Agnieszka Rosales Rodríguez

# Nicolas de Largillierre's *Portrait of a Lady with a Dog and a Monkey* and the Rococo Gender Game

*La peinture n'est qu'un fard.*
ROGER DE PILES

In literature of the past few years, much attention has been devoted to the feminine character of Rococo and the issue of gender in paintings from the period.[1] Gender categories have proven useful in the analysis of the era's style, manner, painterly expression and "touch" of the brush, especially in contrast to the austere and intellectual "manly" art of that generation shaped by the classical aesthetic ideals of Jacques-Louis David.[2] Mary D. Sheriff studied the interrelationship of nature and sex in the painting of Jean-Honoré Fragonard, in doing so referencing the metaphor of the "erotics of the brush."[3] Melissa Hyde, meanwhile, put forth a brilliant analysis of the ties between culture and gender policies using the example of François Boucher[4] as she identifies a link between the 18th century's dominant genre of portraiture (whose aim was to beguile) and the essence of femininity. The feminine aspect of the period's culture was in fact addressed by critics of the Louis XV period and in French historiography of the 19th century. The art history lexicon soon adopted terms like *le beau fard* – meaning 'makeup' – to describe painting, alluding to the female practice of beautification and to grace, coquettishness, and the seductive beauty of colour. "There are too many pinched little faces, too much mannerism and affectation for an austere art. He can show them to me unadorned if he likes, I still see the rouge, the beauty spots, the pompons, and all the frippery of the toilette," writes Denis Diderot mockingly of the canvases of Boucher.[5] In the following century, criticising the mannered taste of the *ancien régime*, Victor Hugo reached for terminology borrowed from the female wardrobe: pannier, bow, frill, pompon.[6] Fragonard, meanwhile, as a Rococo painter of

[1] Jennifer D. Milam, Melissa Hyde, *Women, Art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Aldershot, 2016). Women and Gender in the Early Modern World (contains an extensive bibliography on the subject).

[2] Whitney Chadwick, *Women, Art and Society* (London, 1990), pp. 22–23.

[3] Mary D. Sheriff, *Fragonard. Art and Eroticism* (Chicago, 1997), p. 113.

[4] Melissa Hyde, *Making up the rococo. François Boucher and his critics* (Los Angeles, 2006), p. 83.

[5] As cited in: Hyde, *Making up the rococo...*, op. cit., p. 72.

[6] Victor Hugo, introduction to *Cromwell* (1827), as cited in: Ken Ireland, *Cythera Regained? The Rococo Revival in European Literature and Arts, 1830–1910* (Madison, 2006), p. 93.

flirtation, dubbed "the cherub of erotic painting,"[7] sacrificed fame for pleasure.[8] Eighteenth-century painting, likened to a courtesan in search of delight,[9] was ascribed stereotypical female traits: sweetness, sensuality, lightness, capriciousness, frivolity and affectation. The brothers Edmond and Jules de Goncourt – heralding the 18th century as the age of the woman, and appointing Madame de Pompadour[10] as its symbolic godmother – argued in their writings that the aesthetic flavour of that period was determined by the influential women of the day. Their patronage also nourished the artistic development of Boucher, a favourite of the king's most famous mistress. Earlier, in his pamphlet *Sentimens sur quelques ouvrages de peinture, sculpture et gravure, écrits à un particulier en province* (1754), Étienne La Font de Saint-Yenne called Boucher a painter of "lipsticked" paintings, seeing in him an example of the effeminate taste which turns great painters into marionettes.[11] Condemned in the name of morality, Boucher's "seductive makeup" and indecent nudity appealed to no-one but libertines, according to the critic.[12] Still in the early 19th century, Pierre-Marie Gault de Saint-Germain (1808) wrote that the corrupt artist painted to bewitch the eyes of the wicked.[13]

Nicolas de Largillierre, however, is much less easily written into the network of gender-based notions because the category of sex did not play a part in the criticism of his output. Neither was this painter a target of attacks by defenders of classic tastes, unlike Boucher, who was accused of amorality but went on to personify the ideals of late Rococo. In fact, Largillierre is nowhere to be found in the pantheon of the "French age" that is the Goncourt brothers' collection of writings (*L'art du dix-huitième siècle*, 1859–75[14]), which cemented the 19th-century canon of masters of the Louis XV period. Largillierre actually belonged to an earlier generation of artists, born and educated still during the reign of the Sun King and the "dictatorship" of Charles Le Brun at the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture. Before his artistic career took off in Paris near the end of the 17th century, he received his education in Antwerp and London, which explains his predilection for the Flemish masters, Van Dyck and Rubens in particular. That is also where he became acquainted with Baroque painting conventions. His work, nevertheless, exhibits early markings of the Rococo style, or rather

[7] Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Sztuka XVIII wieku*, compiled, translated and with introduction and commentary by Joanna Guze (Warsaw, 1981), p. 163.

