisque* comes from the Turkish word *odalik*, slave room attendant, *oda* meaning room. Though the Turkish term entered the French language in the seventeenth century, it was not until the middle of the eighteenth that the term *odalisque* took on the connotation of a harem woman with their exotic sensuality.⁶⁶ Throughout his life, Ingres accumulated several prints of Turkish genre scenes--evidence of the eighteenth century vogue for *turquerie*--though these prints are notable for their detailed emphasis on costuming, and all depict clothed figures.⁶⁷

Delacroix's clothed women may have had limited social status and were represented in a private space which Delacroix never personally observed. However, Ingres's *odalisque* is by definition a slave, and thus, in a certain sense, a non-person--an object. Adrian Rifkin sees the *odalisque* as a captive woman--a "femme-objet"⁶⁸ as he calls her. Moreover, he identifies the *odalisque*'s deformed back as the essential quality which makes her an object and characterizes the painting: "Her essence, perhaps, lies in this fault of drawing--the extra vertebra--for she is, above all, a woman who will never need to stand up--least of all at a kitchen sink, or on her own two feet."⁶⁹

Rifkin's comment speaks to the fantasy element that has long characterized the commentary on Ingres's painting. Indeed, the *Grande Odalisque* has become a cliché of Orientalism and the "white male gaze." Rifkin argues that scholarship has used Ingres as an example for these theoretical questions, and, in doing so, scholars have overlooked the nuances of his life and work: "Where there is the white male gaze, there might be one of Ingres' nudes. Where there is the question of the colonial other, his Orient might figure this important theoretical discovery..."⁷⁰

Ingres's painting may be an Orientalist fantasy, but it also contains peculiarities that merit our attention. There is a contradictory element to the fantasy. As if to compensate for his lack of first-hand knowledge of the Orient, Ingres has furnished his *Grande Odalisque* with details rendered with sharp, hyperrealistic clarity. As Linda Nochlin argues in the "The Imaginary Orient" (1983), the Academic artist Jean-Léon Gérôme, celebrated for his hallucinatory images of the Orient, employs such details for the creation of a pseudo-scientific effect of verisimilitude--a documentary representation of the Middle East:

Such details, supposedly there to denote the real directly, are actually there simply to signify its presence in the work as a whole. As Barthes points out, the major function of gratuitous, accurate details like these is to announce "we are the real." They are signifiers of the category of the real, there to give credibility to the "realness" of the work as a whole, to authenticate the total visual field as a simple, artless reflection--in this case, of a supposed Oriental reality.⁷¹

Like Gérôme, Ingres has infused his setting with the precise details and academic finish that signify empiricism. The peacock feather and the shimmering fabrics with their

varieties of textures--including brocade, velvet, and taffeta--are rendered with scientific exactitude, creating an effect of hyperrealism. The sensual contrast of the drapery with the flesh of the odalisque invokes tactility, and the rustle of the fabrics elicit the sense of sound. The effect of the five senses is completed with the other exotic accessories in the composition: the narghile and perfume burner, two motifs that followed an eighteenth-century tradition of iconographically representing the Orient;⁷² one of the prints in Ingres's collection shows Turkish woman smoking a long-stemmed pipe.⁷³ These objects evoke the senses of smell and taste.

Yet, unlike Gérôme, Ingres breaks the reality effect. With the odalisque's distorted body, the painting becomes patently unreal, and the fantasy becomes evident. With this supposed defect of drawing, Ingres reveals his own authorship in generating this scene. The odalisque's body adds a note of dissonance to the multisensory experience of the work. Norman Bryson describes the failed promise of the painting, its tantalizing almost-reality, which provides an experience close to synesthesia:

...the painting comes so close, comes to within a hair's breath, of persuasiveness. The *Grande Odalisque* promises a union of all the senses: touch, in the fan; scent, in the smoking censer; taste, in the hookah; sight, in the jewels; hearing in the version of the *Valpinçon baigneuse*, a spout gushes below the odalisque's right foot into a pool of water. The figure also promises a perfection of unity and self-containment in the finality of her contour. But all such promises are broken by the painting itself, which denies--undoes--its reality as an authentic presence.⁷⁴

The authentic presence is broken for Bryson because the odalisque is no more than a contour; it lacks the corporeal presence that is palpable in Delacroix's living

women. But in contrast, just as *Olympia* would be faulted for reeking of the morgue in 1865, so too does the odalisque's body flirt with the criticism of being deathly.⁷⁵ Critic Théophile Thoré found the odalisque wanting in fleshy reality. He wrote of her body: "Cela ne ressemble point au velouté de la chair vivante."⁷⁶ Her flesh, lacking the velvety soft quality present in the other tactile textures of her surroundings, became all the more jarring in its discordance.

The binary schema constructed in traditional art history narratives--Ingres vs. Delacroix, Classicism vs. Romanticism--begins to break down when the two artists' Orientalist paintings are compared. Ingres's stylistic verisimilitude would seem to convey realism, while Delacroix's effusion of color and visible brushstrokes would seem to imply the supremacy of the imagination and emotion in Romanticism. But in terms of the artists' experiences, Delacroix's painting was grounded in his travels to North Africa, as Michael Marrinan explains, confounding the categories of Classicism and Romanticism:

...Eugène Delacroix--the hot-blooded romantic of 1834--painted a harem that broke sharply with stereotypical male fantasies to control the world of Oriental women directly, and with a scrupulous attention to detail fueled by his eyewitness experience. All of which suggests that the easy categories of style commonly used to frame the history of these decades--especially romantic and classic--were complicated and blurred by cultural forces unleashed in contemporary debates about exoticism and otherness, gender and class.⁷⁷

Underscoring this contradiction further, Thoré called Ingres in 1846 "l'artiste le plus romantique du dix-neuvième siècle,"⁷⁸ a lofty title contrary to subsequent classifications. Thoré further qualified this assessment by defining Romanticism as follows: "si le

romantisme est l'amour exclusif de la forme, l'indifférence absolue sur tous les mystères de la vie humaine, le scepticisme en philosophie et en politique, le détachement égoïste de tous les sentiments communs et solidaires.”⁷⁹ While it is difficult to insert Ingres into such a grandiose definition, it could be argued that Thore's remark about “exclusive love of form,” fits Ingres with regard to the odalisque.

In *Ways of Seeing*, John Berger condemns the odalisque to the category of the nude, rather than the naked--an object rather than an individual.⁸⁰ Berger likens the *Grande Odalisque* to a pin-up photograph, comparing the inviting, calculated expression of a pin-up girl to the blandly pretty, expressionless mien of the odalisque.⁸¹ Devoid of psychological insight, the odalisque's forgettable face could be read as a blank canvas for projected male fantasies.

Bryson, however, contests Berger's reading, arguing that the odalisque is so unreal that she cannot be subject to the objectification of the male gaze. Rather, she disrupts the gaze with her broken and troubling body:

...the woman is not a three-dimensional being at all, but a bi-dimensional design whose plausibility evaporates when elaborated into the ‘three-dimensional’ flesh of this, Ingres' most impossible creation. Above all, she is not a stereotype (as the ‘girlie magazine’ figure most certainly is). Stereotypes can be said to be linked to cultural identity and enjoyment, in a standardising and homogenising process of building ‘the civil subject’; but the *Grande Odalisque* is the opposite of this: a radical disruption of the standard and homogenous image of woman...⁸²

Bryson's use of the word “design” is apt, implying the purely aesthetic intent of the figure. Bryson implies that her images is an abstracted notion of beauty. Her body is a

zen kōan of frustration, the body becoming, in Bryson's words, "a radically dehiscent image whose construction further disintegrates the longer one examines it."⁸³ Indeed, the relationship between the figure's right leg and back is puzzling, and the left leg is implausibly attached to her body. The deformations multiply: the C-curve of her spine is excessively scoliotic, her neck has impossible folds, her shoulders are tapered and jointless, her left arm is shorter than her right. Marrinan reads a more prurient motivation behind the fanciful arrangement of her body as he explicates her impossible anatomy: "...Ingres has twisted his woman anti-anatomically so that the viewer can catch a glimpse of the breast but still delight in the long sensuous curve of her spine and full, fleshy buttock."⁸⁴ This distortion for erotic effect can also be seen in Ingres's *Jupiter and Thetis* (1811).⁸⁵

In addition to showing the seldom seen side of most nudes, the back, Ingres also prominently features the bottom of the odalisque's feet, another infrequently represented part of female anatomy. The bare feet of the odalisque corroborate the *idée reçue* of harem women who, in their indolence and idleness, would never need to wear shoes. The soles of the feet have also been employed as an erotic motif in artistic precedents with which Ingres may have been familiar. In Correggio's highly sensual paintings *Jupiter and Io* (c. 1532-33; Fig. 22), the viewer catches a glimpse of the soles of Io's feet in the intimate moment during her ravishment by Jupiter. Similarly, in Correggio's *Danaë* (c.1531; Fig. 23), Danaë reveals her feet to the viewer while Eros undresses her. A more apt comparison could also be made to Velázquez's *Rokeby Venus* (c. 1647-51; Fig. 24), whose soles are visible. Certainly, the *Rokeby Venus* is part of the lineage of reclining

nudes that undoubtedly influenced Ingres's production of *Grande Odalisque*. Whether Ingres was familiar with this painting and the two by Correggio is uncertain.⁸⁶

A more certain influence on Ingres in his development of the odalisque genre is a print after the painting *Young Woman Going to Bed* (c. 1650; Fig. 25) by Jacob van Loo. Amaury-Duval noted seeing the print in 1830 in Ingres's studio, and Hélène Toussaint contends that Ingres must have been familiar with the image before he left for Rome in 1806.⁸⁷ In *Young Woman Going to Bed*, the figure's pose and body habitus more closely approximate, and undoubtedly influenced, Ingres's production of the *Bather of Valpinçon* (1808; Fig. 26), but the surroundings of *Young Woman Going to Bed* resemble those of the *Grande Odalisque*. The textures of velvet, gold brocade and Oriental carpeting, in their sumptuous tactility, could have provided a model for the setting of the *Grande Odalisque*. Ingres may have also appropriated her coy glance backward at the viewer for the *Grande Odalisque*; her left foot is lifted up, also confronting the viewer. These glimpses of the (literally) base part of female anatomy render these paintings perhaps more outré by displaying what is normally concealed, even in a conventional nude. Outré indeed--Thoré compared the undersides of her feet to a "une vessie pleine"⁸⁸--a full bladder! Though it is difficult to understand exactly what Thoré meant by this analogy, one can assume he viewed the odalisque's feet as unattractively bloated and disproportionate.

