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ABSTRACT

One of the outstanding artists of the Art Nouveau period was the French jeweler René Lalique. Despite the designation of Lalique as "les plus représentatif de l'Art Nouveau" very little research has been done on him or the sources of his unusual jewelry. The dual purpose of this study is to establish a biography of Lalique and present a stylistic analysis of two of his sources: Classical and Japanese art. It is hoped that an analysis of the career and sources of this major figure will aid in producing a deeper understanding of the French Art Nouveau movement.

Biographical information on Lalique is found in Chapter I. Special attention is given to his participation in exhibitions between 1894 and 1900 and this discussion includes specific references to the works and the places he exhibited. Chapter II establishes Lalique's relationship to the two traditions of French nineteenth century jewelry design. Chapters III and IV are stylistic analyses of Lalique's use of Classical and Japanese art respectively. A general background of nineteenth century French interest in these two sources is provided within each chapter. Also included are suggestions as to how Lalique came into contact with each source. Examples of Lalique's work are analyzed for specific tendencies and comparative material is offered as supporting visual evidence.

Several findings resulted from this study of Lalique's biography and two of the sources he used. Events in Lalique's
life and dates of specific works demonstrate that he worked within both the conservative and the non-conservative traditions of French jewelry design. The dates of the jewelry examined in Chapters III and IV demonstrate that Lalique not only worked with Classical and Japanese motifs and styles at the same time but he often exhibited jewelry in these two styles in the same showcase. This could establish a conclusion that these were not successive stages of development in Lalique's style but rather an attempt on his part to meet the tastes of the public. The greater number of Japanese inspired works and the closer stylistic affinities between Lalique's work and his Japanese sources indicate that Japonisme was the stronger influence on Lalique between 1895 and 1908.

From these findings two other conclusions may be reached. Because he did work in both traditions of jewelry design and with two popular styles at the same time it can be noted that Lalique was attempting to maintain a foothold in two camps in relation to his career and reputation. This allowed him to have two separate, but equally large followings among connoisseurs and possible purchasers. The fact that he did pick two very popular styles in which to work indicates Lalique's ability to recognize popular tastes. The changes he made demonstrates his ability to translate them into a personal style. The combination of these conclusions results in the realization that René Lalique was not only a creative artist but also an astute businessman as well.
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INTRODUCTION

In the last decade of the nineteenth century there appeared an international movement in art now commonly known by the French designation L'Art Nouveau. Although the Art Nouveau style was identified by individual traits in each country, the movement was everywhere united by a desire to elevate the decorative arts to a level of importance equaling the fine arts. Because of this interest in the decorative arts it is not unusual to find that the leading Art Nouveau artists were often neither painters nor sculptors. An artist who is considered one of "les plus représentatifs de l'Art Nouveau" was the French jeweler René Lalique.¹ Today's scholars are not the first to recognize Lalique's importance in Art Nouveau, for his position was acknowledged by his contemporaries. In 1899, the well known art critic Roger Marx acclaimed Lalique as a leader in the renaissance of decorative arts.² Another critic, Léonce Bénédite, credited Lalique in 1900 with having created "...un art riche et varié, vivant et expressif, qui est vraiment un art nouveau et qui caractérisera heureusement notre génération dans cette manifestation spécial du beau."³

Further indications of Lalique's importance may be ascertained from the numerous articles and books devoted to his jewelry at the turn of the century. Art et Décoration contained an article in 1897 on Lalique's jewelry: "Orfèvrerie et Bijoux; Les Bijoux de M. Lalique..." by René Binet.⁴ This notice was followed by a series of illustrated articles dealing specifically with Lalique's work: "Les Bijoux aux
Salon de 1898" by Henri Vever, "Les Maitres Décorateurs Français René Lalique" by Roger Marx in 1899, "Rene Lalique" by Pol Neveux in 1900, "Les Bijoux de Lalique au Salon" by André Beaunier in 1902, and "Des Bijoux a Propos de M. René Lalique" by Gustave Geffroy in 1905. In America, the first article on Lalique was published in House Beautiful in 1900, an adaptation of Roger Marx's article of 1899 that included the same illustrations as in the original.5 Lalique's exhibit at the Agnew Gallery in London was reviewed and illustrated in International Studio in 1905.6

Two books have been published which specifically deal with Lalique and his creations. In 1912 John A. Laurvik's René Lalique, Master Craftsman was published in New York and in 1922 Gustave Geffroy's René Lalique was published in Paris. Also a large section of Henri Vever's La Bijouterie française au XIXe siècle was devoted to Lalique and his work. This three volume history of nineteenth century jewelry was published in France in 1908.