[8] Alexandre Lenoir, "Fragonard" in *Biographie universelle, ancienne et moderne...*, vol. 15 (Paris, 1816), p. 420. As cited in: *Fragonard amoureux. Galant et libertin*, Guillaume Farroult, ed., exh. cat., Musée du Luxembourg, Paris 2015–16 (Paris, 2015), p. 22.

[9] Charles Blanc, *Histoire des peintres français au dix-neuvième siècle*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1945), p. 33.

[10] Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, *Les maîtresses de Louis XV*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1860), p. 110.

[11] Penelope Hunter-Stiebel, "French Painting in the Age of Madame de Pompadour" in La Volupté du goût. *French Painting in the Age of Madame de Pompadour*, exh. cat., Musée des Beaux-Arts, Tours; Portland Art Museum, 2008–9 (Tours, 2008), p. 21.

[12] Étienne La Font de Saint-Yenne, *Sentimens sur quelques ouvrages de peinture, sculpture et gravure, écrits à un particulier en province* [1753] – as cited in: *La Font de Sainte-Yenne. Œuvre critique*, Étienne Jollet, ed. (Paris, 2001), pp. 286–89.

[13] Pierre-Marie Gault de Saint-Germain, *Les trois siècles de la peinture en France ou Galerie des peintres français depuis François Ier jusqu'au regne de Napoléon empereur et roi* (Paris, 1808), p. 224.

[14] Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, *L'Art du dix-huitième siècle et autres texts sur l'art*, textes réunis et présentés par Jean-Paul Bouillon (Paris, 1967).

the evolution of Baroque portraiture into Rococo,[15] as evidenced by the sensual treatment of colour, graceful manner, intimate atmosphere, and elaborate game with the viewer, who seeks in the painting not forthright didacticism and hieratic grandiosity but rather visual pleasure. It was the very category of pleasure (*plaisir*) that defined the Rococo period (with which the terms *goût pittoresque* and *goût de mode* came to be synonymous) as a style and an expression of the aristocratic *honnêteté* culture blossoming in the Régence period and during the reign of Louis XV. Largillierre is known above all for his contribution to the ennoblement of lowly genres like portraiture and still life.[16]

In the early years of the 18th century, with the influx of paintings from the North, a new iconography developed in France under the influence of 17th-century Netherlandish realism. No less influential to the growth of the French artist were the technical achievements and illusionistic effects of Flemish and Dutch painters, highly admired by Parisian art amateurs and collectors at that time.

Largillierre's virtuosity and technical bravado were meant to please the viewer's eye. Well documented in the advance of this new sensual orientation in the art of this period is the impact of Roger de Piles,[17] the father of early modern colour theory. An author of numerous treatises[18] and a prominent participant in the famous debate at the academy between supporters of Rubens and Poussin on the hierarchy of artistic means, the French historiographer and collector argued that colour was the constitutive component of a painting. Being a lover of Rembrandt and of the Venetian and Flemish schools, De Piles elucidated a conception of painting as the art of deceiving the eye – "la peinture est de séduire nos yeux et de nous surprendre."[19] The observation that sensual delectation was replacing the classicists' emphasis on intellectual satisfaction and instruction had already been made in *Conversations sur la connaissance de la peinture et sur le judgement qu'on doit faire des tableaux* (Paris, 1677). Hence, at the turn of the 18th century, French art began to witness the consequences of this new "coloristic" attitude in the art of Charles de la Fosse, Noël Nicolas Coypel, Nicolas de Largillierre and Antoine Watteau. With these changes there emerged a new kind of viewer, a *dilettante*, differently-inclined to taking in a work of art, whose impact now rested in suggestion and allusion.[20] Defending the primacy of colour and the idea of imitating nature, De Piles likewise postulated that a painting ought to move the viewer, to amuse and surprise.[21] Such thinking opened the door to a slight loosening of the academic doctrine, a softening of the genre hierarchy, and ushered in the practice of playing with the viewer as a way of imparting meaning.[22] Obviously, all of this concerns the

[15] Pierre Rosenberg, "Avant-propos" in *Largillierre. Portraitiste du dix-huitieme siècle*, Myra Nan Rosenfeld, ed., exh. cat., Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal, 1981 (Montréal, 1981), p. 27.