Due to the odalisque's particularity of anatomy, Clark calls the work "uncompromisingly personal, and for this reason the least classical."⁸⁹ The painting is personal in its unfettered display of the artist's vision, perhaps even his idiosyncratic tastes and offbeat ideals of beauty, countering Baudelaire's claim that Ingres lacked

imagination.⁹⁰ Clark continues by theorizing about the painting's stylistic origins: "[The *Grande Odalisque*] could, indeed, be claimed as the culminating work of the School of Fontainebleau, in which all that is approximate and provincial in the pupils of Primaticcio is at last given a metropolitan finality."⁹¹

The elongated female torsos of the Mannerist school that developed under King François I, exemplified by Primaticcio's stucco overdoors in the palace at Fontainebleau, may have provided a prototype for the long back of his odalisque. Just as these Mannerist distortions were reactions against the stifling confines of the ideals of Renaissance Classicism, so too can Ingres's deformations be read as a reaction against the Classical ideals of David's training. Yet such a citation to these predecessors earned Ingres the criticism that his work was retrograde, or "gothique,"⁹² as Gautier reported. Gautier disagreed with these criticisms, and, in contrast, piled effusive praise on the painting, rapturously describing how the voluptuous curves of the odalisque matched her indifferent and lugubrious expression, all together harmoniously becoming "un type où l'individualité de l'Orient se mêle à l'idéal de la Grèce."⁹³ Gautier's comment underscores the notion that Classical tropes and ideals, such as a canonically proportioned body, would be insufficient to successfully execute a painting of a nude woman in an Orientalist setting.

Returning to the issue of the nude and its viewer, its commissioning and consumption, Carol Ockman has questioned the reading of the *Grande Odalisque* as exclusively an object of the male gaze. However, her analysis differs from Bryson's in that she identifies the role of female agency and pleasure in the genesis and viewing of this work. Indeed, the *Grande Odalisque* was commissioned by a woman, Caroline

Murat, the sister of Napoleon, as a gift to her husband Joachim Murat, then appointed the King of Naples. Queen Caroline commissioned the painting in 1814 as a pendant to the *Sleeper of Naples* (1808), which her husband had purchased in 1809 at the sale del Campidoglio in Rome while Ingres was sojourning there on his Prix de Rome fellowship.

Ingres executed the *Sleeper of Naples* as part of his figure study requirements for the French Academy in Rome; unlike the *Grande Odalisque*, the setting was the classical world. The *Sleeper of Naples* was lost after the fall of the Murats' reign, much to Ingres's chagrin as he tried to search it out many years later.⁹⁴ Studies and descriptions of the painting remain; an extant drawing titled *Reclining Odalisque*, a study for the *Sleeper* (Fig. 27), depicts a forward-facing reclining nude figure, whose languorous twisted position with arm draped over her head is later identically repeated in *Odalisque with Slave* (1839; Fig. 28), though the latter painting has the addition of a lute-playing servant and a black slave.

Ockman further argues that Queen Caroline's commission was an example of a powerful woman employing art both as a form of self-fashioning and an assertion of her authority, slyly referencing the precedent set forth by her sister Paolina Borghese and their acquaintance Madame Récamier. Borghese notoriously immortalized herself as *Venus Victrix* (1808; Fig. 29), the semi-clad victorious Venus, in the sculpture by Antonio Canova. She reportedly posed nude for Canova, continuing a tradition, originating with the School of Fontainebleau, of French noblewomen portraying goddesses.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, this was a transgressive move for a woman in her social position. Her choice to present herself as a reclining nude mythological figure, the

goddess of love, was received as presumptuous and as further evidence of her reputation as a libertine.

As part of the same social circle as Madame Récamier, Borghese and her sister may have been aware of Madame Récamier's reclining portrait by David, painted in 1800 (Fig. 30), whose execution was assisted by Ingres.⁹⁶ The pose of *Madame Récamier*, who was also a close friend of Canova, is closely mimicked in *Grande Odalisque*. The reclining pose-as-meme surely spread among this group. Thus *Venus Victrix* could also be interpreted as a verso to *Madame Récamier*'s recto, a portrait in which her self-styling--delicate clothing and hairstyle--also aligns Madame Récamier with mythological goddesses.

Queen Caroline, unlike her sister, did not pose for Ingres as the odalisque; moreover, her portrait of the same year is of such a different tenor, so defiantly lacking in sensuality that its existence alone would seem to prove that the odalisque could not be Queen Caroline. However, she seems to have battled rumors that she was the model, as evidenced in a letter Ingres wrote to the comte de Narbonne-Pelet, French ambassador to Naples, in which he defended Queen Caroline:

Des obligéants, comme il y en a tant par le monde, ont accredité a ce qu'il paraît que j'ai eu l'intention de retracer les traits de Mme Murat dans cette peinture. Çela est absolument faux, mon modèle est à Rome, c'est une petite fille de 10 ans qui m'en a servi, et d'ailleurs ceux qui ont connu Mme Murat peuvent me juger.⁹⁷

Ingres's assertion that he employed a ten-year-old girl as his model as a defense of Queen Caroline is undoubtedly rather baffling, given that the odalisque clearly does not have a prepubescent body. Ockman suggests that this is Ingres's attempt to desexualize the

perception of the painting, though why a painting of a nude ten-year-old girl would be more appropriate is unclear.⁹⁸ Ingres himself harbored some anxieties about whether the *Grande Odalisque* would be perceived as indecent, or too “voluptueux,”⁹⁹ in his own words.

Ingres was commissioned to paint Queen Caroline’s portrait in the same year as the execution of the *Grande Odalisque*, 1814, though the exact date is unknown. This portrait is a fine example of Ingres’s career as a portrait painter--his skilled ability to use costuming and pose to accentuate the social position of his sitter. In her portrait (Fig. 31), Queen Caroline fashions herself entirely differently than her sister and Madame Récamier--upright, heavily clothed, and defeminized. Queen Caroline is shown as a formidable black pyramid, echoed in form by the smoldering Mount Vesuvius, artfully framed in the window. Vesuvius’s steam is matched by the poof of Queen Caroline’s black hat. This painting has only recently become a visible part of Ingres’s body of work as it was lost until 1987, and not published until 1990.

The *Grande Odalisque* and *Caroline Murat* are, in a certain sense, antipodes in their representation of woman. The odalisque, captive in her setting and disabled by her anatomy, is the corollary of Queen Caroline--the former would not exist without the latter. By commissioning a work whose subject is a fictive object of beauty, Caroline asserts her own power in both creating her and subjugating her. In Ingres’s portrait, Caroline is devoid of any typically feminine iconography, such as décolletage, jewelry (other than her diamond earrings), children or other symbols of motherhood and female narcissism. Her gaze is direct and fearless. As a counterpoint, her portrait from six years prior, Baron François Gérard’s *Caroline Murat and Her Children* (1808; Fig. 32), is a

study of a regal maternal figure, clothed in delicate and graceful fashions which amply display her bosom. Moreover, in the Gérard portrait, she is surrounded by her four children to create an overall image of Napoleonic femininity. The queen looks away from the viewer modestly, as if momentarily distracted from the barely concealed chaotic energy of her children.

In contrast, Ingres's portrait of the queen is a study in orthogonal lines, in the mullions of the window and hard edges in the chairs and table. Her body, wrapped in its mountainous container of clothing, does not allow the painter to engage in fanciful distortion, for only her face and hands are visible. Though there is no evidence that Queen Caroline had a role in designing the composition of her portrait by Ingres, she did require it to be revised to suit her tastes, and Ingres apparently had difficulty satisfying the queen. In a letter to his friend, the architect François Mazois, through whom Ingres had made the queen's acquaintance, Ingres reported that Queen Caroline was dissatisfied, and that subsequently he had to redo her head and hat three times.¹⁰⁰

Queen Caroline's self-fashioning of her image in Ingres's portrait is doubly powerful given her role as progenitor of the *Grande Odalisque*. Siegfried reads a coded reference between the two paintings in the iconography of the odalisque's bracelet.¹⁰¹ The coiled gold bracelet on her right wrist is nearly identical to the bracelet worn by the sitter in Raphael and Giulio Romano's painting *Doña Isabel de Requesens i Enriquez de Cardona-Anglesola* (c. 1518; Fig. 33). In the early nineteenth-century, the painting was known as *Jeanne d'Aragon* based on an attribution by Vasari, and Ingres owned an engraving after the painting. As Jeanne d'Aragon was vice-queen of Naples, Ingres may have painted the bracelet to link her and the present queen of Naples, Caroline Murat--a

very subtle *clin d'oeil* that could be interpreted as Queen Caroline's mark on and ownership of the *Grande Odalisque*. Like the turban, the motif of the gold bracelet repeats again in all but the first of his series *Raphael and La Fornarina*, becoming a motif that haunts Ingres's works.

The *Grande Odalisque* teases us with its enigmatic anatomical errors that invite psychological interpretation. Balzac recognized this potent aspect of this painting and inserted its phantasma into his short story *Le Chef d'oeuvre inconnu* (*The Unknown Masterpiece*; 1831). Balzac set his narrative in the seventeenth century, telling a story that interweaves fictional characters and the fictionalized historical figure of Poussin, a mix of fantasy and reality that is analogous to quasi-reality of the eponymous "masterpiece." Poussin's presence in the story is significant in that Ingres viewed himself as a descendent in the lineage of Poussin, the French Raphael of the seventeenth century. Indeed, Ingres painted Poussin's likeness into his *School of Athens* aspirant, the *Apotheosis of Homer* (1827; Fig. 34), a painting that was a thinly veiled claim that Ingres was the pretender to the Raphael/Poussin throne.