With the concept of unification in the arts the Art Nouveau movement has proven to be one of the most complex in the history of art. Its complexity resulted partially from its international scope and from the multitude of sources it utilized. These sources vary from country to country but generally include Classical Antiquity, Celtic art, the Middle Ages, eighteenth century Rococo, the Pre-Raphaelites, England's Arts and Crafts Movement, William Blake, the nineteenth century Symbolist Movement, Japanese art, and a revival of interest in nature.7
The importance of analyzing the sources of Art Nouveau may be ascertained by the amount of emphasis placed on "trends leading to Art Nouveau" in two major studies of this movement -- S. Tschudi Madsen's *The Sources of Art Nouveau* (1956) and Robert Schmutzler's *Art Nouveau* (1962). A hiatus exists in the scholarship on René Lalique for even the acknowledgements of Lalique's importance in the 1890s and early 1900s has not prompted an attempt to analyze the sources of his jewelry. The articles on Lalique in the 1890s do not provide much information on his sources for the major portion of each article was devoted to praising his work. Most of these articles discussed Lalique's Salon exhibits and as such they are filled with descriptions of the jewelry shown. While this is valuable in establishing the chronology of Lalique's work, it does not aid in determining the sources from which his style was developed. The two previously mentioned books on Lalique are little more than elaborations of earlier articles and do not add much new information.

The one source which does attempt to establish a biographical and stylistic development for Lalique is Henri Vever's *La Bijouterie française au XIXᵉ siècle* (1908). Written while Lalique was alive and implying Lalique's co-operation in furnishing information, it nevertheless presents problems to the student. These problems include a lack of documentation, many vague references to people and events like his account of Lalique's stay in England, and some discrepancies in the exhibition dates cited for particular jewelry.
Despite these problems Vever's book forms the firmest basis we have for a study of Lalique's work. In addition to writing a history of nineteenth century jewelry, Henri Vever was a practicing artist very active in new developments in late nineteenth century jewelry. He wrote reviews of the jewelry at the Salons, and as a jeweler and reviewer Vever was well acquainted with Lalique and his work. He considered Lalique's contribution so outstanding that in 1898 he devoted half of his nine page article "Les Bijoux aux Salons de 1898" to Lalique's exhibit. Vever's own work in the late nineteenth century attests to his knowledge of Lalique's work. Therefore, until the vague references made by Vever are clarified and documentation is provided by members of the Lalique family, Vever's biographical account will have to suffice as the only source of information on René Lalique's early life.

It should be obvious that the discrepancy which exists between the wide acknowledgement of Lalique's role in Art Nouveau and the knowledge of his sources and background should not be left unresolved. An understanding of the sources of the work of this major figure in Art Nouveau will aid in understanding part of the movement in France. It will also assist in putting the various sources in perspective according to their importance and thereby decrease the complexity of the movement for modern students of Art Nouveau.

This paper will attempt to establish a biographical and stylistic analysis of two of Lalique's sources -- Classical
and Japanese art. Although Lalique used many more sources, including Egyptian, Medieval, and Renaissance, the two selected sources probably represent both his most conservative and his most innovative works. A major aspect of this study will be to establish why Lalique used two such contrasting sources and styles. An emphasis will be developed to show how his use of these two sources is related to establishing a commercial basis for his career.
FOOTNOTES FOR INTRODUCTION


4 *Art et Décoration*, I. 1897, pp.68-71.


8 One exception to this is the work of Mrs. Dora Janson who has been interested in Lalique's jewelry for many years. She gave a paper entitled *The Jewelry of René Lalique: Sources of its Style* at the 1968 College Art Association. Mrs. Janson has been most helpful in my research on Lalique.

9 The implications that Lalique furnished information about his early career result from Vever's use of direct quotes attributed to Lalique. Examples may be found on pages 692, 693, 710 and 722 of volume III of Vever's book.

10 Vever's account of Lalique's stay in England is discussed on pages 10-12 of this paper. One discrepancy of dates relates to a comb decorated with a four petaled flower (a poppy) which Vever dates as 1901. This same comb was published in *The Artist* in September of 1898 as part of Lalique's Salon exhibit.

