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Interpersonal relationships in big cities are distinguished by a marked preponderance of the activity of the eye over the activity of the ear.

Paris in the mid-nineteenth century is a prototype of the modern city. In the course of a century, the city underwent four revolutions (1789, 1830, 1848, and 1870), a fourfold increase in population (from half a million to two million), and complete redesign, from a medieval city to a modern one. Under these pressures, together with radical technical changes in communication and transportation, cultural emphasis shifted toward those forms that could respond with alacrity to topical urban themes—journalism, popular theater, and caricature. This encounter with the ephemeral data of city life as prime material for arts and letters is the beginning of social self-consciousness, which is one of the components of modernity.

In the portrayal of "modern life" the caricaturists and writers focused on Parisian "types" and described their urban characters from without, as they would be seen by a stranger. There is a characteristic Parisian preoccupation with visible bodily clues to class, profession, character, and circumstance. Through caricature, popular writing, and theater, Parisian types and their distinguishing traits were codified; in the way they made sense of the city to itself, these arts were the antecedents of more formal models of the urban population in sociology, demography, and criminology.

People are changed by the city and they are the city and the city changes. As people moved from the provinces to the city, and city neighborhoods lost their autonomous character, traditional roles were lost, traditional obligations were unenforced, and traditional behavior seemed inexpedient or naive. New informal codes of behavior emerged, for orientation, for emulation and simulation, to recognize others and to hold one's own. The illustrated newspapers were a vehicle for identifying, deciphering, and communicating the signals and norms of urban exchange.

Social caricature in the newspapers found its public in the streets and cafés; it was consumed casually, as Baudelaire pointed out, along with the news and the morning coffee. To be successful with its public, it had to develop a pungent and rapid communicative vocabulary, exploiting the graphic limitations of its means of reproduction.

The journalistic draftsman, often working directly on the lithographic stone, was a performer, in daily dialogue with the public who were also his subject matter. Daumier's drawing has a communicative bravura and economy that is comparable to the discipline of mime, with its succinct evocation of character and situation. Both caricature and mime drew artistic advantage from their marginal status. (Another generation had to pass before studio painting and "official" theater could allow themselves to profit from the advances in realism that had been won in these popular arts.) Both caricature and mime use vernacular codes directly reflective of daily life. Both are directed to the eye—they show what the urban spectator sees, through highly articulate, and at times subversive, silence.

Caricature draws on and develops a twofold tradition: that of physiognomics, the classification of people into character types according to outward bodily signs, such as the shape of the eyes, forehead, mouth, and so on; and that of pathognomics, the interpretation of changing emotions by facial or bodily expression. In nineteenth-century Paris, in a context of urban pressure, dislocation, and mass communication, this visual lore of physiognomy, bearing, and gesture gained currency, immediacy, and artistic power.

In 1830, when the leftist caricature newspapers La Silhouette and La Caricature were first being published, France underwent its second Revolution. The government of Charles X was weakened when the liberal opposition won the majority of seats in the Chamber of Deputies in the June-July elections. Shortly after that, Charles X prohibited publication of any journal or pamphlet of less than twenty-five pages without official authorization.1 The journalists, led by Thiers, a moderate Republican, issued in the newspaper La Nationale a manifesto calling on France to resist. The caricaturists in La Silhouette and La Caricature contributed to the cause with vitriolic portrayals of the king and his government. A caricature of Charles X as a Jesuit led to the suppression of an issue of La Caricature, and the impact of the image was only increased by the court case that followed. On July 28 there was rioting in the street. In three days of fighting, les trois glorieuses, the monarchy was overthrown.

A coalition of Republicans and anti-Bourbon monarchists proposed the Duke of Orleans, Louis-Philippe, as "lieutenant-general," with the Marquis de Lafayette, the old hero of the great Revolution, as president of the Republic. But to those who held power, landowners, financiers, and politicians, Lafayette was too radical. A compromise was found in Louis-Philippe, who was declared king in 1830: he had fought under the flag of the Revolution at Jenapppes, he was not of the Royal...
Bourbon line, and he seemed agreeable to a constitutional monarchy.

In the Charter of 1830, a declaration of rights of the Republic, Catholicism (which had regained political influence under Charles X) was no longer to be "the religion of the state." The power of suspending or revoking laws was removed from the king to the elected Assembly, and censorship was abolished "forever." Political journals, however, still had to deposit substantial amounts of money (loi de cautionnement) against convictions for offenses to the king or government.

But soon the limitations of Louis-Philippe's constitutionalism became evident. Behind the habits of bourgeois propriety he had acquired in exile, Louis-Philippe was ready to exploit his position. His government served the interests of the wealthy bourgeoisie with open lack of scruple. The result was turmoil and dissatisfaction in the early years of Louis-Philippe's reign. And as it became clearer that the 1830 Revolution had been hopelessly betrayed, an informal opposition of Parisian gens d'esprit developed, whose critique of bourgeois moeurs and culture was inseparable from their political disappointment.

The truth is that remarkable relentlessness and cohesion were displayed in the operation, and however dogged the reply of the authorities, it is a matter of great surprise today, when we look through these archives of buffoonery, that such a furious war could have been kept up for so long.

—Charles Baudelaire on Philipon's campaign against censorship and the regime of Louis-Philippe.

Political caricature had become programmatic in the first caricature journal, La Silhouette, founded in 1829 (and folded in 1831), which brought together many of the caricaturists and journalists who set the tone for the next thirty years. Illustrators and caricaturists, Republican by conviction, who had been issuing individual prints and series of prints on Parisian customs, manners, and habits, came together to launch an attack on the monarch. This generation of caricaturists came of age around 1830; their parents had lived through the great Revolution of 1789. For the most part, they were born into artisanal families from outside Paris: they had experienced political, social, and geographic displacement.

By the 1830s caricature had become a way of carrying out a political discourse particularly adapted to the technical and social emergence of mass daily illustrated newspapers. Caricature was a visual commentary on its time whose vehicle was the human figure; it was a vernacular art, drawing on the expressive conventions of painting, but unhampered by academic precept. Censorship, which started creeping back from 1831 and became official in 1835, feared political images more than words.

The pressure of prosecution on the caricature press provoked the caricaturists to ingenious use of their visual training, forcing the traditional visual repertoire to yield up indirect political and social meaning.

Figure 1  Maison Aubert. In Texier, Tableau de Paris, 1852-1853.

Charles Philipon

Charles Philipon was the founder and director of the two most important caricature newspapers, La Caricature and Le Charivari, and for thirty years the leader of the journalistic and caricatural campaign on behalf of betrayed Republican principles. He was the son of a wallpaper manufacturer in Lyon, acquainted with printing technology and popular imagery. He spent a year in Paris in the studio of Antoine Jean Gros, apparently in preparation to work as a designer in his father's business; he returned briefly to Lyon in 1823, but came back to Paris and found work among the publishers of popular prints, trade cards, children's picture stories, and rebuses.

In the 1820s, Romantic artists had started exploring the new techniques of lithography. The most notable example was Delacroix's illustrations for Goethe's Faust, which were published as a series of lithographic prints in 1828. The young Philipon experimented with decorative lithography and with lithographed caricatures for La Silhouette, where Daumier was also to make his first appearance. Philipon also drew many individual prints and series on fashions and social manners and habits (see Figure 1). His career as the impresario of the graphic publication world began as an enterprise intended to help his brother-in-law, Gabriel Aubert, out of financial difficulties. In 1829 they set up a print publishing business, the Maison Aubert, in the new and elegant Galerie Véro-Dodat. Philipon had a sense of the market and realized that, even when the stock was meager, it was worth having a good shop window that could draw the spectators to see the daily production of lithographs. Here Philipon first began to assemble a repertory of prints, illustrations and caricatures, lithographs and woodcuts, including books, pamphlets, and prints, individually and in series, in a range of popular formats.
Baudelaire described something of the character of this pictorial domain:

For sketches of manners, for the portrayal of bourgeois life and the fashion scene, the quickest and the cheapest technical means will evidently be the best. The more beauty the artist puts into it, the more valuable will the work be; but there is in the trivial things in life, in the daily exchange of external things, a speed of movement that imposes upon the artist an equal speed of execution. As soon as lithography was invented it was quickly seen to be very suitable for this enormous task, so frivolous in appearance. We possess veritable national records in this class; the works of Gavarni and Daumier have been accurately described as complements to La comédie humaine.³

Philipon’s first collaborators had been his colleagues on La Silhouette, most of whom joined the weekly journal La Caricature, which began publication in 1830 with Balzac as editor in charge of text and Grandville as its most distinguished illustrator (see Figure 2). Daumier joined a few months later, at about the time when Philipon shifted from social comment to political satire and polemic. In 1832, Philipon, foreseeing increased difficulties because of censorship lines, established a sister publication and eventual successor, Le Charivari (charivari meaning a loud clatter of pots and pans at the windows of unpopular people). One large sheet folded into four pages, this paper included a full-page lithograph by Daumier, Gavarni, or others, and smaller engraved caricature vignettes interspersed throughout the text. Published daily, it gave caricature a larger audience than ever before. From the start it covered social as well as political subjects. Philipon set the editorial policy and tone.