[16] Krystyna Secomska, *Spór o starożytność* (Warsaw, 1991), p. 284.

[17] Roussina Roussinova, *The Art of Pleasing the Eye: Portraits by Nicolas de Largillierre and Spectatorship with Taste for Colour in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Stockholm, 2015).

[18] *Dialogue sur le coloris*, 1673; *Conversations sur la connaissance de la peinture*, 1677; *Description du cabinet de M. le duc de Richelieu*, 1681–83.

[19] De Piles, *Cours de peinture...*, op. cit., p. 358. ['Painting is to seduce our eyes and to surprise us.']

[20] Thomas Crow, "The Critique of Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Art," *Art Criticism*, no. 3 (1987), p. 20.

[21] Roger de Piles, *Abrégé de la vie des peintres, avec des reflexions sur leurs ouvrages, et un Traité du peintre parfait ; De la connoissance des desseins ; De l'utilité des estampes* (Paris, 1715), p. 27. As cited in: <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb30457153n> [retrieved: 3 March 2018].

[22] See Jennifer Milam, *Fragonard's playful paintings: Visual games in Rococo Art* (Manchester–New York, 2006).

elite circle of *gens du monde*, art lovers capable of appreciating not only the multiple layers of meaning encoded in the mythological-allegorical themes but also pure artistic subtlety. The growing numbers of art connoisseurs meant a greater degree of general appreciation for the non-discursive values of painting, like nuances of light and shadow, tonal gradation and the effect of vibrant, lively paint layers.

Where, then, in this narrative on seduction does Nicolas de Largillierre's *Portrait of a Lady with a Dog and a Monkey* (**fig. 1**) from the National Museum in Warsaw fit in?[23] Since Rococo came to be synonymous with delight and consumption, eroticism and frolic, in stark contrast to Baroque transcendence,[24] what role does the "game" of gender play in the reception of this painting? To this day, no-one has been able to identify the sitter in Largillierre's brilliant portrait (there is no existing print version of the painting) accepted into the pantheon of "art more valuable than gold," as was the title of an exhibition of the National Museum in Warsaw's masterpieces in 1998;[25] the piece also represented French painting in a 2009 exhibition that was the largest ever presentation of 18th-century art from Polish collections.[26] Interestingly, Largillierre's painting also lent its title to an original exhibition at Warsaw's Królikarnia (*Ladies with a Dog & Monkey*, 2011), becoming a calling card of the 18th century's "culture of gender," of the world of pleasure, capriciousness, fantasy and masquerade, all of it, however, catering to the male need for voyeurism and domination. In Agata Araszkiewicz's essay accompanying the exhibition, titled "Orgy and Freedom," Largillierre's canvas opens the reflection on Rococo as a model of "vanity" and "pure pleasure."[27] The picture of the lady with her dog and monkey is presented in the context of the sex clichés formulated by the Marquis de Sade as an example of objectification and alienation, as expressed in the metaphor of a "lady representing vapidity." However, the anathematised Marquis de Sade wrote his *Philosophy in the Boudoir* (1795) in utterly different historical circumstances, after the bloody revolution that marked the end of the 18th century's "culture of appearances." That perverse handbook on sexual education was a dystopia of a life exploited, steeped in dark irony and flippant libertinism. Exposing the violence and cruelty of sexual relations, the compulsive debauchery described by De Sade led, after all, not to sexual pleasure but to torment. The painting at the National Museum in Warsaw can thus be recognized as a subtle overture to Rococo's "liberation of eroticism" rather than a foreshadowing of the sadistic practices born out of the French writer's imagination.