11 Henri Vever was the fourth jeweler in his family. The House of Vever was founded in 1821 by Pierre Vever. Henri's father, Ernest, took over after the grandfather's death and by 1830 Henri and his brother Paul were in charge of the family jewelry firm.
12 This review was published in *Art et Décoration*, III, 1898, pp.169-178.

13 Compare Vever's pendant in Figure 1 to Lalique's brooch in Figure 2.

14 Unless otherwise indicated by footnote reference the biographical information in this paper is taken from Henri Vever's *La Bijouterie française au XIXe siècle*, III, pp.690-780.
CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHY OF RENÉ LALIQUE

René Lalique was born in 1860 at Ay (Marne), France, the homeland of his mother. Soon after his birth the family took up residence in Paris where his father was a "commissionnaire en marchandises." At the age of six or seven school began for the young Lalique. He first attended the "collège Turgot" where his favorite subject was drawing which he studied with M. Lequien. After two years Lalique's drawings won a first place prize in the annual school contest. He remained at Turgot until he was fourteen and then transferred to Fontenay-sous-Bois to continue his education.

In 1875 Lalique began using his artistic talent commercially by selling ivory miniatures on which he had painted bouquets of flowers. This sudden commercial interest may have been, as Vever suggests, the natural desire for independence expressed by a teenage boy. It might also have been related to the ill health of his father and the resulting uncertain financial situation. In relating events of 1876, Vever refers to Lalique's mother as being a widow. Furthermore, Vever specifically mentions Lalique selling his ivory miniatures in Epernay, a town in the Marne area. This implies Lalique was in his mother's homeland area rather than in Paris where his father had been in business.

Later in 1876 Lalique returned to Paris where his mother placed him in apprenticeship to the Parisian jeweler Louis
Aucoc. Aucoc had a well established house of jewelry manufacture which specialized in joaillerie. This was the conservative tradition of jewelry design and manufacture in the nineteenth century and it consisted of work in diamonds and precious stones. ² From 1876 to 1878 Lalique learned the techniques of the jewelry profession in Aucoc's atelier. He continued to draw and even made wax models of jewelry from his own designs, some of which were executed as works in Aucoc's studio.

During this period of apprenticeship Lalique also attended classes at the École des Arts décoratifs. This academy of industrial arts was, like other French nineteenth century academies, a very conservative institution. The École des Arts décoratifs developed out of an eighteenth century school, the École de dessin et de mathematique, founded in Paris in 1765 by Jean Jacques Bachelier (an eighteenth century decorator and still life painter). ³ Nikolaus Pevsner describes the instruction at Bachelier's school as "...confined to copying from drawings or prints." ⁴ This conservative type of instruction was continued at the École des Arts décoratifs which taught anatomy, the elements of architecture, practical perspective, general history, history of industry, drawing, and architecture, mathematics, drawing sculpture, and water color. ⁵ Lalique attended these classes at the École irregularly and after a few months he abandoned them entirely. The training he received in Aucoc's atelier and during his brief attendance at the École des Arts décoratifs places Lalique well within an academic and conservative tradition at the beginning of his jewelry career.
In 1878 Lalique left Aucoc's atelier to go to England where he remained for two years. Very little is known about this English sojourn. Roger Marx referred to it in 1899 by stating Lalique had been a "...lauréat dans plusieurs concours de composition en Angleterre." Vever described Lalique's two year stay in England in this way:

Il y resta deux ans, au Collège de Sydenham, où il travailla avec une nouvelle ardeur, ne négligeant aucune occasion de se perfectionner dans l'étude du dessin qu'il préférait à tout.

Sydenham is a residential area south of London which developed when the Crystal Palace was being reconstructed there in 1854. It is quite possible Lalique lived in Sydenham as there were several French residents in the area. In this community there were two schools during the time Lalique was there. These were Sydenham College and the Crystal Palace Company's School of Art, Science, and Literature. It is doubtful the Crystal Palace School of Art was the one attended by Lalique for it was in its last years when he arrived in England. Accounts of this school in English periodicals further indicate it was not a logical choice for Lalique. The school's instruction was predominantly in water color and sculpture and only the ladies' division of the school was concerned with art. The awards given by the Crystal Palace School of Art in 1878 went only to ladies for water color painting and for modelling.

The other school in the Sydenham area which Lalique might have attended was Sydenham College. This school was founded in 1857 and by 1878 its art curriculum seems to have been
limited to drawing courses. During the time period Lalique would have been there the head of the school was Reverend William Taylor Jones.\textsuperscript{12} It is curious Lalique could have chosen this type of school over one oriented toward design and decorative art, such as the South Kensington School.