Philipon was not a caricaturist of the first order himself, but he was a generous discoverer and sure-footed guide and animator of the talents of others. In his little study on Daumier, Henry James spoke of Philipon as having "a suggestive share in any enterprise in which he had a hand."⁴ Daumier is reported as saying that without Philipon’s prodding he "would never have done anything."⁵ Philipon had the instinct of the publicist: a sharp awareness of the realities and the potential of his milieu. In his obituary for Philipon, Nadar spoke of his great sense of the public.⁶

Balzac and Philipon, the man of letters and the imagier, friends and collaborators, each took city life as his source material and as his field of struggle. Although their political stances were widely different, their common enterprise was the understanding and portrayal, through visual clues, of a new urban society. In a short article written in the form of a manual for caricaturists, Le Dedans jugé par le dehors (The Inside Judged by the Outside), Philipon left an explicit document of the contact between the caricaturists’ art and the literary tradition of moeurs.⁷ This is strikingly close in tone and focus to Balzac’s Théorie de la démarche (A Theory of Bearing). But Balzac’s piece is cast in the form of a guide to behavior, whereas Philipon’s little treatise, intended for the novice caricaturist, is a witty, vernacular take-off of Le Brun’s classic guide to the expression of the passions and emotions, gesture and painting, the textbook that had been most familiar to every art student since the seventeenth century (Conférence sur l’expression générale et particulière, 1698). Most of Philipon’s examples were taken from the life of the street and the boulevard—vignettes as seen by a passerby, a nonparticipant. One section deals with how people greet one another when they meet, and what can be inferred by eye about their relationship: "Two men who despise one another greet each other with great deference, very affectionately, for they fear one another"; in another example: "the husband greets the lover with a protective air: the lover smiles as he returns his greeting; two rival lovers greet one another with pinched lips; the creditor greets with embarrassment, the debtor with lightness."⁸

LA CARICATURE
POLITIQUE, MORALE ET LITTÉRAIRE.
Journal
rédigé par une société d’artistes et de gens de lettres

On s’abonne à Paris
AU MAGASIN DE CARICATURES.

Figure 2 Advertisement for La Caricature.
Philipon's description of "detestable" behavior is very close to Theophrastus's "Tedious Man" in La Bruyère's translation. According to Philipon:

Among detestable gestures, in the first line is that of unbuttoning and rebubtoning the interlocutor’s waistcoat, of taking the auditor by the front of his coat and shaking him from time to time, of stopping him every three paces, letting him go and stopping him again, until he is falling over with impatience and lassitude.¹¹

An observer who wrote like this must, indeed, have been good company for Daumier. Champfleury, writer, critic, and historian of caricature, observed of Philipon that he personified himself—I was about to say that he created—political caricature, one of the liveliest forces of argument, which pierces when it touches, against which no shield can protect; it is all the more redoubtable under its apparent harmlessness, like the barbs of an arrow.... Its incisive art of memory, which argues and preaches to the eye, equips it with a force which governments could not be slow to understand and to repress.... The man of unique talent who took up this terrible weapon and used it dazzlingly was a man of virtue and conviction.¹²

Baudelaire noted: "The symbol had been found, thanks to an obliging analogy. From then on, the symbol was enough. With this kind of political slang, artists could express and convey to the populace anything they like, and it was, therefore, around this tyrannical and cursed pear that the large mob of yelling patrons collected."¹³ The pear openly teased the censors and provoked them to more convoluted regulations, which in turn the caricaturists bypassed with increasing inventiveness.

The pear, which appeared frequently in caricature, in popular literature, and imagery, became a cause célèbre between the caricaturists and the government. The loi de cautionnement made it easy for the government to fine newspapers: it depended on the daring and budget of the paper to test the limits. After several attempted prosecutions, Le Charivari was accused of "offense to the person of the king" because of a caricature showing him as a pear. On November 14, 1831, Philipon, appearing for the defense, claimed his right, under the Charter, to criticize the government openly; he described how he had decided to dedicate Le Charivari to political polemic because of the government's reaction to an early cartoon showing Louis-Philippe blowing soap-bubbles, each of which was a promise made at the setting up of the July monarchy.

Pencil in hand, Philipon showed the court the contradictions that followed from condemning the pear motif as an offense to the king's person. He drew four heads (Figure 3); the first was a representation of Louis-Philippe; in the second, he slightly reduced the distinctiveness of the features; the third emphasized further the shape of a head, pointed at the top, rounded at the bottom; and the fourth was a pear. To be consistent, Philipon claimed, the court would have to prosecute any drawing of a pear-shaped object in any context. Philipon did not pretend that his pear caricature was not political; he defended the paper's right to use a symbol of the king as a visual means, recognizable to everyone, of making critical statements about the regime. Philipon described how the government's harassment of the press "held back his pen and his tongue" so that he "tried by signs, by sketches, to make the regime understand that it is deceiving itself and going wrong."¹⁴ La Caricature printed the judgment that went against Philipon in the typographical form of a pear (Figure 4).

Over the next four years, the pear appeared frequently in popular imagery and literature. In an article published in La Caricature in 1832, L’Envahissement de la poire (The Invasion of the Pear), a journalist observed that the image of the pear was so pervasive that the mayor of Auxerre, a town 170 kilometers from Paris, added to the post-no-bills sign "nor any pears." Bouquet illustrated this point in a lithograph for La Caricature showing a group of children drawing Louis-Philippe pear heads on a wall.
One of the first Physiologies published was Peytel's *Physiologie de la poire* in 1832, a parody of a naturalist's taxonomic description, listing the varieties of pears including the *Roi-Louis*:

One of those pears of destiny which ripen around the end of July or the beginning of August. The *Roi-Louis* was imported into France in the year of grace 1830. Since then it has been a large, broad fruit, puffy and ill-formed. Abroad, it had already produced abundant seeds, and although it was not certain that the stock would do well on French soil, the variety was purchased here at high cost, 500,000 Paris.\(^{15}\)

In one caricature, a pear is shown being raised as a central monument in the Place de la Concorde with the inscription: "The monument expiatoire [expiatoire = expiatory] is raised in the site of the Revolution, exactly in the place where Louis XVI was guillotined." Daumier showed Louis-Philippe as a pear perilously crossing a tightrope. Grandville and Forest depicted a reception where all of the figures in Louis-Philippe's court are pears (Figure 5). Bouquet's *Les Favoris de la poire* (The Favorites, or Side Whiskers, of the Pear) shows two censors with scissors snuggling up to a huge pear. In *Le Charivari*, May 1, 1835.

**Poire et ses pepins** (The Pear and its Pips), a double-page spread of an open half of the huge fleshy fruit shows in its dark womb Louis-Philippe's ministers huddled around a pot marked "budget" from which they feed. The censors in despair finally adopted Philimon's doctrine of consistency and forbade the caricaturists to draw any pear-like objects. This in itself became a subject for satire, as the caricaturists teased the censors with animals and objects that approximated pear-shapedness. The censors' preoccupation with pears led them to overlook other disguised political references and the journalists and caricaturists teased the censors on this point. A writer for *La Caricature* noted: "It's fortunate that the censors didn't see in the hunter with his cap, an allusion to the censorship firing at sparrows and didn't recognize some great personage of the court in the fox, emblem of cunning."\(^{16}\) It is quite likely that such retrospective gibes were often made even when the original drawing had in fact had no particular political implication.
In *Censeurs* (Figure 6), Grandville depicted the censors as bug-headed with crossed bulging eyes, pawing over pages; Grandville’s caption read: “Ah, this is too much, we, the censors, rendered in caricature, we owe a lesson to these artists. Cut!” The accompanying text explained:

Few qualities are necessary for the censor! It’s enough if he hasn’t the vaguest idea, in order to be able to judge the ideas of others; that is the sole condition of impartiality required of him.... You may be astonished by the indulgence they have shown toward this picture of themselves, but rest assured, it is more stupidity than magnanimity. The artist has so flattered their portraits, that these gentlemen, no doubt, don’t recognize themselves.17

In *Liberté de la presse* (Figure 7), Daumier showed a strong and noble printer, a man of the people, standing firm in defense of his press, contrasted with the figures of monarchy, church, and a group of politicians who hover and lurk in the background. This was published as one of thirty-six extraordinary prints issued monthly by Philipon’s *Association Lithographique Mensuelle*, in order to raise revenues to pay the fines.18
Earlier political caricatures, such as Goya’s *Caprichos*, and the work of Hogarth, Gilray, and Rowlandson, had been issued as self-contained series or individual prints. With the use of lithography in the newspapers and the mechanization of the popular press, caricature could be integrated with journalism and reach a much wider audience on a daily basis. Over the next twenty years there was a continual growth of illustrated newspapers and journals. The newspaper channeled back images, often daily, into the texture of city life from which they were drawn. The caricaturists became a current conscience for the urban population.