In *Le Chef d'oeuvre inconnu*, old master Frenhofer waxes lyrically to his friends and fellow painters Poussin and Porbus about a painting he has been working on for ten years. The painting is a portrait of a woman of an indescribable, exotic beauty, whom the painter says he has imbued with his soul. Frenhofer claims that he would need "to go to Turkey, to Greece, to Asia--for the purpose of finding a model"¹⁰² who would possess these attributes. Frenhofer states, "The woman is not a creature, she is a creation,"¹⁰³ emphasizing the role the artistic imagination has played in the production of this painting. The old painter describes his masterpiece: "Whoever saw it would believe he was

observing a woman lying on a velvet couch, beneath the surrounding curtains. Beside her, on a golden tripod, perfumes are burning. You would be tempted to grasp the tassel of the cords which hold back the curtains...”¹⁰⁴ Evidently, in this ekphrasis, Balzac’s description lucidly evokes the *Grande Odalisque*. However, when the two younger painters finally enter Frenhofer’s studio, they are stupefied by beautiful, mimetic paintings on the wall that Frenhofer dismisses as “worthless” and “mistakes.”¹⁰⁵ Instead, Frenhofer draws their attention to a painting that is nothing more than a mass of blurred hues and chaotic accretions of paint. Poussin and Porbus are confused by this canvas, until they finally see a foot, the only evidence of humanity visible in the imaginary masterpiece. The old man continues to rhapsodize on the contours and details of his figure, his finest work, an ideal of painting that exists purely in his imagination. Poussin and Porbus finally grasp the situation. Porbus reassures that Frenhofer is a “a very great painter.”¹⁰⁶ Poussin affirms Porbus’s claim by making an pronouncement that equally could be applied to Ingres with his real-life odalisque and her baffling anatomy: “He is even more poet than painter.”¹⁰⁷

Balzac’s story is a parable about the singularity of artistic vision and the challenge of creating a masterpiece under the burden of artistic tradition. Unlike Frenhofer, Ingres had a patron for his singular *Grande Odalisque*. Caroline Murat’s patronage of the painting was more than a titillating gift for her husband; it was also a means to assert her authority by distinguishing herself as a woman who commissions and controls the woman-as-object. Just as Frenhofer was bored by his conventional painting and needed to deploy abstraction to achieve greatness--though imaginary--Ingres superseded the cliché of the mimetic nude by deforming the body of the *Grande Odalisque* with five extra vertebrae. The *Grande Odalisque*’s distortion is a sign of her unreality, matching the

highly-finished unreality of hers setting--and analogous to Frenhofer's painting, it was often ill-received due to its distortion. Like Frenhofer, Ingres aligned his purely imaginary woman, charmed with an inventive anti-human distortion, to a fabricated setting--both poetic ideals that only existed in the artist's imagination. Unlike Frenhofer, however, Ingres has left us the legacy of his very well known, unquestionable masterpiece.

Notes

⁵⁴ Kenneth Clark declared that the odalisque had two vertebrae too many in *The Nude: A Study in Ideal Art* (London: J. Murray), 157, though he did not cite a source for this assertion. Adrian Rifkin, on the other hand, reported that Kératry said the figure had one vertebra too many in “Ingres and the Academic Dictionary: An Essay on Ideology and Stupefaction in the Social Formation of the ‘Artist’,” *Art History* 6.2 (1983): 167.

⁵⁵ “His odalisque has three vertebrae too many,” Eugène-Emmanuel Amaury-Duval, *L’atelier d’Ingres: Souvenirs* (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1878), 282 (translation mine).

⁵⁶ “We measured the length of the back and of the pelvis in human models, expressed the mean values in terms of head height, and transferred them to the painting. The deformation was found to be greater than originally assumed (five, rather than three, extra lumbar vertebrae), and to involve both the back and the pelvis,” in Jean-Yves Maigne, Gilles Chatellier and Hélène Norlöff, “Extra Vertebrae in Ingres’ *La Grande Odalisque*,” *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 97.7 (2004): 342-44.

⁵⁷ “[Kératry] was perhaps right. And so what? Who knows if it is not the torso’s length which gives it its serpentine shape, so striking at first glance? In exact proportions, would she have exerted such a powerful attraction?” Amaury-Duval, 282 (translation mine).

⁵⁸ The painting is inscribed “J. Ingres faciebat 1808 et 1848.” Clark, 392.

⁵⁹ Susan Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 97.

⁶⁰ “Venus Anadyomene is perhaps the figure that the painter has most lovingly caressed; he left her, took her back, as one does with a beloved mistress,” Théophile Gautier, *Les Beaux-Arts en Europe--1855* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1856), 152 (translation mine).

⁶¹ Charles Baudelaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), 588.

⁶² Clark, 157.

⁶³ For a further discussion of the criticism surrounding the three Venus paintings in the salon of 1863, see Jennifer Shaw, “Figure of Venus: Rhetoric of the Ideal and the Salon of 1863,” *Art History* 14.4 (1991): 540-70.

⁶⁴ Gustave Courbet’s realist nudes also offered a challenge to the Academic Venus during the 1850s and 1860s, though many of them were commissioned for private collections. *The Bathers* (1853) caused a scandal at the Salon of 1853 for its seeming vulgarity. See Georges Riat, *Gustave Courbet*, trans. Michael Locey (New York: Parkstone Press, 2008), 73-75.

⁶⁵ “Ingres loves this subject so propitious for painting, this convenient pretext for a nude in our clothed-from-head-to-toe era,” Théophile Gautier, 159 (translation mine).

⁶⁶ Mary J. Harper, “The Poetics and Politics of Delacroix’s Representations of the Harem in Women of Algiers in Their Apartment” in *Picturing the Middle East: One Hundred Years of European Orientalism: A Symposium* (New York: Dahesh Museum, 1996), 56-57.

⁶⁷ For a more in-depth discussion of Ingres’s print collection depicting Turkish scenes, see Hélène Toussaint, *Le Bain turc d’Ingres* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1971), 14-18.

⁶⁸ Rifkin, “Ingres and the Academic Dictionary,” 167.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 167.

⁷⁰ Adrian Rifkin, *Ingres Then, and Now* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 23.

⁷¹ Linda Nochlin, “The Imaginary Orient,” *The Politics of Vision* (New York: Harper and Row, 1991), 38.

⁷² Siegfried, 110.

⁷³ Toussaint, 17.

⁷⁴ Norman Bryson, *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 137.

⁷⁵ Emily A. Beeny, “Christ and the Angels: Manet, the Morgue, and the Death of History Painting?” *Representations* 122.1 (2013): 51.

⁷⁶ “That does not at all resemble living flesh,” T. Thoré, *Salons de T. Thoré: 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848* (Paris: J. Renouard, 1870), 249 (translation mine).

⁷⁷ Michael Marrinan, *Romantic Paris: Histories of a Cultural Landscape, 1800-1850* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 201.

⁷⁸ “The most romantic artist of the nineteenth-century,” Thoré, 240 (translation mine).

⁷⁹ “if Romanticism is the exclusive love of form, the absolute indifference to all the mysteries of human life, skepticism in philosophy and politics, selfish detachment from all common feelings” *ibid.*, 240 (translation mine).

⁸⁰ John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London: Penguin, 1972), 54.

⁸¹ Ibid., 55.

⁸² Bryson, 136-37.

⁸³ Ibid., 137.

⁸⁴ Michael Marrinan, "Picasso as an 'Ingres' Young Artist," *The Burlington Magazine* 119.896 (1977): 759-760.

⁸⁵ In Jupiter and Thetis, the Nereid Thetis supplicates Jupiter to restore the honor of her son Achilles. The deformed body of Thetis, whose elongated back, swollen neck and ample side view create an erotic effect contrasts with Jupiter, whose oversized body symbolizes male potency.

⁸⁶ The Rokeby Venus was in Spanish collections until 1813, when it came to England in the collection of John Morritt and was hung in his house in Rokeby Park. See Lynda Nead, *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 1992), 36.

⁸⁷ Toussaint, 14.

⁸⁸ "Le dessous des pieds est comme une vessie pleine;" in Thoré, 249.

⁸⁹ Clark, 157.

⁹⁰ "L'imagination qui soutenait ces grands maîtres, dévoyés dans leur gymnastique académique, l'imagination, cette reine des facultés, a disparu." in Baudelaire, 585.

⁹¹ Clark, 157.

⁹² Gautier, 157.

⁹³ "A type where the individuality of the Orient mixes with the ideals of Greece," Ibid., 158 (translation mine).

⁹⁴ Hans Naef, "La Dormeuse de Naples: Un dessin inédit d'Ingres," *Revue de l'art* 1-2 (1968): 102.

⁹⁵ A prime example is the Fountain of Diana (c. 1549, Musée du Louvre) by an unknown sculptor from the School of Fontainebleau. Diane de Poitiers is the model for the goddess Diana, whose torso is elongated in the Mannerist style. Moreover, the portraits from the Fontainebleau school were also notable for their display of the nude torso for erotic effect, which may have been an important influence for Ingres. An example would be François Clouet's portrait of Diane de Poitiers (1571, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). See Henri Zerner, *Renaissance Art in France: The Invention of*

Classicism, trans. Deke Dusinberre, Scott Wilson, and Rachel Zerner (Paris: Flammarion, 2003) 392-94.

⁹⁶ Carol Ockman, *Ingres's Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 41.

⁹⁷ "These helpful people, as there are so many in this world, have implied that it was my intention to draw the features of Madame Murat in this painting. That is absolutely false, my model is in Rome, it's a little ten year old girl who modeled for me, and moreover, those who know Madame Murat can judge me," Cited in Hans Naef, "Deux dessins d'Ingres, Monseigneur Cortois de Pressigny et le chevalier de Fontenay," *Revue de l'art* 6 (1957): 248.