Largillierre depicts the attractive young woman in an outdoor setting, in line with his personally-devised convention of "naturalness." She sits directly on the ground, against a background of dense vegetation in a dark landscape (treated rather hastily) offering a contrasting scrim for the subject, brightly illuminated with artificial light. Recognisable in the mysterious

[23] Inv. no. M.Ob.686 MNW, oil on canvas, 135 × 106 cm.

[24] Jean Weisgerber, *Les masques fragiles. Esthétique et forms de la littérature rococo* (Lausanne, 1991), p. 211 and Jean Weisgerber, "Qu'est que le rococo ? Essai de definition comparatiste" in *Études sur le XVIII^e siècle*, vol. 18, *Rocaille. Rococo*, Roland Mortier, Hervé Hasquin, eds (Brussels, 1991), p. 20. Groupe d'étude du XVIII^e siècle.

[25] *Sztuka cenniejsza niż złoto. Obrazy, rysunki i ryciny dawnych mistrzów europejskich ze zbiorów polskich*, Anna Kozak, Antoni Ziemba, eds, exh. cat., The National Museum in Warsaw, 1999 (Warsaw, 1999), pp. 256-57, cat. no. 93 [Maciej Monkiewicz].

[26] *Le siècle français, Francuskie malarstwo i rysunek XVIII w. ze zbiorów polskich*, Iwona Danielewicz, ed., exh. cat., The National Museum in Warsaw, 2009 (Warsaw, 2009), pp. 275-76, cat. no. 60 [Ewa Manikowska].

[27] Agata Araszkiewicz, *Orgia i wolność*, <archiwum-obieg.u-jazdowski.pl/obiegtv/22133> [retrieved: 27 December 2016]. See also ead. et al., *Ladies with a Dog & Monkey*, exh. cat. The Xawery Dunikowski Museum of Sculpture at the Królikarnia Palace, 2011, (Warsaw, 2011), pp. 49–81.

foliage are a rose shrub and a morning glory vine snaking at the woman's feet. In one hand the lady clutches a small dog which is clearly excited at the sight of the capuchin monkey emerging out of the thicket. The dog looks eager to pounce; he opens his mouth, exposing his teeth, and flattens his ears. These living "props," traces of Flemish inclinations in the work of this animal lover and still life painter, enliven the scene, building a sense of spontaneity and injecting action into the carefully arranged portrait. According to Emmanuel Coquery, toward the end of the 17th century the paintings of François de Troy, Hyacinthe Rigaud and Nicolas de Largillierre exhibited a fusion of portrait approaches: the idealised court portrait, flaunting opulence and splendour, coupled with realism, intent on detailed representation and expressiveness.[28] Antoine-Joseph Dézalier d'Argenville, in a supplement to *Abrégée de la vie des plus fameux peintres* from 1752, in which he included a biography of Largillierre, noted the artist's astonishing realism, calling him the "Van Dyck of France."[29] His portraits do not lack elegance or decorative flair, but there is also a sense of ease and a virtuoso use of colour. The illusion of materials and textures is evidence of the artist's technical mastery, and an embodiment of the concept of a painting as a living scene, captivating the viewer's attention. The textiles painted in oily vibrating blots with visible brush strokes contrast strongly with the carefully modelled face of the sitter.

Largillierre arrived at this type of intimate yet casual portrait early in the century. The dating of the work to the beginning of the second decade of the 18th century is supported by the painting's similarity to other portraits made by the artist around this time, such as the *Portrait of a Lady as Astrea* from around 1710–12 (Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal, **fig. 2**), which most likely depicts Lady Mary Josephine Drummond, Countess of Castelblanco,[30] who died in 1712. The countess was also painted by Largillierre's student, Jean-Baptiste Oudry (Prado, Madrid) in 1716.[31] Though the woman in the Warsaw painting may be likened to her counterpart in the Montreal work by their similar physiognomy, clothing and hairstyles, the resemblance may in fact only be due to the fashion of the day and the artist's convention of idealising his sitters.