Nineteenth-century French caricature had a traditional predilection for formal exaggerations, mutations, transformations, sets of variations and, as we have seen, puns, emblems, and analogies; among the precedents were Louis Boilly’s *Grimaces* of 1823-1828 (Figure 8). The generation of caricaturists led by Philipon, who faced the new opportunities of daily lithography and the new constraints of censorship, inherited a well-stocked formal armory. Explicit caricatures appeared of Louis-Philippe in allegorical situations that reveal his attitudes and policies, such as Daumier’s depiction of him as a clown posed before a stage, pointing derisively to a gagged and blindfolded personification of France (Figure 9); or standing by the bed of a dead Republican exclaiming: “It is safe to release this one.” In one of the most virulent caricatures of Louis-Philippe, Daumier depicted him as Gargantua sitting on a commodious throne, being fed bribes by small courtiers and defecating medals and money; this referred to Louis-Philippe’s distribution of insignia of the Legion of Honor, ennobling bureaucrats and shopkeepers loyal to Napoleon’s military glory. This caricature, published in 1832, led to a six-month imprisonment for Daumier.

Another distinct branch of political caricature was the portraits-charges (see Figure 10), exaggerated portraits of recognizable political figures such as Louis-Philippe and his ministers (Dargou, Dupin, Persil, and others). Daumier was the most practiced, skillful, and imaginative caricaturist of this genre both in drawing and in sculpture.

There were also group portraits-charges, in *Le Ventre législatif* (The Legislative Paunch), published by the Association Lithographique Mensuelle (Figure 11). Daumier represented each member of the Legislative Body, varying the predominant characteristics of each deputy: fat, big-paunched, heavy-jowled, thick-lipped, small-eyed, each in a state of stupor, indifference, or arrogance, while the deputy Dr. Prunelle presides over them with Machiavellian alertness.

Analogies between animals and humans were another form of political caricature. Daumier, for example, represented Dupin, the attorney-general, exaggerating his simian skull. But the animal analogy was more often used in caricatures of type than of public individuals, and

*Figure 7*  Daumier,
"Freedom of the Press, Don’t meddle with it,"
1834. D. 133.
Ah, qu'il est bon!
Figure 9  Daumier, "Lower the curtain, the farce is over," 1834. D. 86.

Figure 10  Daumier, "D'Argout," Censor of the July Monarchy and Minister of Commerce, Public Works, Fine Arts, and the Interior. D'Argout's emblems were the scissor and his large nose, which got into everything. 1832. D. 48.
Figure 11  Daumier, "The Legislative Body (or paunch): Aspect of the ministerial branch in the prostituted chamber of 1834," 1834. D. 131.

Figure 12  Grandville, "Cast Shadows," 1830.
mostly to convey moral categories. This type of caricature was practiced primarily by Grandville, a master of transformation (Figure 12). In his Ombres portées (Projected Shadows) of 1830, the shadows cast by parading politicians and clerks betray their sinister animal equivalents, owls, serpents, and lizards; he also depicted politicians as strutting roosters.

In August 1835, official and comprehensive censorship laws were declared in an attempt to silence the caricaturists’ continual barrage against the king and his government. In July there had been an assassination attempt on the king. The loi de cautionnement was increased from 30,000 to 100,000 francs. Administrative authorities were encouraged to interfere with the press in day-to-day activities. There were new press offenses: one could not attack the king directly or indirectly in any of the following forms—any criticism of the king, any censure or blame of the king for any act of government, any attack against the character or form of the government established by the Charter, any act of disloyalty, any use of the name “Republican,” any desire or wish that the constitutional monarchy might be destroyed, and, on the “rightist” side, any wish that the legitimist Bourbon might be restored. Such offenses could be classified as treason. Furthermore, any reporting of libel or slander trials, even the names of witnesses in such trials, was forbidden.

The major innovation of the new law was prior censorship: no drawings, engravings, lithographs, or prints of whatever nature (even decorative vignettes) were permitted to be publicly exhibited or placed on sale without the prior authorization of the Minister of the Interior or by authorization of a Prefect in the provinces. If any were objected to, they could be confiscated and the publishers would be tried, not by juries but by “correction tribunals” presided over by the king’s magistrates. Fines and terms of imprisonment were doubled or even quadrupled. Theaters and plays were also subjected to prior authorizations and regulation. All street performers who were known for subversive skits had to submit their songs and acts to government officials in advance of their performances.

All in all, the laws of 1835 effectively brought the explicit pictorial treatment of political subjects to a halt. La Caricature folded on August 27, 1835. And although the Charter proclaimed that “Frenchmen have the right to circulate their opinions in published form,” it added that: “when opinions are converted into actions by the circulation of drawings, it is a question of speaking to the eyes. That is something more than the expression of an opinion; it is an incitement to action not covered by Article 3.”

On September 16, the day after the censorship laws were officially announced, Le Charivari published a blank page surrounded by a funeral border. The missing drawing was described in words, an expedient which ridiculed the anomaly of the new laws, more fearful of images than of words. This provocative device was repeated over the next months. The guerrilla warfare of Philibon and his troupe of caricaturists was mobilized with new imaginative devices.

On September 17, Le Charivari addressed its subscribers “concerning the evil designs [dessins] of the censor against the drawings [dessins],” explaining that the publication of drawings would be affected by the censor but that they would still do everything they could to assert themselves on political issues: they were concerned and committed as ever. They stated their position in verse: “You can gag me, oh hostile doctrine! But force me to change, never!—I defy you/No, Charivari will not change.” This was followed by verses obviously set to the tune of the Marseillaise:

La censure en vain nous devore!
Elle enfante des traits nouveaux;
Sous les ciseaux, voyez eclore
Croquis, pochades et tableaux.
Meprison cette vaine injure!
Laissons couler leur encre impure!
En avant, croquons!
Et que nos crayons,
Bravent ses ciseaux, ses grattoirs, ses torchons,
Embetent la censure!

(Censorship in vain devours us! She brings forth new traits;/ Under her scissors, see sketches, scribbles, scenes unfold/ We despise this futile insult!/ Let their foul ink flow!/ Onward, sketching! And let our crayons/ Defy their scissors, erasers and wipers/ Continue to harass the censorship.)

Legitimist and Republican journalists informed their readers that cunning and hypocrisy would be needed, and that readers should become accustomed to looking for innuendos. Their defiant irrepressibility became a recurrent motif with political force in itself, and generated a wealth of alternative codes for making political points. The journalists established a new level of highly articulate subversive silence. Such inventiveness, involving the complicity of the audience in the same way as a ruse or a puzzle would, was a great part of the appeal of the caricatures of that period.

At the same time a deeper transformation was taking place: the caricaturists were beginning to shift their focus from public events, individual politicians, and specific laws and policies, to their sources and consequences in social conditions. In this shift, Daumier, in collaboration with Philibon, played the major role. This new strain of caricature was more resistant to censorship. The individual political portrait-charge and explicit political caricature were replaced by the representative or symbolic type, which stood for a recognizable category of protagonists, beneficiaries, or victims of the regime. The classification of people by types became part of the caricaturists' armory.
Emblematic Types

One version of this device was the "emblematic type," a fictional character with a proper name and set of characteristics with whom the public could gradually develop an involved acquaintance. Once created and established in the public's imagination, such types were put through a variety of contemporary situations and stresses and given different professions. Sometimes these figures were explicitly political in their activities; sometimes only the accompanying text would spell out the political reference; sometimes they reflected the attitudes and cultural effects of the regime. The sources of these popular types were found in illustrations, literature, fables, theater, and popular songs. Inevitably, the depiction of such types tended to represent weaknesses and faults rather than merits and good qualities.²⁷

Four principal emblematic types were evolved in caricature between 1830 and 1870; they reflected a political progression. They were Mayeux from 1830 to 1833 (at the same time as the poire); Robert Macaire from 1835 to 1838; Ratapoll from 1850 to 1852; and Joseph Prudhomme from 1852 to 1870.²⁸ As types for caricature, Macaire, Ratapoll, and Prudhomme are Daumier's, although both Macaire and Prudhomme were taken over from the theater.