⁹⁸ Ockman, 39.

⁹⁹ "Que ce tableau peut paraître un peu voluptueux à cette cour, d'en faire un autre de tout autre sujet, religieux ou autre" cited in Naef, "La Dormeuse de Naples," 102.

¹⁰⁰ Henry Lapauze, *Le Roman d'amour de M. Ingres* (Paris: Pierre Lafitte), 267.

¹⁰¹ Siegfried, 113-15.

¹⁰² Honoré de Balzac, *Gillette or the Unknown Masterpiece*, trans. Anthony Rudolf (London: Menard, 1988), 25.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 31.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.

CHAPTER 4

RAPHAEL REDUX: INGRES AND HIS FORNARINA

In this chapter, I examine how Ingres's iterative paintings *Raphael and La Fornarina* (1813-1860s) help explore Ingres's anxiety about originality and distortion. The anatomical deformations in the subtly varying series of five paintings are notable for containing both imaginary and pathological distortions that serve dual purposes. La Fornarina sitting on Raphael's lap has an impossibly curved back and shoulders and questionably inhabits space, an inventive deformation. Her implausible body serves to envelop Raphael, an Ingres alter-ego, in an embrace, a metonym for Ingres's love both for Raphael and for woman-as-muse. By distinguishing her face from the original Raphael prototype and characteristically deforming her body, Ingres turns his Fornarina into a familiar Ingres type. In *Raphael and La Fornarina*, he placed an Ingresque Fornarina in Raphael's studio, and thus figuratively inserted the female figure of his creation into Raphael's oeuvre.

La Fornarina's distortions are underlined by the preparatory sketch upon which the artist gazes which is a remarkable drawing of Raphael's *La Fornarina* (1518-1520; Fig. 35). This dialogue between the mimetic (the picture on the easel) and the fictive (the woman on Raphael's lap) underscores a central tension of Ingres's oeuvre: reconciling an original vision with the perfection of the past. Ingres worked on these variations on a theme throughout his entire lifetime and they reveal his shifting preoccupations over time. In painting *Raphael and La Fornarina*, Ingres demonstrates his ability to recreate the forms of his spiritual mentor and displays his own genius, while also rebuking those critics, such as Baudelaire, who viewed Ingres's works as devoid of imagination. *Raphael*

and *La Fornarina* invites speculation on Ingres's psychology and becomes a key for interpreting his oeuvre.

During his time, Ingres was not alone in his adulation of Raphael. Since the mid-seventeenth-century, the French Academy had elevated his art as the ultimate aspirational ideal.¹⁰⁸ Hagiographies of the Renaissance master flourished in the nineteenth-century, including celebrated biographies by David's former pupil Quatremère de Quincy and J. D. Passavant published in 1824 and 1839, respectively. However, Ingres's worship of Raphael started before the publication of these influential works. As a twelve-year-old student in Toulouse, the young Ingres spotted a copy of the *Madonna of the Chair* (1513-1514; Fig. 36) that his teacher Joseph Roques had produced.¹⁰⁹ Mesmerized by this painting, he described the ecstatic experience of viewing it as "like a star that had fallen from heaven."¹¹⁰ Ingres's hero worship of Raphael continued into his adulthood. Amaury-Duval recorded that Ingres pronounced, "Raphaël n'était pas un homme, mais un dieu descendu sur la terre."¹¹¹ In his writings, he admitted to wishing he could have lived in Raphael's time: "I, unhappy enough to regret all my life not having been born in his [Raphael's] century. When I think that, three hundred years earlier, I could really have been his disciple."¹¹² Ingres's study of his idol and the lifelong series of Raphael and *La Fornarina* are the manifestations of this wish.

Ingres's research into Raphael's life was based on the text that launched the nineteenth-century vogue for Raphael, Angelo Comolli's *Vita Inedita* (1790). In *Vita Inedita*, a biography purported to have been written before Vasari's *Vite* (1550), Comolli claimed that he discovered this text, written by a certain C. R. Riccio, supposedly a contemporary of Raphael. Annotated by Comolli, the work was revealed to be entirely

forged in 1882.¹¹³ Ingres's works that paid homage to Raphael were based on his reading of Comolli's text.¹¹⁴

Just as Ingres intended to create a sequence of works from the *Inferno*, tracing the story of Paolo and Francesca, he also planned to complete a narrative cycle of different scenes of the life of Raphael. In Ingres's ninth notebook, sections of which Henri Delaborde published, he described eight separate scenes from Raphael's birth to his funeral procession.¹¹⁵ In this excerpt he does not include scenes with La Fornarina or Raphael's betrothal to Cardinal Bibbiena's niece. In a separate section of this notebook, which remains unpublished and is in the Musée Ingres archives at Montauban, he does propose ideas for paintings based on Raphael and La Fornarina, but not the series which came to fruition: "Raphaël a [sic] la farnesina avec la fornarina" and "Raphaël avec sa maîtresse--Raphaël la peignant, la maîtresse derrière lui."¹¹⁶ Yet, as with his series *Paolo and Francesca*, Ingres did not advance beyond the first scene, repeatedly refining and making subtle adjustments to these tableaux. Eternally stuck reworking the first scene to a never achieved ideal, Ingres was, in Rosalind Krauss's words, "like a frantic stutterer, repeated the initial, excessively static vocable of his tale."¹¹⁷

Ingres first began work on this theme of mentor and mistress/muse in 1813, producing the so-called Riga version, which was lost during World War II. A photograph remains (Fig. 37). of this painting, the most straightforward of the series in its composition and narrative. Unlike her representation in later versions, the Riga Fornarina more closely resembles her likeness on the canvas. With her peasant garb and gesture of clutching her breast, she is a logical model for Raphael's canvas. However, her head is inclined at an angle that resembles that of *Madonna of the Chair*, that original painting

which had mesmerized Ingres. The interior of the studio in which Raphael and La Fornarina sit is spare, without the window, the city view, the art work and the furniture of the later paintings.

The subsequent version, the 1814 painting in the Fogg Art Museum (Fig. 38), is the most cited painting in the literature on Ingres's *Raphael and La Fornarina*. In the back of Raphael's studio hangs Raphael's painting *Madonna of the Chair*. Though today the identity of Raphael's model is a subject of scholarly debate, in Ingres's time La Fornarina was understood to be the model for *Madonna of the Chair*. Sketched on the canvas on Raphael's easel, this Fornarina replicates Raphael's painting, with her delicate Mediterranean-typed features reproduced exactly on the fictive canvas upon which Raphael draws.

However, La Fornarina of Ingres's creation is a totally different woman. Her face looks nothing like Raphael's *La Fornarina*, the portrait presumed to be of Raphael's mistress Margheriti Luti, called La Fornarina as she was a baker's daughter.¹¹⁸ In *Raphael and La Fornarina*, the canvas with its drawing by Raphael is an analogue to Ingres's frequent motif of the mirror and its distorted reflection, a false optical effect seen in his portraits of the *Comtesse d'Haussonville* (1845), *Madame Moitessier* (1856; Fig. 39) and *Madame de Senonnes* (1814; Fig. 40). The mirror reflects the sitters at a different angle than what would be expected by their positioning. Heather McPherson describes how Ingres uses a mirror to "correct" the anatomical inaccuracy of Madame Moitessier's boneless arm and "starfish hand."¹¹⁹ In the reflected landscape of the mirror, her hand appears normal-looking while the angle of her face is optically impossible given her position. In the same way, the canvas upon which Ingres's Raphael paints shows the

“true” or historical Fornarina. By placing a mimetic copy of Raphael’s *Fornarina* in his painting, Ingres underlines the deliberateness of his distortions of his Fornarina.

McPherson argues that these “grotesque ‘grace notes’ that Ingres seamlessly integrates into his portraits foreground his artistic virtuosity by going beyond mere replication of nature to elevate portraiture to a higher artistic realm.”¹²⁰ Ingres’s deviation from Raphael’s model underscores his meaningful departure from his idol. In comparing the two artists with regard to their drawing abilities, Baudelaire favored Ingres, perhaps due to his fanciful exaggerations and the romantic qualities of his bizarreries: “Dans un certain sens, M. Ingres dessine mieux que Raphaël, le roi populaire des dessinateurs.”¹²¹

Despite Baudelaire’s praise for his draughtsmanship, Ingres invoked his disapproval posthumously by his seeming unoriginality in recreating Raphael’s style, a specific criticism Baudelaire leveled against Ingres for the *Martyrdom of Saint Symphorien* (Fig. 41;1834).¹²² Olivier Merson, a biographer of Ingres who probably knew him,¹²³ wrote in 1865 about the paradox of Ingres’s Raphaelisms:

Ici nous nous heurtons à une critique souvent répétée: M. Ingres n’est que le copiste de Raphaël. Le fait est que dans ses travaux il se montre à la fois impersonnel et personnel; impersonnel parce que, pour rendre sa pensée, il s’est guidé sur le style du Sanzio; qui lui paraissait préférable à tous les autres; personnel, parce que, sur les traces mêmes du modèle qu’il a choisi, on le voit à tout instant se dérober pour affirmer sa libre autorité. De telle sorte que l’action de sa personnalité n’a jamais été interrompue, et que, si amoindrie qu’elle paraisse par endroits, la première réflexion désintéressée lui restitue son importance et son rôle.¹²⁴

As Merson describes, Ingres reveals his own personality in taking liberties with La Fornarina's design, anatomy and physiognomy. In the Fogg painting, the woman on Raphael's lap is pathologically distorted in her anatomy. Her odd "buffalo hump," is a sign of hypercortisolism, a pathology typically caused by a disorder of the adrenal glands. She has a goiter, which may be taken from a Raphael precedent--*La Velata*, another painting for which La Fornarina most likely modeled. However, the goiter has become typically Ingresque in the figures of women in his troubadour paintings. The embrace of the lovers, which Krauss calls "Raphael's strangely distracted fondling of his mistress, the Fornarina,"¹²⁵ seems awkward, and moreover, implausible. It seems unlikely that Raphael's right hand could reach around to clasp his left behind the back of La Fornarina, voluminous in her generous costuming and flesh, yet also two-dimensional in the space that she could plausibly occupy. She seems to hover over the chair, neither on it, nor in it.