While Largillierre did not only paint women, it was in women's portraits that the idealisation was most pronounced, which Roger de Piles attributed to female vanity.[32] After all, the correspondence between a painted canvas and social ideals or conventions was not a direct one, as writes Mary D. Sheriff: that which is made to seem obvious by the subject can be "turned upside-down" by the painting's formal structure or its subtexts.[33] And so, the portrait becomes a field for the manifestation of not only social status, prevailing tastes and fashions but of a(n) (elite) standard of a woman – the *femme de qualité*. In Largillierre's oeuvre, ladies are shown in the costumes of Flora, Diana, Pomona and Astrea. We know that the artist had a repertoire of allegorical figures that he proposed to his clients, yet, breaking with the tendency of the

[28] Emmanuel Coquery, "Le portrait français de 1660 à 1715" in *Visages du Grand Siècle : le portrait français sous le règne de Louis XIV (1660–1715)*, exh. cat., Musée des Augustins, Toulouse; Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nantes, 1997–98 (Paris, 1997–1998), pp. 50–64.

[29] Antoine-Nicolas Dezallier d'Argenville, *L'abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres avec leur portraits gravés en taille-douce*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1752), p. 246.

[30] This relationship was underscored in earlier literature – see entry for Maciej Monkiewicz in *Sztuka cenniejsza...*, op. cit., pp. 256–57.

[31] See *Largillierre. Portraitiste du dix-huitieme siècle*, Myra Nan Rosenfeld, ed., exh. cat., Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal, 1981 (Montréal, 1981), cat. no. 66.

[32] De Piles, *Cours de peinture...*, op. cit., as cited in: Rosenfeld, op. cit., p. 178.

[33] Mary D. Sheriff, "Fragonard's Erotic Mothers and the Politics of Reproduction" in *Eroticism and the Body Politic*, Lynn Hunt, ed. (Baltimore and London, 1991), p. 14.

17th century, the resulting likenesses eschewed austere didacticism in favour of the intimate atmosphere characteristic of Rococo.[34] Mythological templates like: the shepherdess Astrea from Honoré d'Urfé's pastoral romance (1606–27), a symbol of platonic love; the goddess Diana, the personification of purity; the nymph Pomona, who resisted the advances of Satyr – ought to be interpreted in the context of the courtly love shaped by Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and by erotic *poésie galante*. In the visual arts, the spiritual ideal of beautiful love is, however, often only a pretext for portraying sensual beauty and the charms of the material world. Purity, youth, the life-giving spring – these are *travesti galant*, disguises by way of which the sitter theatricises the accepted conventions of the amorous idiom.

To paraphrase Judith Butler, gender is a way of stylising the body, a set of repeated acts which over time come to be regarded as natural.[35] Yet, the sitter in the painting in question here does not wear a mythological costume and it is only the landscape that discreetly alludes to a pastoral atmosphere, with the erotic subtexts being suggested here mainly by the dog and the monkey. Dogs, in fact, appear particularly often in Largillierre's work, usually as household pets or hunting companions. Shown with a small dog, for example, is the so-called *Beautiful Woman from Strasbourg* (1703, Musée des Beax-Arts, Strasbourg), dressed in a fanciful costume. Dogs were a regular feature of women's portraits because the animal was traditionally understood as a symbol of marital fidelity and purity. The presence of the canine motif in the painting from the NMW has also been interpreted as an allusion to virtue because the dog seems to be protecting its owner from the monkey – the "embodiment of sin."[36] The domesticated dog and the "wild" monkey may also represent opposing forces, civilisation versus nature, the realm of moral integrity on the one hand and unbridled passion on the other.[37] As already pointed out by Ewa Manikowska, above all else, both species are the attributes of luxury, underscoring the woman's privileged social status. Yet, in order to abstain from an overly moralistic tone, the artist shows the tame, domesticated pet as being the more animated of the two, almost aggressive: he is agitated by the sight of the monkey, tensing his body in readiness to leap while in the safety of the woman's grasp. The monkey, meanwhile, has the air of an "uncanny creature", part diabolical and part bewildered; it wants to engage the woman, teasing or provoking her. It is worth noting that the technique of composing directional tension through motion, gestures and an interplay of glances was used by Largillierre in many of his canvases, like, for instance, his *Decorative Composition* (c. 1715, Louvre, Paris), in which a cat snarls at a parrot, in the *Portrait of Mademoiselle de La Fayette* (1697, Marquis de Lastic collection, Château de Parentignat), where a pug on the right is counterpointed by an elegant hound on the left, and in the *Portrait of a Young Prince* (c. 1712, The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu), in which a dog barks at a bird.