Mayeux was the creation of Traviès, who reportedly based the physical type on the grimacer Leclercq's impersonation of a hunchback, partly pathetic, partly querulous (Figure 13).²⁹ Traviès' inspiration was to adapt this image to a political type who, at the height of the patriotic fervor of July 1830, personified a whole ominous aspect of the 1830 Revolution: the figure of the small self-seeker who

Figure 13  Traviès, "Out of the question, my dear! I'm on duty—Later, perhaps...." 1831.

Figure 14  Frederick Lemaitre in his role as Macaire. After a photograph by Carjat.
had chosen the revolutionary side and who, as a member of the National Guard, was in a position to exercise petty tyranny and exploitation, not least over women. He remains a small shopkeeper, but he has naive ambitions to positions of influence under the new regime. His hunchback associates him with Punch or Polichinelle, traditionally a cynical outsider, the butt of mockery and himself a mocker. The Gazette de Paris, in a note on Mayeux in 1833, put him in the tradition of Thersites and Aesop, malformed outsiders and mockers of society. The force of the character comes from the fact that this outsider, without social ties or responsibility, is in a position of arbitrary (though petty) social power. As soon as he appeared in Traviès' cartoons, he was generally seized upon as a current reference in political and social commentary as “the figure who summed up our anger, our enthusiasm, our credibilities, the type of 1830 and 1831.” Mayeux's reign was short-lived. He was declared dead in 1833, of ennui and disappointment, a “devouring and indeterminate malady which the doctors... have named ingrown revolution.” The Gazette de Paris reported: “Mayeux disappears and Robert Macaire takes possession of the street... the hunchback dies at the hour when illusions are no longer possible; the rascal Robert Macaire... says to Mayeux: 'Ah, die, naïve buffoon. Naïveté is dead.'”

Robert Macaire, the quintessential con man, was a satire on the July Monarchy and its financial oligarchy. Macaire had his origins in the theater, the creation of the actor Frédéric Lemaitre in his free interpretation of a bland melodrama of Benjamin Antier, Saint-Amand, and Paulyanthe, L'Auberge des adrets, first performed at the Théâtre Ambigu-Comique in 1823 (see Figure 14). The plot concerned a criminal who was shot and died a repentant sinner. Lemaitre introduced comic elements in his characterization so that by the early 1830s the play had become a satire. In the final scene Macaire and his sidekick Bertrand stand in front of the Bourse, the stock exchange, about to be admitted to the Panthéon des Voleurs, the Robbers' Hall of Fame. Daumier rendered this scene in caricature.

In 1834 a new comedy was written around Lemaitre's Macaire, Robert Macaire, ou cynique scapin du crime, clearly a satire on the July Monarchy. In the last performance of this play, when it was banned in 1835, Lemaitre/Macaire appeared made up as Louis-Philippe.

Daumier adopted Lemaitre's Macaire for caricature. On November 13, 1834, he first depicted Macaire and Louis-Philippe embracing while picking one another's pockets. In the background are Thiers and Persil, the Attorney-General. The hundred lithographs of Daumier's Macaire series, Caricaturana, were published in Le Charivari between 1836 and 1838 in collaboration with Philibert, who wrote the legends. Macaire, manipulative, corrupt, dissembling, represented politics on the citizen level; as a financial and social operator, he was a political phenomenon (see Figure 15). He came to life in an age of feverish speculation, a supporter of the monarchy in his own financial interest. Le Charivari noted that while Macaire had been banned from the theater where he had his origins, "his type persists as the most complete personification of the period. Because of censorship we can't stigmatize the political Robert Macaire, so we look to the businessman Macaire."

Baudelaire noted:

Macaire was the clear starting point of the caricature of manners... The political pamphlet gave way to comedy... And so caricature took on a new character, and was no longer particularly political. It became the general satire of the citizenry. It impinged on the domain of the novel.

Macaire was depicted in various professional guises, but "money was the common denominator." A banker, chairman of a stock company, shareholder, speculator, lawyer, industrialist, political candidate, editor of an industrial journal, proprietor (Figure 16). Also among his professions was medicine; he was represented as doctor, surgeon, dentist, oculist, hypnotist, magnetizer, pharmacist, and dispenser of quack medicine. His depiction as journalist and editor without scruples led one English

Figure 15  Daumier, The Lion's Share: "Quiet, gentlemen, please! We have 100 louis; 80 for me, 18 for M. le Compte de S. Bertrand, remainder, 2... and 15 of you asking for them... Really, these endless demands.... People ought not to deceive themselves like this! Well, gentlemen, we're all honest men, arrange it among yourselves how to divide these 2 louis. Let's not make trouble!" Caricaturana, 1837. D. 376.
contemporary to speculate that Macaire was in part a parody of Emile de Girardin, who, after his days at La Silhouette, became a conservative and establishment figure. Balzac described his Baron de Nucingen, an exploitative hard-hearted banker who appeared in many of his novels, as "ce vieux Robert Macaire du Nucingen." And Marx directly linked Macaire to Louis-Philippe, observing: "The July Monarchy was no more than just a joint stock company, for the exploitation of French national wealth....Louis-Philippe was a director of this company, a Robert Macaire in the throne."\(^{40}\)

There are no moral claims in Macaire's world. Gautier noted his "audacity and his desperate attack on the social order and against people."\(^{41}\) His bearing is a matter of manipulation, a dramatic device. Daumier expressed this attitude through his depiction of Macaire based on Lemaître: he wears an eye-patch, and a cravat hitched high to mask his mouth, obscuring his most revealing features.

With Macaire, Daumier first developed his particular syntax of bearing and gesture, the modification of conventional gestures by individually observed traits that amend and sometimes reverse our reading of the figure's intentions: we can tell from Macaire's pose what he is really up to. He took on the lawyer's outstretched accusatory arm, the landlord's proprietary stance. Macaire was also often presented in a gentleman's pose, but exaggerated to the point of charlatanry (Figure 17). The pose itself was conventional, at least since the Renaissance, and was adopted consistently in artistic representations from Poussin and Le Brun to David and nineteenth-century academic painting. In The Art of Painting and All Its Branches (1838), Gerard de Lairesse described this pose aptly: "In an erect posture, the feet must make a right angle, to wit, the heel of the one with the inner ankle of the other."\(^{42}\) This is what is known in ballet as the fourth position. Daumier used this pose in depicting politicians, lawyers, the bourgeoisie, anyone with power or pretension. The popular Swiss physiognomer Johan Casper Lavater had described moral traits deducible from this pose:

Ridiculous affectation of superiority exercising its empire over a humble and timid character... Presumption of every kind supposes folly at bottom and one meets both in every disproportionate and gross physiognomy which affects an air of solemnity and authority... Theatrical affectation of man is destitute of sense and meaning and used to give oneself airs."\(^{43}\)

---

Figure 16  Daumier, Robert Macaire, Attorney: "Gentlemen the contract in question is manifoldly null and void, fraudulent and without force in law. (The President interrupting M. Macaire) But you are arguing against your own client. (Robert, aside) The Devil! It's true, I'm in trouble. (Aloud) This is no doubt what my colleagues will try to tell you....But in fact, this contract is certainly sound, legal and completely binding, etc. etc. (He pleaded five hours without stopping to spit and lost his case)." Caricaturana, 1837. D. 399.

Figure 17  Daumier, "Bertrand, I'm in love with finance...if you want, we'll open a bank. Yes, a real bank! Capital 100 million, million shares, 100 milliard milliards. We'll sink the bank of France, we'll sink the bankers, we'll sink the mountebanks, we'll sink everybody!—yes, but what about the police?—Don't be a fool, Bertrand, no one arrests a millionaire." Caricaturana, 1836. D. 354.
Figure 18 Daumier, Ratapoli making Propaganda: “If you love your wife, your house, your field, your heifer and your calf, sign, you haven’t a minute to lose.” Current Events, 1851. D. 2117.

Figure 19 Daumier, sculpture of Ratapoli, 1851.

A contemporary writer of theatrical gesture, Henry Siddons, in his Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action of 1822 (based on J. J. Engel’s Idéen zu einer Mimik, 1785-1786, which is reprinted in the Lavater L’Art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie, Paris 1806-1809), described the pose as indicative of pride and conceit, pretentiousness and arrogance.

Macaire, who personified the exploitative opportunities of the July Monarchy, disappeared with the downfall of Louis-Philippe in 1848. The new Republican government was helpless in the face of the economic crisis which followed the Revolution of 1848.44 Distrust and tension built up between the masses and the middle class.45 It became clear that economic conditions under the Republic were worse than under Louis-Philippe. Six “June days” of bitter street fighting between working class and bourgeoisie ensued.46 In December Louis-Napoleon was named President of the French Republic. The conflict and instability of this new appointment was expressed in Daumier’s lithograph of Hugo balancing Louis-Napoleon on a seesaw. In 1852 the new French constitution gave the president monarchical powers.47 Two weeks later Louis-Napoleon proclaimed himself Emperor Napoleon III. This “Second Empire” lasted until September 1870.