The disjunction between the two Fornarinas raises the question of the identity of the Fornarina on Raphael's lap, this woman of Ingres's creation. There is a hazy quality to her face, as if recognition of her identity is just beyond our grasp. Consequently, it is difficult to identify an exact model for the Fornarina prototype. In contrast to his striking female portraits, such as *Madame Moitessier* and the *Comtesse d'Haussonville* which forcefully convey the personality and character of the sitters, Ingres does not give us clues about the psychology of La Fornarina. Similarly, the women in the harem and troubadour paintings are also devoid of personal psychology, their faces unremarkable and seemingly interchangeable. Norman Bryson describes how these enigmatic effects are generated in Ingres's frontal view of female faces: "The chosen configuration of eyebrows, nose and mouth, is highly precarious; the slightest shift in any of the elements

necessitates so many mutual and compensating adjustments that entirely different overall effects are generated at once.”¹²⁶ The deliberate obfuscation of the model’s identity has made La Fornarina’s face a Rorschach test for viewers and critics. Susan Siegfried sees in her face an amalgamation of Raphael types: “In the Fogg painting she is a composite of different women painted by Raphael, an artificial creation that demands to be read in relation to the depicted images of the mistress and the Madonna on display.”¹²⁷

However, Eldon van Liere recognizes in her face an imprint of Ingres’s personal history, pointing out her remarkable resemblance to Ingres’s first wife Madeleine Chapelle, whom Ingres married in 1813 in Rome. Van Liere postulates that the Fogg version of Raphael and La Fornarina can then be seen as an “emblematic wedding portrait.”¹²⁸ Ingres was by all accounts very much in love with Madeleine. He became engaged to her, sight unseen, after becoming infatuated with her married cousin Adèle, an acquaintance from artistic circles whom Ingres met during his stay in Rome. Adèle, thinking that her lookalike cousin would be a good match for Ingres, brokered the connection. Their happy union lasted thirty-six years until Madeleine’s death.

Ingres’s portrait of *Madame Ingres* (early 1814; Fig 42) shows a woman in her early thirties, whose round face, small mouth, and delicate nose bear an uncanny likeness to Ingres’s Fornarina. Madeleine has been identified as the model for Raphael’s mistress in his Study for *Raphael and La Fornarina* (c. 1818; Fig. 43).¹²⁹ This sketch shows a sensualized and relaxed version of his wife, compared to the erect and primly dressed Madeleine Chapelle in Ingres’s sketch of her from 1818 (Fig. 44). We have also seen a version of this face before--the *Grande Odalisque*, that hybrid creature of East and West, who has very similar features both to Ingres’s Fornarina and his first wife.

Unsurprisingly, all three works were executed in 1814. Philip Conisbee and Hans Naef validate the hypothesis that her likeness may be seen in many of his works, not just those of the early years of their marriage: “She not only appears in this painted portrait and nine portrait drawings but also served as the model for any number of figures in Ingres’s narrative paintings.”¹³⁰ Conisbee and Naef’s suggestion thus leaves open the possibility to interpret her presence widely in his oeuvre; in fact, they suggest that Ingres included her likeness in the *Turkish Bath* (1862; Fig. 45). Could Madeleine be the woman in the fez-like brocaded cap on the right?

Just as the Madeleine-like face resurfaces in many of Ingres’s works, so too is the turban a recurring motif that links the many women who haunt his paintings. Though the turban was a popular accessory for fashionable French women from the Napoleonic period until the 1820s, it also possessed exotic connotations.¹³¹ Since the Middle Ages, the turban in Western art has been a sign of otherness and exoticism. According to Ruth Mellinkoff, the turban “appears as a multivalent headdress in the visual arts...to characterize the exotic foreigner...distant in time, distant in place, or distant in customs, and religious belief.”¹³² Moreover, the turban was not a common female headdress during the Ottoman empire, so most likely Western artists who adapted this motif were deploying the headdress in a fanciful manner.¹³³ In the nineteenth-century, rumors circulated that Raphael’s mistress, as a lower class artist’s model, was Jewish, a common trope in Realist fiction, and, therefore, an exotic Other.¹³⁴ Though Ingres deploys the turban in the *Bather of Valpinçon* and the *Turkish Bath*, the particular beige striped turban with pearl accent appropriated from Raphael’s *La Fornarina* reappears, like a tantalizing iconographic Ingrism, on Ingres’s *Fornarina* and the *Grande Odalisque*.

La Fornarina's influence seeped into one of Ingres's portraits from the same era, the waxily beautiful *Madame de Senonnes*, whose costuming--a red velvet gown with silver trim, pays homage to La Fornarina's Renaissance garb, as Conisbee suggests.¹³⁵ But in fact, Madame de Senonnes's dress resembles even more closely the red velvet gown worn by Cardinal Bibbiena's niece in the *Betrothal of Raphael and the Niece of Cardinal Bibbiena* (1813-1814; Fig. 46). Caroline Murat commissioned the *Betrothal of Raphael* in 1813. During Ingres's lifetime the painting was lost, a loss the artist lamented, though it has since resurfaced and is in the collection of the Walters Art Museum. In a letter to his friend Marcotte, Ingres described how he admired this painting as one of his finest, which seems surprising given its pastiched figures and staid composition¹³⁶

In its emotional sobriety, the *Betrothal of Raphael*, provides a counterpoint to Ingres's series of *Raphael and La Fornarina*. The painting, whose composition is based on Raphael's *Marriage of the Virgin* (1504; Fig. 47), imagines the moment of Raphael's engagement, a union facilitated by Cardinal Bibbiena.¹³⁷¹³⁸ The Cardinal so esteemed Raphael that he offered the artist his niece Maria in marriage. Though they became engaged in 1514, this union, like the *Marriage of the Virgin*, was unconsummated. Raphael's lack of enthusiasm for this match resulted in his indefinitely delaying their nuptials, ultimately avoided by Maria's death in 1520, the same year Raphael died. In the painting, Raphael appears nonplussed, hesitant even, despite the gracious gesture of the Cardinal, who points to his niece. The Cardinal, the focal point of the painting, is the only actively engaged figure. With his sly, three quarter glance, the Cardinal appears nearly identical to Raphael's portrait of him (c.1516; Fig. 48). Indeed, this is one of Ingres's most striking plagiarisms/homages to his idol.

The model for Raphael was based on his *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti* (c. 1515; Fig. 49), which in Ingres's time was mistakenly believed to be a self-portrait of the artist. This handsome young man with a penetrating gaze and flushed cheeks provided a model of nobility and passion that Ingres deployed in his renderings of Raphael, not only in the *Betrothal*, but also in *Raphael and La Fornarina*.

Ingres fashioned his own self-portrait after *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti*.¹³⁹ In his *Self-Portrait at the Age of Twenty-Four* (1804; Fig. 50), Ingres adopts the same over-the-shoulder gaze and looks out at a three-quarter angle, with an identical hand gesture and the pursed lips of *Bindo Altoviti*. By stylizing his face and body after the purported self-portrait by Raphael, Ingres plays at merging bodily with Raphael, becoming his idol in his self-representation. In *Raphael and La Fornarina*, the face of Ingres's Raphael is always depicted at an oblique angle, contrasting with Ingres's fascination with viewing the female face head-on. This direct view, according to Bryson, is "the least susceptible to resolution"¹⁴⁰ and therefore the most enigmatic

In the *Betrothal*, Maria stands docilely on the Cardinal's left, modestly averting her gaze from Raphael, who seems to look at her blankly. Maria's likeness was inspired by a painting which, in a reference by Vasari, was attributed to Raphael and assumed to be a portrait of his mistress. Called *La Fornarina* in the nineteenth century, this *Portrait of a Woman (The Fornarina)* (1512; Fig. 51) is now attributed to Sebastiano del Piombo. *Portrait of a Woman* depicts a young woman with coarse features, a thickened neck and large hands.¹⁴¹ Compared to Raphael's *La Fornarina*, she is rougher and less delicate, both in her physiognomy and in the style in which she is rendered. Ingres thus conflates

these women, making the Fornarina prototype both mistress and fiancée, erasing the distinction between the lower-class artist's model and the chaste and noble virgin.

With Maria's swollen neck mimicking that of Francesca's, the motif of the goiter reoccurs. Unlike the passion displayed in Ingres's paintings of *Paolo and Francesca*, the lack of chemistry between the affianced couple is palpable. The painting, a corollary of *Raphael and La Fornarina*, could be read as the anti-*Paolo and Francesca*: a sanctioned union lacking passion as opposed to a forbidden and smoldering love. The *Betrothal of Raphael* has a distinctly troubadour "look" with its jewel-toned color palette, attention to Renaissance costuming, and intimate setting. Indeed, this intimate scene shows the distinctly anti-climactic moment of two individuals unenthusiastic about their brokered match. In the background of the painting, a shadowy character hides behind the curtain. The lurking figure is a recurring motif in Ingres's troubadour paintings. In most versions of *Paolo and Francesca*, Giancotto sinisterly peaks out behind a curtain, spying on the lovers. In later versions of *Raphael and La Fornarina*, such as the Kettaneh version (1830s; Fig. 52) and the 1840 version in the Columbus Museum of Art (Fig. 53), Ingres inserted another man in the background, a spectral figure. Standing in the back of Raphael's studio, he mirrors our own voyeurism, as he gazes upon the intimate moment of Raphael and La Fornarina. He also gazes, perhaps jealously, at the new painting on Raphael's canvas. Delaborde cited this interloper as the artist Giulio Romano, Raphael's pupil and assistant.