Another peculiar aspect of Lalique's stay in England is discovered in the investigation of references to his having won prizes in contests sponsored by British magazines. One of the major sponsors of such contests was \textit{The Art Journal}, and this magazine frequently published award lists also for the contests it did not sponsor. Lalique's name does not appear in any of the award lists published in \textit{The Art Journal} for various contests held from 1878 to 1880. Possible explanations for the discrepancy in this information might be that Lalique was awarded a prize not listed in the awards lists, such as an honorable mention or a certificate or that he entered a very minor contest.

These puzzling aspects of Lalique's stay in England lead to the possibility that perhaps it was different than what he later led biographers and the public to believe. One can not help but wonder why he would have chosen an insignificant school when there were so many distinguished schools of design in England or why his name is not found in the award lists of the more well known design contests. These aspects of Lalique's English sojourn suggest his choice of a school was influenced by his financial situation, which was probably somewhat insufficient, as he was only an apprentice.
before traveling to England. Perhaps Vever's vague reference to the Sydenham school and Roger Marx's equally ambiguous reference to Lalique's having won drawing contests in England were the result of Lalique's own intentionally evasive statements to biographers in an attempt to cover up what he considered a financially embarrassing and non-illustrious period in his early career.

Upon his return to Paris in 1880 Lalique worked a year as a pattern drawer, designing wall paper and fabrics in the workshop of a relative, M. Vuilleret. The next year he spent with M. August Petit but left M. Petit's house in order to become more independent.

During the next five years, 1881 to 1886, Lalique worked as a free lance jewelry designer for such firms as Jacta, Aucoc, Cartier, Renn, Gariod, Hamelin, Destape, and Boucheron. As a free lance designer Lalique furnished somewhat conservative designs for diamond jewelry (Figs. 3-5). He also utilized the freedom of his free lance status to study sculpture. At a school subsequently known as "l'école Bernard Palissy" Lalique attended a modelling course with "le statuaire Lequien," son of his old drawing teacher at Turgot.

In 1882 Lalique formed an association with an old family friend named Varene. Serving as Lalique's agent for two years Varene was responsible for placing Lalique's designs in established firms that manufactured jewelry. For this work Varene received half of the price of the sale. With this arrangement Lalique was able to devote all his time to
designing. Figure 32 provides an example of Lalique's design sheets during this two year association with Varenne. The designs were painted in gouache on a dark ground and stamped on the back with "Lalique et Varenne, rue de Vaugirard, 84."

Lalique also developed an interest in etching during the period from 1881 to 1886. In 1883 he became interested in publishing a magazine on industrial art using etchings for illustrations. Lalique was encouraged in this venture by M. Charles Arfvidson who saw this as a productive means of supplying jewelry manufacturing firms with new designs. Although their venture failed to materialize Arfvidson did bring Lalique to the attention of the editor of Le Bijou, M. Rothschild. This magazine, founded in 1874, served the same end Lalique had intended for his magazine, that is publishing new designs for jewelry. Le Bijou, however, was predominantly subscribed to by foreign jewelers. Lalique worked for this magazine for a short while in 1883 but soon his interest waned and he passed his position on to a designer named Banneville.

In 1885, at the age of twenty-five, Lalique was given the opportunity to purchase an established jewelry manufacturing firm. Jules Destape, head of a house of joaillerie in Paris, had been a regular patron of Lalique's designs since 1880. He decided to retire in 1885 and offered to sell his workshop and equipment to Lalique. Lalique apparently took some time deciding whether to accept the offer or to remain a free lance artist. It was not until 1886 that he accepted and
thus established himself as a *fabricant bijoutier*. Vever states:

...Lalique put se consacrer librement et entièrment à des créations personnelles dégagées de la moindre influence étrangère. Ce ne fut pas encore le grand essor qui devait, quelques années plus tard, le conduire à renover l'art de la bijouterie, mais il commençait à boler de ses propres ailes...

In accepting Destape's atelier Lalique acquired a well organized and supplied workshop complete with an overseer, Briançon, who worked for Lalique the next twenty years.