In the period between 1848 and 1852, the censorship laws were lifted, and Daumier and other caricaturists returned to political caricature. It was in 1850, when Daumier felt that the Republic was doomed, that he invented his new emblematic character, Ratapoli, who first appeared in individual lithographs in Le Charivari (see Figure 18). A hired bully and agent of the secret police, who had begun his rise to power in 1848, Ratapoli gathers votes for Louis-Napoleon by threats and bribes. Ratapoli was first conceived as a sculpture: Daumier’s only free-standing, full-length single figure, 17 inches high (Figure 19). In the lithographs of 1851, he took on his typical look: angular, skeletal, a battered hat resting on a broken nose.48 Ratapoli appeared in forty Daumier lithographs between 1850 and 1851. The writer and art critic
Gustave Geoffroy called him "the resumé of an epoch, the agitator who prepared the coup d'état."  

Daumier’s sustained indictment of this figure was a cry of warning, part of a campaign against Louis-Napoleon’s claims to sovereignty. As Jules Michelet, the prominent anti-Bonapartist historian, remarked, Daumier did more for Republicanism with Ratapoil than all politicians put together.  

By the time of the establishment of the Second Empire (1852), whether because of censorship or because the battle was now lost, Ratapoil was dropped from Daumier’s repertoire. He reappeared in a few lithographs in 1871, after the Franco-Prussian war, where he was depicted trying to rouse peasants to the cause of the deposed emperor. Ratapoil’s political successor in Daumier’s work was to be Henry Monnier’s type of the quintessential, apolitical bourgeois, Joseph Prudhomme.  

Professional Types  
Along with typical and recurrent emblematic characters like Macaire and Ratapoil who have a name and continuity through all their guises, Le Charivari also developed broader strategies for expressing political attitudes in social satire (see Figures 20, 21). After the censorship laws of 1835, satirical representations of professions flourished. The first and most important of these series, Types français (1835), was a collaboration between Traviés and Daumier, at the time when they were also drawing Mayaux and Macaire respectively. The introductory text stated that the series reproduces the types of physiognomy, the bearing, and the costume particular to the different classes that form the ornament of society. This series along with Grandville’s Grotesques parisiens and Bourdet’s Bécotismes parisiens [Parisian follies] forms in Le Charivari a complete physiognomy of the Nation known as the most witty and gracious in the world.  

This editorial provided a specific link between one of the occupational types and two named public figures, Le Charivari’s special enemies:  

The La Bruyère who is responsible for tracing in our contemporary pictures a moral portrait of the little cleric, the brook-jumper [message-runner], has only forgotten to add that above all he is not afraid of getting his hands dirty. It is from the number of the brook-jumpers that two actual censors come, MM Jules de Wailly and Pierrot.  

While each figure in Types français bears the attributes of his trade, there is something suspect about each of them. In contrast to the noble emblematic workers whom Daumier represented in Liberté de la presse. Mort pour la liberté, and Rue Transnonain, and the politically neutral earlier types of the “Cries of the City,” these ragpickers, letter-writers, bootblacks, and clerks are portrayed in a way that provides a bitter insight into their corrupting or degrading circumstances.  

For example, Daumier’s L’Ecrivain public (The Public Scrivener) is shown as a poor and mean-looking old man huddled in a small hole-in-the-wall, his office, which, we are told, reeks of alcohol and tobacco (Figure 22). We also learn that he serves as the neighborhood confessor, and as confidant for the messenger, the water-carrier, the valet, and the lady’s maid. He might once have been an apprentice to a notary, or an ex-procurer of the monopoly, or an author of novels successful thirty years ago. All the same, no secret is safe with him, because he is the chief informer for the prefect of the police. The text warned:  

all you to whom the new law concerning the liberty of the press applies, when you pass before this miserable shop of the public scrivener, doff your hat.
Figure 21  Daumier, "Sir, I will willingly pay a new franc... if you will do me the extreme favor of extricating me from this turnstile!" *The World's Fair*, 1855. D. 2693.

Figure 22  Daumier, The Public Scrivener: "The public scrivener is the confidant of the chambermaid, the poet, the cooks, the love interpreter of the soldiers and the consultant of the porters. His status is the last refuge of the missed education and for the invalids of literature." *French Types*, 1835. D. 262.
The implication may be: because this is where you too may end; or perhaps it is an expression of his power to compromise his neighbors.

Daumier’s depictions of the banker bear a close resemblance to the pear-like figure of Louis-Philippe: “nothing but a container, a coffer exclusively fit for finances” (Figure 23). The accompanying text read:

This is the banker-lynx [lynx: an epithet for “greedy capitalist”]; robber and croupier of the stockmarket, a politic speculator, a deputy who gravitates to the centre. In his physique he is large and fat; morally he is even more gross. He is the prototype of egoism, presumption and pride. He loves luxury, and apes the aristocracy which he aspires to displace.

He keeps his carriage, livery, and Opera dancer, as the nobility do, but he lacks their tact, manners and taste. In his air, manner and language, he shows his usurious origins. He is attached to the established power. Patriotism, liberalism, national dignity, are utopian chimeras at which he smiles pityingly. Politically he has good sense: he is eligible, often he is elected, he always keeps silent in the House—that is, he does not speak; but he roars ah! and oh! and h! according to the needs of the minister, whose feudal dependent he is.

Any country where the banker gains government power is liable to become the most cowardly, the most materialistic, the most debased in the world.⁵⁸
This character also bears close resemblance to Lavater’s description of a type to be avoided:

Large bulky persons, with small eyes, round full hanging cheeks, puffed lips, and a chin resembling a purse or bag: who are continually occupied with their own corpulence, who on every occasion consult their own ease without regard to others, are, in reality, frivolous, insipid, powerless, vain, inconstant, imprudent, conceited voluptuous characters, difficult to guide, which desire much and enjoy little—and whoever enjoys little, gives little.54

The banker embodies exploitation, as did the similar characters of Gobseck and Nucingen in Balzac’s Père Goriot. In Daumier’s caricatures, lawyers stand for injustice and bankers for speculation, corruption, and greed. Caricatures of professional types continued throughout the nineteenth century. However, by the mid-1840s they became increasingly characterological, with only occasional political innuendo.

Caricatures of other nonprofessional urban types appeared regularly in Le Charivari, alternating with the Types français. Daumier’s Fibustiers parisiens of 1835 depicted different kinds of thieves and petty criminals. The editorial explained that Daumier proposed to represent the different ways in which the inexperienced provincial was fleeced by crooks, as well as by the foolishness of the local citizens. The series had the double appeal of putting the public on guard and of offering a physiognomic guide to that category of the population of Paris.

A. Bourdet’s Béotismes parisiens, published in Le Charivari on August 12, 1836, provided comment on politics, caricature, and the bourgeois censorship and economics. In one scene a politician is depicted requesting a lithographic portrait to distribute to his constituency, while the accompanying text explained: “Thanks to the excellent type of the Parisian bourgeois, the caricaturist/artist, sentenced to inaction by the September Laws, can still find work.”

Throughout this period the caricaturists were elaborating their basic techniques of physiognomic expression beyond the scope of Le Brun and Lavater. After intensive collaborative political caricature between 1830 and 1835, the individual stylistic gifts of the caricaturists began to emerge with greater clarity. Their work developed in two directions: civilian satire in the caricature journals, and book illustration, less subject to day-to-day pressures and bordering on contemporary genre painting. Some genre themes of Impressionist painting—café scenes, street scenes, casual encounters—are directly anticipated in this material.

J. Traviés

After 1835, Traviés (1804-1859) attempted the transition to social caricature in his lithographs for Le Charivari.56 He depicted Parisian working-class types living on the squallid outskirts of the city, demeaned by their work or lack of work and usually broken down by drink (see Figure 24). His Tableau de Paris and Politesse française were as unappealing as Hogarth’s Gin Lane had been in the previous century and, like Hogarth, he included in his panorama of demoralization a rogues’ gallery of “reputable” citizens: the consumer, a rich fat man; the industrialist holding a purse and a ledger; the “honest” solicitor depicted as a robber. His style was literal and unrelenting. His proto-naturalism and pictorial social conscience were out of step with his time: a prefiguration of the novels of Zola (Figure 25).