The theatrisation of portraits, usually outfitted with a suitable array of attributes, was a common means of ennobling this painting genre, resulting in works that were allegorical or historical portraits. According to Giovanni Pietro Bellori, an elevated status was also

[34] Rosenfeld, op. cit., p. 216.

[35] "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being." Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York, London, 1990), p. 33

[36] Monkiewicz, op. cit., pp. 256–57.

[37] Manikowska, op. cit., pp. 274–75.

achieved by depicting the sitter in action.[38] After all, activity and the sense of an episode unfolding over time stimulates the viewer's interest. In the eyes of the period's theory on the reception of art, the non-discursive element – compositional dynamics, narrative invention, piquing the viewer's interest, in the opinion of l'Abbé Du Bos achieved by painterly illusion, *charmes de l'exécution* – was no less important than the allegorical message, irrespective of the painting's subject.[39] As Mary D. Sheriff shows using the example of Fragonard's *Seasons*, interpreted as stages of love,[40] a painting may be comprehended on several semantic levels to discover substitutes for sexual content illegible to innocent eyes. Even acknowledging the obviousness of the monkey as a symbol of wantonness and shamelessness, in the portrait by Largillierre this motif may be interpreted as a pretext for an irreverent game with the viewer and not a serious ethical admonition. The lady with a sweet and innocent face reveals her charm and sexual allure, suggested by the smoothness of her skin, her delicate neckline, rosy lips, the fresh roses, the suppleness of her fabrics and hair, and her casual pose, in which her body rests on the ground and appears to be becoming one with nature. The sitter, appearing to be caught in a fleeting moment, is basking in private delight amidst an aroma of flowers in a picturesque wild garden. If she opens herself to the temptations (embodied by the monkey) courting the fairer sex, then she herself becomes a temptation, an erotic promise. Haptically, the softly painted picture also contains the act of touching – in the dog being petted and the monkey reaching out to the woman. As the portrait becomes a spectacle unfolding in front of the viewer's eyes, it eludes being boxed into a clear moral dilemma (like the choice faced by Hercules at the crossroads) between virtue and vice, purity and indulgence. The scene's ambiguity may be viewed as a very Rococo strategy of representing gender as a "stylisation" and as a manifestation of the period's understanding of what a painting is – a game, caprice, a plaything. It must be remembered that the monkey is not only a symbol of foolishness and lust, as in the Christian interpretation, but also of the senses in general. It alludes to human vice while also being an embodiment of ease, freedom and play.[41] It belongs to the natural world as much as to the realm of art, as a charming, striking, comical and exotic element bringing to mind the tradition of drolleries and the Rococo fashion for fantastic singeries, as found, for example, in Christophe Huet's 1735 wall decorations for the Château de Chantilly or François Boucher's design drawing for a screen – *Rocaille* (*Nouveaux morceaux pour des paravants*, 1737, etching by Claude-Augustin Duflos, **fig. 3**).

The curious, playful capuchin in the portrait from the National Museum in Warsaw is perhaps not so much a signifier of moral dangers as a foreshadowing of the licentiousness of curiosity , to use the apt metaphor coined by the De Goncourt brothers as a description of 18th-century culture.[42] If we are to accept the scholarly conclusion that Rococo masked a "meta-

[38] Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *Le vite' de pittori, scultori et architetti*, as cited in: *Nicolas de Largillierre*, exh. cat., Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris, 2003–4 (Paris, 2003), p. 36.

[39] Abbé de Bos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1740), p. 68. As cited in: <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb30360217d> [retrieved: 3 March 2018].

[40] Sheriff, *Fragonard*..., op. cit., pp. 107–11.

[41] Ptolemy Tompkins, *Monkey in Art* (New York, 1994), p. 38.

[42] Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Dziennik. Pamiętniki z życia literackiego*, compiled and translated by Joanna Guze (Warsaw, 1988), p. 116 [1860].

physical void"[43] with grotesque, elegance and eroticism, then the *Portrait of a Lady with a Dog and a Monkey* can be deemed an example of flirtation with the viewer: it amuses and surprises with is iconographic concept, stimulating the senses with its harmonious appeal and with the beauty of the young woman it depicts.

Translated by Szymon Włoch

[43] Helmut Hatzfeld, "Rokoko als literaischer Epochenstil in Frankreich," *Studies in Philology*, vol. 35 (1938), pp. 532–65.