However, van Liere argues that this figure is, in fact, Michelangelo, Raphael's rival--the Delacroix to Ingres's Raphael. Van Liere's argument is based on Ingres's extant notes, which make no mention of Romano, whose youth at this time would have

been incongruent with the age of the bearded, middle-aged figure in the painting. Rather, van Liere indicates that Ingres cited Michelangelo several times in his notes, comparing him to Raphael, the former being the painter of the earthly and human, the latter the painter of the divine.¹⁴² The question is open whether by placing the Michelangelo figure in the studio, Ingres valorizes the rival to his master subordinates him to the primacy of Raphael's genius.

The Columbus version is distinguished by its inclusion of an additional artwork, which changes the dynamic of the painting. The gigantic canvas of Raphael's *Transfiguration* (1516-1520; Fig. 54), his last painting, often considered his finest, looms behind the couple. With its swirling lines and twisted figures, the *Transfiguration* breaks the tradition of orthogonal lines and rationally ordered compositions that characterize Raphael's oeuvre. Instead, the *Transfiguration* approaches the style of Mannerism. As mentioned in chapter two, the elongated figures and bizarre elements of Mannerism undoubtedly influenced Ingres's bodily and spatial distortions. Indeed, the *Transfiguration* stylistically echoes the sweeping style of Michelangelo, who both prefigured Mannerism and became an early vanguard of the style. Thus, if van Liere's hypothesis is correct--that the identify of the lurking figure is Michelangelo--the placement of the *Transfiguration* in Raphael's studio could signify a wish to align himself with both masters and upset the received idea of their rivalry. However, it is also important to note that Giulio Romano worked on the *Transfiguration* along with Raphael.

The *Transfiguration* offered another allusion. As it was originally commissioned for the Cathedral of Narbonne by the Cardinal de Medici, the painting had been considered part of French patrimony. As part of Napoleon's Italian conquest, the

Transfiguration was brought back to Paris to be displayed in the Musée Napoléon, where it was triumphantly exhibited, linking the heritage of the Italian Renaissance with French patronage.¹⁴³ Indeed, the significance of this painting was not lost on Ingres's contemporary Pierre-Nolasque Bergeret who painted a deathbed scene of Raphael. In *Honors Rendered to Raphael on His Deathbed* (1806; Fig. 55), Bergeret prominently placed the *Transfiguration* at the end of Raphael's bed, defining it as the towering achievement of his life.

Raphael's untimely death at the age of thirty-eight was notoriously blamed on overexertion from excessive lovemaking with his mistress, an ignoble end which was lamented in his early biographies. Raphael had a reputation for being so distracted by his amorous pursuits that his work suffered. According to an anecdote by Vasari, Raphael's patron Agostino Chigi, in order to expedite his commission, had to install La Fornarina in his house while Raphael was working there to keep him on task.¹⁴⁴ Ashamed to tell his doctors why he was ill, Raphael was bled to death by his physicians. According to the Comolli version of events that Ingres studied, La Fornarina was roundly blamed for Raphael's premature death. In his text, Comolli writes, "Raffaello da Urbino, the first painter of the universe, the most beautiful genius of his century, the most respectable man in terms of all virtues, at the height of his glory, in the flower of his years, victim of a woman: and what a woman!"¹⁴⁵ Yet, despite Comolli's condemnation of La Fornarina as killer of European history's greatest artist, Ingres avoids this cynical view of Raphael's mistress. Siegfried argues that Ingres's interpretation of her is distinct from that of his colleagues:

Ingres revised the misogynistic interpretations of the Fornarina popular at the end of the eighteenth century. In representations of Raphael's death done by Harriet and Bergeret, Ingres's colleagues from David's studio, from the early 1800s, either the Fornarina is blamed for Raphael's untimely death or the artist's lovers are banished from mourning by his deathbed as a stain on his virtue.¹⁴⁶

Bergeret's painting is a scene of masculine mourning, a vision of art and creativity where women do not belong. Instead, Ingres, in his vision of the life of Raphael, ignores the sinister aspersions cast on La Fornarina. Rather, he has only emphasized the aspect of La Fornarina as muse, the product of Ingres's creation and the font of Raphael's creativity. Yet despite their creative synergy, Raphael looks away from his mistress towards his canvas, demonstrating that his art takes precedence over carnal distractions.

As Ingres's versions of *Raphael and La Fornarina* advance over time, La Fornarina gradually encircles Ingres in a closer embrace, resting her cheek on Raphael's head. In the last three versions, her body becomes a C curve that surrounds the artist. As van Liere remarks, this embrace echoes the embrace of the *Madonna of the Chair* for the Christ child.¹⁴⁷ Raphael becomes more enfolded in the arms of his mistress, though he loosens his grip on her, edging his way closer to the canvas, where he ultimately rests his arm and casts his final gaze. In the last, unfinished version of *Raphael and La Fornarina* (1860s; Fig. 56), La Fornarina cradles Raphael, her dress slipping down farther to envelop him in a more intimate embrace. With his youthful visage, the Raphael figure now becomes Ingres's grasp at eternal youth, while the artist himself descended into senescence. By eliminating the lurking artist figure, Ingres removed the sinister element of jealousy and intrusion into a private space. The artist and his model, in their

moment of creative fusion, convey a sense of tranquility and intimacy. Ingres wrote to his friend Marcotte of his desire that this edition be seen as ultimate manifestation of the *Raphael and La Fornarina* theme: “Je reprends ce tableau de Raphaël et la Fornarina, ma dernière édition de ce sujet, et qui, j’espère, fera oublier les autres.”¹⁴⁸

Hans Belting’s description of the series lyrically describes how Ingres captured the struggle of artist as genius and his dreamlike wish of creating the perfect work of art, fusing reality and imagination:

In Ingres’s *Raphael and La Fornarina* the youthful beauty looks at us seductively, while Raphael’s eyes are turned towards her portrait on the easel. In Ingres’ imagination she is still directing at us the loving look she has bestowed on Raphael as he painted her. Here the boundary between reality and dream, between then and now, dissolves. Everything becomes an enticing absence that at the same time stimulates the memory. A magical enchantment hovers above this sphinx-like painting, in which the puzzle of old and new creates a fiction of life that escapes life experience. But the viewer’s imagination is powerfully aroused by the sense that a work of art familiar to everyone is only just being created, as though one had stopped back into an age that was really forever beyond reach. That perfect work of art is, as it were, made once again. Raphael’s love, mirrored in the portrait of his beloved, was bestowed on the living woman before it lived on in the painted one. The subject has an emotional content that, in Ingres’ re-creation, imbues a work of the past with false life.¹⁴⁹

Ingres’s lifelong fanaticism for Raphael was manifested in the psychodrama of *Raphael and La Fornarina*. By vicariously living through the past, Ingres embraced the problem of originality, gently distorting his Fornarina to signify his personal vision--both in

distinction and alignment with the tradition he emulated. Dying at the age of eighty-six, Ingres outlived his idol by nearly a lifetime; he also outlived his generation and cohort. At the end of his life, just as with the start of his career, he was, unintentionally, an anomalous figure, whose delightful yet puzzling artistic choices ultimately provided inspiration for the generation of modernists to come.

Notes

¹⁰⁸ The artists and critics Charles le Brun and Charles Alphonse du Fresnoy were particularly influential in the French Academy for their codification of Raphael's style as ideal. See Martin Rosenberg, "Raphael in French Art Theory, Criticism and Practice (1660-1830)" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1979), 33-34, 46-55.

¹⁰⁹ Henry Lapauze, *Le Roman d'amour de M. Ingres* (Paris: Pierre Lafitte, 1910), 48.

¹¹⁰ "Comme un astre du ciel." Ingres to Roques, July 29, 1844, in Boyer d'Agen 1909, 374-375, quoted in Gary Tinterow, Philip Conisbee, and Hans Naef, *Portraits by Ingres: Images of an Epoch* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1999), 12.

¹¹¹ "Raphael was not a man, but a god descended on earth." Eugène-Emmanuel Amaury-Duval, *L'atelier d'Ingres: Souvenirs* (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1878), 89 (translation mine).

¹¹² J.A.D. Ingres, *Écrits sur l'art* (Paris: La Jeune Parque, 1947), 45.

¹¹³ The forgery was discovered by Anton Springer in 1882. See Stefano Onofri, "L'Abate Angelo Comolli (1790-1794) et il Confronto Raffaello-Dürer," *Intrecci d'Arte* 1 (2012): 65-80.

¹¹⁴ Norman Schlenoff, *Cahiers littéraires inédits* (Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1956), 13.

¹¹⁵ Henri Delaborde, *Ingres: sa vie, ses travaux, sa doctrine* (Paris: Plon, 1870) 327-28.

¹¹⁶ "Raphael at the Farnesina with the Fornarina" and "Raphael and his mistress, Raphael arranging her hair, his mistress behind him." Van Liere here cites from a notebook #9 at the Montauban archives, 110.

¹¹⁷ Rosalind E. Krauss, "You Irreplaceable You," in *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989), 155.

¹¹⁸ La Fornarina was not identified as Margherita Luti da Siena until 1897 by Antonio Valeri. See Antonio Valeri, "Chi Era la Fornarina?" *Vita Italiana* 3.2 (1897): 353-63.

¹¹⁹ Heather McPherson, "Ingres and the Poetics of the Grotesque," in *Modern Art and the Grotesque*, ed. Frances S. Connelly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 149.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 149-50.

¹²¹ Charles Baudelaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1868) 459, translation by Jonathan Mayne in Charles Baudelaire, *The Mirror of Art* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), 88.

¹²² “Ses préoccupations sont le goût de l’antique et le respect de l’école...Aussi le voyons-nous errer d’archaïsme en archaïsme;...Raphaël (Saint Symphorien).” Baudelaire, *Oeuvres complètes*, 588.

¹²³ Conisbee, in Tinterow et al, *Portraits by Ingres*, 49.