A competent draftsman, he drew several series of satirical physiognomic studies in the manner of Boilly, including Les Contrastes (1829), which pairs off independence and servitude, ferocity and compassion, and Les Petits Grimaces (1830-1831). Traviés employed animal-human analogies in his Histoire naturelle of 1830, a parody of Buffon applied to contemporary reprehensible types. He also contributed illustrations to the Physiologies of the Maison Aubert, Les français peints par eux-mêmes and Texier’s Tableau de Paris, as well as a few series on Parisian moeurs, Scènes de moeurs, les Plaisirs Parisiens, and Les Rues de Paris.

But nothing further developed along these lines: Traviés’ work with its edge of brutality did not survive long in the milder world of social satire. Little is known about his remaining years. Champfleury, in his history of caricature, cites an 1859 article recounting Traviés’ end: poor, alone, and forgotten.56
Grandville

Grandville (Jean Isidore Gérard, 1803-1846) was born in Nancy, where his father was a miniaturist painter. Even in political days he had operated on a different axis from his colleagues—more fantastic, more abstract. He had turned mainly to book illustration by the late 1830s, occasionally contributing a print to one of the published albums of individual caricatures. There are approximately 3,000 prints, lithographs, and engravings in his oeuvre. Grandville’s work in the 1830s extended the formal vocabulary of feature and expression. His morphological reduction from Apollo to a frog follows studies by Giacomo della Porta, Le Brun, and Lavater (Figure 26). Physiognomic variations in response to a common stimulus, such as sniff-taking or smoking, are also in the tradition of Bollly’s Grimaces. In Formes différentes du visage (1836), he paired heads with their reduction to basic shapes: circular, square, triangular, and so on. Such analogies had also been made by Lavater (see Figure 27).

It was Grandville who provided the frontispiece for Peyel’s Physiologie de la poire in 1832, and he also drew vignettes for the 1845 edition of La Bruyère’s Les Caractères ou les moeurs de ce siècle. For Les Français peints par eux-mêmes (1835), he illustrated the stockholder, the man of letters, the pharmacist, the writer, and the surgical orderly. Social roles, customs, and habits are depicted in Chaque âge à ses plaisirs of 1827, Types modernes: les dédans de l’homme expliqué par le dehors of 1835, and piquant analogies between diners and items on the menu in Cartes vivantes du restaurateur of 1830.

As Grandville distanced himself from daily comment, he moved away from speaking silence to silent silence. He became obsessed with fantastic cosmology outside social reality. His cosmogotic romanticism anticipated the fantasy genre of science fiction. He returned to his earlier interest in physiognomy, bearing, and gesture, and became fascinated by the “physiognomy” of inanimate objects and in animating them. He drew morphogeneses and metamorphoses: animals turned into humans, inanimate objects to animate ones, geometrical forms to organic shapes. Above all, he developed animal-human analogies. Working within the long tradition of expressing moral issues through animal fables, from Aesop to La Fontaine whom he illustrated, Grandville greatly extended the traditional range of characterological traits associated with animals. Such analogies recur throughout his oeuvre. One of his first series, Les Metamorphoses du jour (1830), consisting of seventy-two lithographs, was reprinted in Le Charivari in 1832 with the title Metamorphoses du jour ou les hommes à têtes de bêtes.
Grandville’s most complete study of animal-human analogies appeared in *Scènes de la vie privée et publique des animaux: études des moeurs contemporaines* (its projected but unpublished title was *Les Animaux peints par eux-mêmes et dessinés par un autre*). This consisted of illustrations for a collection of short stories by Balzac, De Musset, Janin, Nodier, George Sand, Louis Viardot, and de la Bédollière, published in a hundred installments between 1840 and 1842. The preface made it clear that in this case the book was conceived as a satire on government and society.

The framework of the story is a revolt initiated by the animals (anticipating George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*) in the Paris zoo, the Jardin des Plantes. The revolutionaries elect Grandville as an honorary animal and enlist him to illustrate the history of their republic. Each animal contributes a tale. As in his earlier journalistic work, there are references to politics and professions. This is how he described the theater critic:

As it was a first night of a representation, I left the box at once with the air of one burdened with thought; and making my way to the green-room, joined a group of theatrical critics walking about with a supercilious pedantic air. One had the sting of a wasp, another the beak of a vulture, a third the cunning of a fox. Birds of prey were there, hungering for helpless victims. Lions were proudly showing their teeth.58

*Un Autre Monde* (Another World), of 1844, with 188 wood engravings, is the culmination of Grandville’s work; it was subtitled *Transformations, visions, incarnations, ascensions, locomotions, explorations, peregrinations, excursions, stations, cosmogonies, fantasmagories, reveries, games, buffooneries, caprices, metamorphoses, zoomorphoses, lithomorphoses, metempsychoses, apotheoses and other matters.* This work was initially issued in thirty-six installments: the author’s name was given as Taxile Delord, a pseudonym for Grandville. The story tells of three travelers who explore the modern world from three points of view: under the seas, from a balloon in the sky, and from the land. It is about the world turned upside down, with fish luring humans from the water with baits of jewelry, money, and liquor, and animals visiting ahuman zoo. There are also metaphors taken from carnivals and puppet theaters: the puppets act out the mechanical conformities of social life (variations on the *Vanity Fair* motif). In the chapter called “The Best Form of Government,” people’s heads are being hammered and tagged and the inscription reads: “Applying the discoveries of the phrenologists’ society will eliminate crime and encourage virtue by physically altering the bumps on people’s heads.” Grandville also used inanimate objects as characters in this book, such as the chisel sculpting a human thumb of huge proportions (Figure 28).

Grandville also brought the spectator theme into sharp focus. In "Venus at the Opera," Grandville presented the viewers as heads of eyes, the stare epitomized (Figure 29).
Grandville's imagery was not to find its true audience until the times of symbolism and surrealism. Baudelaire wrote:

Grandville... wanted his pencil to elucidate the law of association of ideas... There are certain superficial people whom Grandville amuses; for my part, he alarms me... When I step into the world of Grandville, some sort of disquiet takes hold of me, as though I were going into an apartment where the disorder was systematically organized... It is by the lunatic side of his talent that Grandville is significant.\(^{59}\)

Whether or not his eccentricity was clinical, his end was tragic. His book illustrations brought him a moderate livelihood but, by 1847, after the deaths of several of his children, he was a broken man. His wife and eldest son destroyed many of his original drawings after his death. He provided his own epitaph: "Here lies Grandville; he gave life to everything and made everything move and speak. The one thing is, he didn't know how to make his own way."\(^{60}\)
Gavarni

A third major caricaturist, Gavarni (Guillaume-Chevalier, 1804-1866), a Parisian from an artisan family, had been in practice since the late 1820s as an illustrator, costume designer, and elegant satirist of manners. In 1830 he was hired by De Girardin as chief illustrator for *La Mode*. His work was less prominent than that of Daumier, Grandville, or Traviés in Philippon’s newspapers between 1830 and 1835 when political caricature was in the ascendant. After 1835 he emerged as one of the principal social caricaturists of Philippon’s stable; with Daumier he is the best-known and the most technically accomplished of the caricaturists of the mid-nineteenth century, producing over 10,000 lithographs and wood engravings in his forty-year career. Like Daumier, Grandville, Monnier, Traviés, and others, Gavarni contributed to the *Physiologies of the Maison Aubert, Les Français peints par eux-mêmes, Musée parisien* as well as *Le Diable à Paris*, and *La Grande Ville*.

The theme of most of Philippon’s caricaturists at this time was the solid core of the bourgeoisie; the world of Gavarni, a Romantic, is the demimonde of erring wives, flirtatious shop girls (*grisettes*) and tarts (*lorrettes*), students and artists. His flowing, chiaroscuro style lent itself to the theme of social mutability through the elegant costume of social theater (see Figure 30). What Romantics and Realists had in common, observable in relation to their enthusiasm for Debureau, was a commitment to “being of one’s time,” and a sense of opposition to the bourgeois and to the status quo in the official arts with their bourgeois clientele.

But Gavarni’s wide popularity depended on his ability to show people as they liked to see themselves, on display at the foyers and boxes of the theaters, at their leisure, at balls and carnivals, rather than defined by their work (see Figures 31, 32). Gavarni was the illustrator of women *par excellence*. His satire lay in his choice and presentation of a situation rather than in physiognomic caricature. In the series *Les Gens de Paris*, published in *Le Diable à Paris* in 1845, class distinctions are conveyed by the decorum of the pose.

By means of bearing, situation, and costume, Gavarni distinguished between amateur and professional dissipation, from the shop girls of easy morals to kept women (see Figure 33). His women are languorous and laconic: there is little action or reaction. The contours are static, the facial expressions muted. Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, Gavarni’s biographers, commented that his applied physiognomics was worthy of Gall and Lavater. According to the De Goncourts he presented

the modern body in its melancholy, fatigue, estrangement, informality, nonchalance, the looseness of it at ease and in movement... a full length portrait for which the nineteenth century posed as it was in the street, in one’s room, without assuming a pose.

In 1837, when Daumier’s series on Robert Macaire was coming to an end, Philippon suggested to Gavarni a series on “une Mme. Robert Macaire.” Gavarni rejected the idea and in its place Philippon and Gavarni launched a series on *Fourberies de femmes en matière de sentiment*, a Balzacian profusion of deceits, hypocrisy, ruses, outrages, and duplicities of all sorts. For instance, an enraged husband catching his wife in an illicit amorous scene is restrained by her with the words, “Would you harm the father of your children?” It was with this series that Gavarni introduced his own brand of social satire.

In 1848, when revolution was brewing and his “frivolous” social scenes were in disfavor with fervent Republicans, Gavarni moved to London where his work had already attracted a particularly appreciative audience. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert were said to be collectors of his prints. Once in London, rather than the elegant world and the court, he drew everything that struck him as picturesque: scenes of the professions, new industries, but also the Dickensian poor of the London streets, hardly less abject than in Hogarth’s time. These prints were published in the illustrated London News, *L’Illustration* in Paris, and in a set of prints entitled *Gavarni in London*. Gavarni complained that he was weary of making images to amuse the bourgeois. Soon he lost interest in his work and started to drink. He frequented only a few English friends with whom he could discuss mathematics, inventions, and his growing obsession with a new system of astronomy which would supersede and dethrone the sun.
Figure 31  Gavarni, "Paul finds that the ball is disgusting—Pauline doesn't think so." *The People of Paris*, from *Le Diable à Paris*, 1845-1846.

It is paradoxical that while in France, Gavarni only occasionally showed scenes of low life, but was taxed with social irresponsibility; and yet once in England, where the *beau monde* was eager to see itself in his mirror, he was drawn instead to picturesque exposes.

Back in Paris in the early 1850s, Gavarni heartened and applied his new social concern. Among his best series of the 1850s was *Masques et visages*, verbal and visual vignettes on Parisian types and situations in which he developed a new emblematic figure, the ragged street philosopher, Thomas Virelloque, who has "a bitter eloquence of uncultivated wisdom," and was born in one of the old working-class neighborhoods of Paris, like Gavarni himself. Virelloque is a bestial-looking character "with a skull like Socrates and a monkey's mouth." He wears the Phrygian bonnet, attribute of the *chiffonnier* or rag-picker, a popular type in the "Cries of the City." The theme of the down-and-out street philosopher was taken up by Manet in the early 1860s in his *Buveur d'absinthe* (*Absinthe Drinker*) and *Le Vieux Musicien*. The drunken and loquacious rag-picker is also the protagonist of Baudelaire's poem, *Le vin du chiffonnier*.
Virelloque, the opposite of Gavarni’s fashionable character, became his spokesman, free, able to speak his mind, sharpened by years on the street and with nothing to lose. Like Gavarni in later life, Virelloque was proudly misanthropic. Gavarni himself wrote that Virelloque had a “vigorous hatred of all wickedness, translated into a bitter sarcasm.”

Gavarni, a Romantic in subject matter and style, became increasingly embittered in his last years, sick of his audience and of his profession. In 1857, when his young son died, he entered a final period of profound depression that lasted until his death in 1866.

There is a pattern in the lives of all these caricaturists: and many of the emblematic figures they devised are woven into this pattern. Travies is the adversary of his creature, Mayeux: he saw himself as the defender of those whom Mayeux exploits. In contrast, Gavarni’s Virelloque sardonically represents his author in late life.

Henry Monnier, the subject of another article, represents an extreme case of an author’s identification with his principal character, Joseph Prudhomme; this identification with his antithero encapsulated his whole life story and, finally, illustrates his downfall. Except for Daumier, all the caricaturists discussed here lived their lives in increasingly tense and abrasive relations with society and ended in isolation and despair. Daumier, exceptionally, was supported in old age and adversity by the strength of his talent and conviction, and by the ties of family and friendship. The spectacular variety of Daumier’s work, and its unprecedented completeness of information about character and social interaction, remain for another lengthier discussion.
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Figure 32 Gavarni, “Physiognomy of the Peanut Gallery: Toward the End of the Fifth Act.” The People of Paris, from Le Diable à Paris, 1845-1846.

Figure 33 Gavarni, Men and Women of Letters: “a smell of cooking mingles with the myrtles, And trails the unkempt muse, even in her verses, In these—so sensitive—amorous games, How many tears fall in the rabbit stew, How love partakes of onions! Illusion, followed soon by sour regret! Ah, Poesy, where will you hide your crown, Tomorrow, when Expedi- ence puts on sale The lover’s portrait (and the rabbit-skin?).” People of Paris, from Le Diable à Paris, 1845-1846.
Notes
1 This was one of four ordinances of repression. The other three were: the dissolution of the Chamber recently elected; restriction of the franchise to the wealthiest 25 percent of the existing electorate; convocation of the electoral colleges to choose a new chamber. See Alfred Cobban, A History of Modern France, Vol. 2, 1799-1871, London 1961; Penguin edition 1973, p. 90.
2 In December 1831, the right of hereditary peers to sit in the assembly was suspended: the upper chamber was to consist instead of the nominees for the "bourgeois king." The propertied class, which still held the majority of seats, had successfully ousted the legitimist and clericalist regime and, on the other hand, prevented Republicans from acceding to power. The government of France was now "a bureaucracy and plutocracy." Louis-Philippe "stood between France and a Republic." (Cobban, op. cit., pp. 97-98.)
4 After Le Charivari was well established, Charles Philipon founded and edited other publications in which caricature and illustration played a major role: Musée Philipon; Journal pour rire which became Journal amusant; Petit journal pour rire. Modes parisiennes. Toilettes de Paris: Musée français, revue des peintres, which illustrated painting exhibited at the Salon; and Revue pittoresque, which illustrated popular contemporary novels. He also published Paris au daguerréotype in 1840.

Other newspapers with caricatures and illustrations were the short-lived Le Boulevard, 1848-1850, edited by the caricaturist and photographer Carjat, Le Monde illustré. L'Illustration, L'Univers illustré, and Le Journal illustré.

Caricature newspapers and publications continued to proliferate between 1860 and 1890 but they are beyond the purview of this article. (See Philippe Robert-Jones, "La Presse satirique entre 1860-1890," Etude de Presse, Vol. 8, 1956, pp. 5-113.)
8 Nadar, Le Journal amusant and Le Charivari, February 2, 1862.
9 "Le Dedans juge par le dehors," excerpted in Audebrand, op. cit., pp. 239-246. There appears to be no official publication of this essay and it is not clear whether Philipon actually distributed it among his staff and friends. I have found no other mention of the essay.
10 Ibid., p. 242.
11 Ibid., pp. 244-246.
14 La Caricature, November 14, 1831.
15 Sébastien-Benôit Peytel, Physiologie de la poire. Paris 1832, Ch. IV.
16 Le Charivari, September 16, 1835.
17 Le Charivari, November 8, 1835.
19 Lithography, invented by Aloys Senefelder, a Bavarian playwright, in 1798 was as widely used as engraving in Paris by 1819. This more immediate graphic process—the artist could draw directly on the lithography stone rather than giving his drawing to a professional engraver—allowed for greater speed of execution and publication. Significant to the popularization of caricature was the increasing mechanization of the printing press, imported from England at the end of the 1820s, doubling the number of exemplars that could be produced hourly, and halving the cost. The newspaper industry expanded while reducing its costs. In 1833 there were twelve presses for producing newspapers on a large scale. The papers of Emile de Girardin, the nineteenth-century newspaper magnate, lowered their subscription rate in 1835 from 80 to 40 francs and circulation rose rapidly. (See Albert George, The Development of French Romanticism, Syracuse University Press 1955, pp. 19-20). Thus, the technology for mass literature and illustration existed by 1830.

Before 1830, newspapers had been essentially limited to a wealthy upper-class readership. In 1824 papers had been available by subscription at 80 francs a year, the equivalent of one-tenth of a worker's annual wages. A total of between 50,000 and 61,000 copies of French newspapers were sold daily in 1830. In the first three months of 1831 the readership rose to 77,500, and by the next month to 81,490. By 1832, the number of newspapers sold in France jumped by 50 percent. And the figures continued to increase. Between the July Revolution and 1835, six million copies of newspapers, broadsheets, and circulars were distributed by 1,500 hawkers (see Irene Collins, The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1881, Oxford 1959, p. 80). The principal political dailies in Paris doubled circulation from 73,000 to 148,000 between 1836 and 1845. By 1858, 235,000 newspapers were sold daily in Paris (Bechtel, op. cit.).
But still newspapers reached a limited audience. In 1858 the Paris population measured approximately one and a half million. And only a small minority of the overall Parisian readership subscribed to the caricature newspapers. In 1846, while Le Sène, a major liberal paper, sold 32,885 copies in daily sales and 21,500 outside the city, Le Charivari sold 2,740 copies daily in the city, and 1,705 subscriptions outside the city. (See Histoire générale de la presse française, II, Paris 1969, p. 146, published under the direction of C. Bellanger, J. Godetot, P. Ouriard, and F. Terrou.) Commercial literary success was measured on a lower scale than now. In the first half of the nineteenth century, the sale of 2,500 copies of a popular novel of Hugo or Paul de Kock was considered exceptionally high. (Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, II, Oxford 1973, p. 368.)