¹²⁴ “Here we run into an often repeated criticism: Ingres is only a copyist of Raphael. The fact is that in his work he seems to be both impersonal and personal; impersonal because in order to render his thoughts, he is guided by Sanzio’s style; which seemed to him preferable to all others; personal because in following the outlines of his chosen model, we see him suddenly reveal himself to assert his free will. It is done in such a way that the action of his personality has never been interrupted, and if it seems diminished in places, the first impartial reflection restores its importance and role.” Olivier Merson, *Ingres: Sa vie, ses oeuvres* (Paris: J. Hetzel, 1865), 47-48 (translation mine).

¹²⁵ Krauss, 153.

¹²⁶ Norman Bryson, *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 149.

¹²⁷ Susan Siegfried, *Ingres: Painting Reimagined* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 182.

¹²⁸ Van Liere, 109.

¹²⁹ Conisbee and Naef in Tinterow et al, *Portraits by Ingres*, 154.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 154.

¹³¹ Ruth Turner Wilcox, *The Mode in Hats and Headdresses* (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2008), 189-90.

¹³² Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 60-61.

¹³³ John Block Friedman, “Turbans and the Exotic: Robinet Testard’s Turbans and Turban-like Coiffure,” in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles*, vol. 4, ed. Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Rochester: New York: Boydell Press, 2008), 176-77.

¹³⁴ Marie Lathers, *Bodies of Art: Literary Realism and the Artist’s Model* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska), 72.

- ¹³⁵ Conisbee in Tinterow et al, *Portraits by Ingres*, 148.
- ¹³⁶ Henri Delaborde, *Ingres* (Paris: Plon, 1870) 226-27.
- ¹³⁷ David Alan Brown, *Raphael and America* (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1983), 184.
- ¹³⁸ Raphael's Marriage of the Virgin has its compositional origins in Perugino's Christ Handing the Keys to Saint Peter (1481-1483, Sistine Chapel), and this may also have been a source for Ingres.
- ¹³⁹ Brown, 186.
- ¹⁴⁰ Bryson, 149.
- ¹⁴¹ Lathers, 256.
- ¹⁴² Van Liere, 113.
- ¹⁴³ Martin Rosenberg, "Raphael's Transfiguration and Napoleon's Cultural Politics" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 19.2 (1986): 191.
- ¹⁴⁴ Lathers, 67.
- ¹⁴⁵ Angelo Comolli, *Vita inedita di Raffaello da Urbino* (Rome: Vaticano, 1790), 92-3, cited in Lathers, 68.
- ¹⁴⁶ Siegfried, 184.
- ¹⁴⁷ Van Liere, 113-14.
- ¹⁴⁸ "I am returning to the painting of Raphael and La Fornarina, my latest version of this subject which I hope will make the others be forgotten." Delaborde, 226 (translation mine).
- ¹⁴⁹ Hans Belting, *The Invisible Masterpiece*, trans. Helen Atkins (London: Reaktion Books, 2001), 79.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Ingres's distortions are beguiling in their revelation of the unexpected. They are more complex than either a willful rejection of the ideals of the Académie or a manifestation of incompetent technique. For this reason, they provide an intriguing focus for examining the enigmatic complexities of Ingres's oeuvre.

In my assessment of Ingres's anatomical inventions, I make important distinctions among the images and their functions as between distortions that represent pathological deformations of the body caused by disease, and distortions that are purely inventive fantasy, distinctions which have not yet been addressed in scholarship. As I argue, the goiter is a potent motif displayed in the heroines of his troubadour paintings, *Roger Freeing Angelica* and *Paolo and Francesca*, and it becomes a metonym for sadistic eroticism. Their swollen throats appear as hybrid signs of sexuality, a female analogue to the phallic symbols in the paintings, such as Roger's lance and Paolo's sword. Both paintings infuse sexuality with sadism--the threat of rape by Roger and or the impending murder by Francesca's husband.

What remains to be addressed in my review of pathological distortions is whether Ingres had personal contact with or exposure to these pathologies, such as goiter. If so, did he view this sign of disease as a fanciful variation of nature, one which provided him with needed aesthetic qualities? Or was Ingres simply replicating this deformation from historical visual precedents or treating it as a commonplace? How, too, did his images differ from those in medical books?

In *Grande Odalisque*, in contrast, the deformed back and pelvis of the odalisque had no origin in a medical model, but did have a visual precedent in Mannerist works, including the School of Fontainebleau. With her five extra vertebrae, the odalisque defies the conventional nude. Though he still used this formula in successful works such as *La Source* (1820-1856), Ingres associated the inventive element of the *Grande Odalisque*'s body with the harem genre, making it a sign of fantasy. Caroline Murat's patronage of this painting raises the intriguing question of whether this work was simply a titillating gift for her husband, or a powerful political statement about female agency while alluding to the tradition of reclining nudes during the Napoleonic era.

In *Raphael and La Fornarina*, distortion distinguished his work from that of his idol, Raphael, while paying homage to Raphael through numerous quotations--some earnest, some wishful. His *Fornarina* is a carefully constructed figure whose distortions stamp an Ingresque signature on a Raphaellesque work.

In the same way that Ingres cited Raphael, Ingres's legacy had a profound effect on numerous artists, an influence that I only mention briefly here. For Matisse and Picasso, Ingres provided a historical visual precedent and permission for the playful attenuations of their figures. In his discussion of Ingres's influence on Matisse, who along with Ingres was given a retrospective at the 1905 Salon d'Automne, Jack Flam notes that Matisse had a particular connection to Ingres in "his desire to create a radically new art and his innate conservatism."¹⁵⁰ Flam notes that Matisse borrowed forms from Ingres's nudes for his execution of *Le bonheur de vivre* (1906). Matisse's languorous nudes with their lumpy and elongated bodies reference Ingres's harem paintings:

In fact, the way that Matisse flattens his forms and submits all his figures in the [Le bonheur de vivre], to a systematic distortion, in which the pulse of the contours seems to be a strong determinant in the proportions and arrangements of the figures, owes a good deal to Ingres. This concern with a kind of supple, yet willful linearity is one of the things that drew Matisse to Ingres at this time.¹⁵¹

In the case of Picasso, Michael Marrinan contends that the *Grande Odalisque*'s distortions provided Picasso with a model for his nudes upon which he elaborated a multiplicity of points of view. In Marrinan's view, Ingres's impact was important in 1907-1908, a surprising fact given that Cézanne is usually cited as Picasso's main influence during this period. But in a photo taken of his studio from 1910-1911, Picasso had a framed copy of the *Grande Odalisque*. Ingres's odalisque's anatomy permitted multiple angles to be viewed at once; Picasso may have referenced odalisque's distortions for developing his ideas further. In his analysis of *Nude with Drapery* (1907), Marrinan explicates Picasso's allusion to Ingres:

Whereas Ingres shows us the woman's back, Picasso has painted himself around the *Grande Odalisque*, giving us the hidden side of her anatomy. In Picasso's work the nude's buttock is located at the top of the canvas, while the apex of her bent knee points down, toward the viewer. This disposition is possible only if we read the painting as depicting a frontal view, resulting in yet another instance of Picasso's preference for the 'other side' or 'all at once' of his subjects.¹⁵²

The revisionist interpretation of Ingres as a proto-modernist reconsiders his works as foreshadowing modernism's rejection of the ideology of mimesis. According to Richard Wollheim, "At the time these anatomical liberties were criticized as incompetent;

nowadays they are admired as recruiting Ingres for the modern movement. Both responses seem to be equally hasty.”¹⁵³

During Ingres’s long lifetime, numerous changes occurred in artistic movements and technology, while Ingres’s work stylistically evolved little. One of the most notable of these changes is the invention of photography--by the mid-nineteenth-century, portrait photography had become affordable and accessible to many. In a certain sense, the invention of photography only seemed to make Ingres’s work more relevant, as his particular deviations from the “banality of academic illusionism”¹⁵⁴ highlighted the importance of the artist’s hand. This was especially true in portraiture, where Ingres’s insistence on revealing his sitters’ nature and moral character through exaggerations and distortions--*Monsieur Bertin* and *Madame Moitessier* being prime examples--made his portraits especially compelling.

As critic Michael Kimmelman writes of Ingres’s first large retrospective in France, “Ingres's portraits and nudes speak to modern tastes because they also have an element of abstraction, from which derives their almost narcotic strangeness.”¹⁵⁵ The strangeness and the unexpected deviations of his paintings keep Ingres’s work fresh and fascinating into the twenty-first century.

Notes

¹⁵⁰ Jack Flam, "Matisse and Ingres," *Apollo* 484 (October 2000): 21.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹⁵² Michael Marrinan, "Picasso as an 'Ingres' Young Artist," *The Burlington Magazine* 119.896 (1977): 760.

¹⁵³ Richard Wollheim, *Painting as Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 261.

¹⁵⁴ Flam, 22.