The audience for caricature was also expanding. There was a constant growth in the number of caricatural publications, newspapers, journals, albums, and series of prints. There was no systematic accounting of the papers’ readership. Nor is there any “scientific” way to measure their impact and influence. Still, we can glean from contemporary comments and illustrations at least a partial view of their constituency (Zeldin, op. cit., II, p. 1126). La Caricature and described that “the press had addressed young people.” Baudelaire described Daumier’s readership as “honest bourgeois, business man, young and fine lady.” Daumier depicted bourgeois men reading Le Charivari. People often read papers in cafés or public reading rooms. Founded during the Restoration, these quot;Cabines de lecture quot; reached their peak around 1844, when there were 215 of them. They subsequently dwindled as a result of the availability of pirated cheap editions published in Belgium. Most of the clientele in these public reading rooms were bourgeois and young people—the reading rooms were primarily located in bourgeois neighborhoods. (See Oudale Pichois, “Les Cabines de lecture a Paris, durant la première moitié du XIXe siècle,” Annales, 1959, pp. 521-534.)

There is some evidence that the caricatures in Le Charivari reached a wider audience. An article on Le Charivari published in London in 1838 observed that in contrast to London, in Paris “even very poor families have prints of all kinds...gay caricatures of Gravelle (sic), of Monnier—military pieces of Raftet, Charlet Vernet.” Presumably these were clipped from the newspapers. Crowds are described gathered outside the window of the Maison Aubert where the day’s caricatures were posted. Daumier and others depicted such scenes as well. Contributing to the audience for Republican caricatures was the growing number of people with some literacy and education. Between 1840 and 1870 the number of secondary school graduates doubled and this at a time when there was little suitable employment (Zeldin, op. cit., II, p. 126). These newly educated, unemployed, and dissatisfied people joined the Republican party and were undoubtedly sympathetic to the views of the Republican newspapers and caricaturists, particularly Daumier.

However, illiteracy rates were still high. Despite the new education laws that had been passed in 1833, in 1866 35 percent of the population of France could not read (Zeldin, op. cit., II, pp. 542-543). Caricature, as seen in the papers in the café, may have been a means of getting a visual report and editorial on the day’s political and social activities (as photojournalism and television provide in the twentieth century).

20 For a general illustrated history of prints and their public see Ralph Shikes, The Indignant Eye: The Artist as Social Critic (Boston 1969), and Hyatt Mayor, Prints and People, New York 1971.

21 L. L. Boilly, Grinaces, 92 lithographs 1823-1828, reissued by the Maison Aubert in 1837 as Groupes physionomiques connus sous le nom de grinaces par Boilly. 200-300 exemplars of first edition, up to 1,000 on a few. Also issued in more limited editions in London.


23 The censorship laws were published in La Caricature, August 27, 1835. See also Bechtel, op. cit., pp. 39-40.

24 The assassination attempt was made by a Corsican, Fieschi, assisted by two members of the Leftist Society for the Rights of Man.

25 Quoted in Oliver Larkin, Daumier, Man of His Time, Boston 1966, p. 29.


28 The dates indicate their primary period. See the entry on Mayeux, Le Grand Dictionnaire du XIXe siècle, Larousse, Paris 1874; and Felix Meurié, Les Mayeux Essais iconographique et bibliographique, 1830-1850, Paris n.d.


30 Jules Janin, Histoire de la littérature dramatique, I, p. 95, observed: “The prints, the songs on the passions, loves and angers of Mayeux one can’t count. He gave his name to clothes, handkerchiefs, hats, stores, vaudevilles. One sports hats a la Mayeux.”

31 Champfleury, op. cit., pp. 206-210, reports that a number of journals were published using Mayeux; for example, Du nouveau...Attention, nom de...! Mayeux, 1830-1832, a monthly journal. Aware of his popularity, Mayeux published his collective work as a monument to himself. Oeuvres de feu M. Mayeux, de son vivant chasseur de la garde nationale parisiennes. Membre de sept académies, aspirant à l’ordre royal de la légion d’honneur, et l’un des braves des trois journées. Episode de l’histoire de France, Paris 1832.

32 When he did not achieve the power he sought, he joined the cause of democracy, publishing Mayeux à la société des droits de l’homme (1833), where he uttered his famous adage: “A chaque crime, éleveons un poteau, nom de D.” (For every crime we shall raise a scaffold... cited in Champfleury, op. cit., p. 205.) He memorialized the cholera epidemic in verse and prose: La France, M. Mayeux et le choléra (1833). Mayeux returned briefly with the 1848 Revolution; he published six issues, Mayeux, journal politique, and a reactionary brochure, Voyage de M. Mayeux in Icarie, ses aventures curieuses dans le pays de M. Cabet. In 1851 he made a final appearance. Mayeux l’indépendant, homme politique, etc. appellant les hommes du jour par leur nom. Suivi d’une revue critique sur diverses positions de sa vie et quelques pages sur l’événement du 2 décembre, Paris 1851.

33 Champfleury, op. cit., p. 205.

34 Ibid.


36 Ibid., p. 390.


38 Ibid., p. 289.


40 Osiakowski, op. cit., p. 389.

41 Ibid., p. 389. Karl Marx, Class Struggles in France 1848-1850, New York, 1932, p. 36.


45 Politics had simmered down between 1836 and 1848; but in that year attacks on government corruption increased in the liberal papers, which called on the people of Paris to take up the struggle. In February 1848 Paris revolted and, with the aid of the National Guard, toppled the monarchy. A split had occurred between the supporters of Louis-Philippe, the Bourbon monarchist, and the Republicans. Louis-Philippe abdicated; the new Republican government, which emerged from the meeting of the National Assembly, proclaimed universal male suffrage. The voting population increased from a quarter of a million to nine million, and laid the foundation for the subsequent Bonapartist dictatorship. Cobban, op. cit., p. 319.
Workers were dismissed from factories and craftsmen were unemployed. There was little government assistance, credit, or charity.

Ledru-Rollin, Minister of the Interior, who was responsible for the election of the Constituent Assembly, realized that if the vote was held, with universal suffrage, the illiterate peasants were likely to follow the lead of the clergy and the landowners.

Louis-Napoleon had the Orleans family banished from France and encouraged a plebiscite in support of the revival of the empire.

Philippe Robert-Jones observed that Ratapoli's physiognomy is grafted onto the God Mars in Daumier lithographs of 1867 and 1869. See *Étude de quelques types physionomiques dans l'oeuvre lithographique de Daumier*, doctoral dissertation, Brussels 1949-1950.


Jules Michelet (1798-1874), letter to Daumier, March 30, 1851. Published in *Daumier, raconté par lui-même et par ses amis*, Paris 1945, p. 87.


*Le Charivari*, October 4, 1835.

*Le Charivari*, October 16, 1835.


Traviès was born in Switzerland of working-class origins and came to Paris before the end of the 1820s. Little has been written about him apart from the brief sections in Baudelaire, op. cit., in Grand-Carteret, *Les Moeurs et la caricature en France*, Paris 1888, and in Champfleury, *Histoire de la caricature moderne*, Paris 1865. Still less has been reproduced. Albums of his work are available at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Cabinet des Estampes.

Champfleury, op. cit., p. 231.

Grandville was his grandparents' stage name. Grandville came to Paris in 1825 to study miniature painting after apprenticing to his father. For a major reproduction of his work see *Grandville: Das gesamte Werk*, 2 vols., Munich 1969.


The Goncourt report that the Republicans of 1848 thought Gavarni's work aristocratic and conservative, maintaining that he had a pernicious effect on the masses. He was dubbed "a corrupter of the people." *Goncourt*, op. cit., p. 217.

Ibid., p. 314.

Ibid., p. 315.

Ibid., p. 354.


Frederick Lamartine, who played Macaire in *L'Auberge des adrets*, also acted in a social drama, *Le Chiffonnier* (The Ragpicker), in 1847 and was regarded as influencing the Revolution of 1848.


Goncourt, op. cit., p. 358.