¹⁵⁵ Michael Kimmelman, "Ingres at the Louvre: His Pursuit of Higher Reality," *New York Times*, March 24, 2006, accessed November 9, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/24/arts/design/24ingr.html?pagewanted=all>

REFERENCES

- Amaury-Duval, Eugène-Emmanuel. *L'atelier d'Ingres: Souvenirs*. Paris: G. Charpentier, 1878.
- Arikha, Avigdor. *J.A.D. Ingres: Fifty Life Drawings from the Musée Ingres at Montauban*. Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 1986.
- Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando Furioso: A New Verse Translation*. Translated by David Slavitt. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Balzac, Honoré. *Gillette or the Unknown Masterpiece*. Translated by Anthony Rudolf. London: Menard, 1988.
- Barthes, Roland. *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. Richard Howard. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1868.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *The Mirror of Art: Critical Studies*. Trans. Jonathan Mayne. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1956.
- Beeny, Emily A. "Christ and the Angels: Manet, the Morgue, and the Death of History Painting?" *Representations* 122.1 (2013): 51-82.
- Belting, Hans. *The Invisible Masterpiece*. London: Reaktion Books, 2001.
- Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penguin, 1972.
- Bertin, Eric. "Ingres d'après les lettres reçues de contemporains illustres," *Bulletin du Musée Ingres* 71 (1998): 17-80.
- Betzer, Sarah. "Ingres's Shadows." *The Art Bulletin* 95.1 (2013): 78-101.
- Bondeson, Lennart and Anne-Greth Bondeson. "Michaelangelo's Divine Goitre." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 96 (December 2003): 609-11.
- Brown, David Alan. *Raphael and America*. Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1983.
- Bryson, Norman. *Tradition and Desire: From David to Delacroix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

- Cohn, Marjorie B., and Susan L. Siegfried. *Works by J.-A.-D. Ingres in the collection of the Fogg Art Museum*. Cambridge, Mass.: Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Condon, Patricia et al. *In Pursuit of Perfection: The Art of J.-A.-D. Ingres*. Louisville, Ky: The J.B. Speed Art Museum, in association with Indiana University Press, 1983.
- Connelly, Frances. S. *Modern Art and the Grotesque*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Clark, Kenneth. *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art*. London: J. Murray, 1956.
- Crow, Thomas E. *Emulation: David, Drouais, and Girodet in the Art of Revolutionary France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Delaborde, Henri. *Ingres: Sa vie, ses travaux, sa doctrine*. Paris: Plon, 1870.
- Feaver, William. "Why all Ingres is Erotic." *ArtNews*, 1 September 2006. Accessed 23 November 2014. <http://www.artnews.com/2006/09/01/why-all-ingres-is-erotic/>
- Fend, Mechthild. "Bodily And Pictorial Surfaces: Skin In French Art And Medicine, 1790-1860." *Art History* 28.3 (2005): 311-39.
- Flam, Jack. "Ingres and Matisse." *Apollo* 484 (October 2000): 20-25.
- Fried, Michael. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Friedman, John Block. "Turbans and the Exotic: Robinet Testard's Turbans and Turban-like Coiffure," in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles*. Vol. 4, ed. Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker. Rochester: New York: Boydell Press, 2008.
- Garric, Jean-Michel. *Papiers d'Ingres: Ingres, Prix de Rome*. Montauban: Musée Ingres, 1991.
- Gautier, Théophile. *Les Beaux-Arts en Europe--1855*. Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1856.
- Guégan, Stéphane. *Ingres Érotique*. Paris: Flammarion, 2006.
- Haskell, Francis. "The Old Masters in Nineteenth Century French Painting." *Art Quarterly* 34.1 (1971): 55-85.
- Haskell, Francis. "A Strange Painter." *The New York Review of Books*. 11.1 (1968): 7-10.

- Hattis, Phyllis. *Ingres' Sculptural Style: A Group of Unknown Drawings*. Cambridge, MA: Garland Publishing, 1973.
- Ingres, J.A.D. *Écrits sur l'art*. Paris: La Jeune Parque, 1947.
- Jones, Colin. *The Smile Revolution in Eighteenth Century Paris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Jover, Manuel. *Ingres*. Paris: Pierre Terrail, 2005.
- Kimmelman, Michael. "Ingres at the Louvre: His Pursuit of Higher Reality." *New York Times*. March 24, 2006. Accessed November 9, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/24/arts/design/24ingr.html?pagewanted=all>
- Krauss, Rosalind E. "You Irreplaceable You." *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1989. 151-59.
- _____. "Sculpture in the Expanded Field." *October* 8 (Spring, 1979): 30-44.
- Kuspit, Donald. "Girodet's Sensationalism." *ArtNet Magazine*, 16 August 2006. Accessed 26 September 2014. <http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/features/kuspit/kuspit8-16-06.asp>
- Laignel-Lavastine, Paul-Marie Maxime. "La Glante Thyroide Dans L'Oeuvre De M. Ingres." *Aesculape* 3 March (1929): 69-72.
- Lapauze, Henry. *Le Roman d'Amour de M. Ingres*. Paris: Pierre Lafitte: 1910.
- Lathers, Marie. *Bodies of Art: French Literary Realism and the Artist's Model*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2001. 70-85.
- Leeks, Wendy. "Ingres Other-Wise." *Oxford Art Journal* 9.1 (1986): 29-37.
- Lewis, Reina. *Rethinking Orientalism: Women, Travel and the Ottoman Harem*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.
- Lhote, André. *Figure Painting*. London: A. Zwemmer, 1953.
- Maigne, Jean-Yves, Gilles Chatellier and Hélène Norlöff. "Extra Vertebrae in Ingres' *La Grande Odalisque*." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 97.7 (2004): 342-44.
- Marcus, Amy Dockser. "Doctors Enlist Paintings to Hone Skills." *Wall Street Journal*. 31 December 2014. Accessed 1 January 2014. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/doctors-enlist-paintings-to-hone-skills-1420052107>

- Marrinan, Michael. "Picasso as an 'Ingres' Young Cubist." *The Burlington Magazine*. 119.86 (1977): 756, 758-63.
- _____. *Romantic Paris: Histories of a Cultural Landscape, 1800-1850*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Mellinkoff, Ruth. *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Merke, Franz. *History and Iconography of Endemic Goitre and Cretinism*. Berne: Hans Huber, 1984.
- Merson, Olivier. *Ingres: sa vie et ses oeuvres*. Paris: J. Hetzel, 1865.
- Meyer, Barbara Hochstetler. "Leonardo's Hypothetical Painting of Leda and the Swan." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 34.3 (1990): 279-94.
- Mirzoeff, Nicholas. *Bodyscape: Art, Modernity and the Ideal Figure*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Naef, Hans. "Deux dessins d'Ingres, Monseigneur Cortois de Pressigny et le Chevalier de Fontenay." *La Revue de l'art*. 6. (1957): 243-48.
- _____. "Un chef d'oeuvre retrouvé: *Le portrait de la Reine Caroline Murat* par Ingres." *La Revue de l'art* 6 (1990): 11-20.
- _____. "Monsieur Ingres et ses muses." *L'Oeil* 25 (1957): 48-51.
- _____. "La Dormeuse de Naples: Un dessin inédit d'Ingres." *La Revue de l'art*. 1-2 (1968): 102-03.
- _____. "Paolo und Francesca: Zum Problem der Schöpferischen nachahmung bei Ingres." *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 10.1 (1956): 97-108.
- Nead, Lynda. *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Nochlin, Linda. *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society*. New York: Harper and Row, 1989.
- Ockman, Carol. *Ingres's Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Onofri, Stefano. "L'Abate Angelo Comolli (1790-1794) et il Confronto Raffaello-Dürer." *Intrecci d'Arte* 1 (2012): 65-80.

- Outram, Dorinda. *The Body and the French Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Pansksepp, Jaak. *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Picon, Gaetan. *Ingres*. Paris: Skira, 1980.
- Picturing the Middle East: A Hundred Years of European Orientalism: a Symposium*. New York: Dahesh Museum of Art, 1996.
- Porterfield, Todd B, and Susan L. Siegfried. *Staging Empire: Napoleon, Ingres, and David*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.
- Raphaël dans les collections françaises: Raphael et l'art français*. Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1983.
- Riat, Georges. *Gustave Courbet*. Trans. Michael Locey. New York: Parkstone Press, 2008.
- Rifkin, Adrian. *Ingres Then, and Now*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- _____. "Ingres and the Academic Dictionary: An Essay on Ideology and Stupefaction in the Social Formation of the 'Artist.'" *Art History* 6.2 (1983): 153-170.
- Riopelle, Christopher. "Ingres and Sensuality and Refinement." *The Art Quarterly of the National Art Collections Fund* (1998): 50-54.
- _____. "Study for Roger Freeing Angelica." in *A Private Passion: 19th-century Paintings and Drawings from the Grenville L. Winthrop Collection*. Edited by Stephan Wolohojian. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Rosenberg, Martin. "Raphael in French Art Theory, Criticism and Practice (1660-1830)" PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1979.
- _____. "Raphael's *Transfiguration* and Napoleon's Cultural Politics." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. 19.2 (1986): 180-205.
- Rosenblum, Robert. "The Ingres Centenary at Montauban." *The Burlington Magazine*. 109.775 (1967): 583-85, 587.
- _____. *Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres*. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1967.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

- Schlenoff, Norman. *Cahiers littéraires inédits*. Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1956.
- Shaw, Jennifer. "Figure of Venus: Rhetoric of the Ideal and the Salon of 1863." *Art History* 14.4 (1991): 540-70.
- Shelton, Andrew Carrington. *Ingres and His Critics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Siegfried, Susan L., and Adrian Rifkin. *Fingering Ingres*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Siegfried, Susan L. *Ingres: Painting Reimagined*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Smith, Graham. "Ingres and Bronzino." *Source: Notes in the History of Art*. 2.4 (Summer 2002): 17-24.
- Ternois, Daniel. "L'Éros ingresque." *Revue de L'art* 64 (1984): 35-56.
- Thoré, T. *Salons de T. Thoré: 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848*. Paris: J. Renouard, 1870.
- Tinterow, Gary, Philip Conisbee, and Hans Naef. *Portraits by Ingres: Image of an Epoch*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1999.
- Toussaint, Hélène. *Le Bain turc d'Ingres*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1971.
- Tscherny, Nadia. *Romance and Chivalry: History and Literature Reflected in Early Nineteenth-Century French Painting*. London: Matthiesen Fine Art, 1996.
- Van Liere, Eldon N. "Ingres' 'Raphael and the Fornarina': Reverence and Testimony." *Arts Magazine*. 52 (1981): 108-15.
- Vigne, Georges. *Ingres*. Paris: Citadelles, 1995.
- _____. *Ingres*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1995.
- Wilcox, Ruth Turner. *The Mode in Hats and Headdresses*. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2008.
- Wildenstein, Georges. *The Paintings of J. A. D. Ingres*. London: Phaidon Press, 1956.
- Wollheim, Richard. *Painting as an Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Zerner, Henri. *Renaissance Art in France: The Invention of Classicism*. Trans. Deke Dusinberre, Scott Wilson, and Rachel Zerner. Paris: Flammarion, 2003.

Zola, Émile. *The Masterpiece*. Trans. Thomas Walton. New York: MacMillan Company, 1957.