Despite becoming the head of his own jewelry firm, Lalique continued to submit designs to other jewelry manufacturers. Vever cites a diamond hair ornament representing swallows in flight which was executed by Lalique in 1887 in his own house only after it had been declined by Lalique's former patron, Boucheron. Boucheron refused to accept the design because of its "fantasie excessive." Believing in his design, Lalique then executed it himself and its success can be determined by the many times the bird motif was used in his later work. With the success of this fanciful ornament Lalique gradually began introducing more fantasy into his designs.

Lalique's participation in exhibitions began in the late 1880s. In the Exposition nationale des Art industriels in 1887 he entered only designs for *bijouterie*. Included in his exhibit was "...un projet de cadre, un éventail de fleurs avec sa monture...." His exhibit was noticed and praised by the jeweler Alphonse Fouquet and the two became friends after this meeting.

Because he received so many commissions from Parisian
jewelers Lalique was compelled in 1887 to move to larger quarters to house some thirty workers in his atelier. In his new atelier Lalique prepared works for the 1889 Exposition. Although he was represented there Lalique did not have his own exhibit. Rather his work ". . . figurèrent à l'Exposition de 1889 dans le vitrines de plusieurs des exposants le plus en vue, put qui il fut un collaborateur annoye. . ." In recalling the 1889 Exposition Roger Marx stated that despite the anonymity of Lalique's works his jewelry "... purent triompher à l'Exposition de 1889, sans qu'aucun lustre rejaillisse sur leur auteur dont les catalogues taisaient jalousement le concours." After 1889 Lalique's business increased and he was again forced to move his atelier the following year. Lalique was apparently married by this time for Vever reports that Lalique's father-in-law and brother-in-law, Auguste Ledru, senior and junior, assisted him in decorating his new quarters. For his new location Lalique designed his own furniture and the Ledrus, who were sculptors, designed wall and ceiling sculptural decorations. Subsequently they also became Lalique's collaborators, serving to transfer his designs into reliefs.

In 1893 Lalique entered a drinking cup in a competition organized by L'Union centrale des Arts décoratifs and was awarded second prize of 500 francs. This piece is an indication of Lalique's interest in ceramics and glass which was later to attract his full attention. At this time, however, he was just learning about glass work and the art of firing.
Lalique was assisted and advised in the procedures of firing by Léon Appert and Jules Henrivaux, director of manufacture of the Saint-Gobain works. Vever described several examples of Lalique's glass work done from 1890 to 1893, including a small head of John the Baptist, a decorative panel representing centaurs, vases of different colors, and a goblet decorated with a hops vine. 26

Under his own name Lalique entered a small exhibit in the Paris Salon of 1894. Roger Marx described Lalique's exhibit in this way:

*En 1894, les dépisteurs de signature nouvelles avaient retenu, pur leurs allure peu banales, un vase de fer, puis une reliure de la Walkyrie, malaisément appréciable cause de l'oxydation immédiate des dorure qui rehaussaient l'ivoire;...* 27

In this same year a profile of Sarah Bernhardt, which Lalique had designed in 1890, was used on a commemorative medal presented to that actress. 28 Lalique had been introduced to Sarah Bernhardt by their mutual friend, George Jules-Victor Clairin, a painter and theatre decorator. Following this introduction in the early 1890s the actress commissioned Lalique to design a number of pieces of jewelry for her. He continued to execute works for the theatre and its stars in the 1890s (Figs. 6-8) thereby increasing his reputation.

Léonce Bénédite later cited encouragement from Miss Bernhardt and her friends as the deciding factor in Lalique's decision to exhibit his newest and most unusual creations in the 1895 Salon. 29 According to Vever, however, Lalique entered his own exhibition because he was concerned with
proving to "les magasins les plus importants" that his jewelry was pleasing to the public. Whatever the cause Lalique did enter an exhibit of seventeen pieces in the newly admitted section of Art Décoratif in the 1895 Salon and was awarded a third place medal.

Roger Marx had only high praise for Lalique's 1895 exhibit: "...nous souvient de la surprise ravie où jeta cette sélection initiale de dix-sept joyaux, d'aspect et d'usage diverse, pareillement exquis par l'décor, le travail;..." Included among the seventeen pieces exhibited by Lalique were the following:

...une ravissante libellule aux ailes tachées d'améthystes et de saphirs jaunes...(and)...une grand broche ou agrafe, de style Renaissance, avec améthystes calibrées, rehaussée d'email et de quelques petits diamants aux scintillements discrets. Au milieu du rinceau principal se tenait, ciselée dans l'or, une femme debout entièrement nue...

There were also pieces representing animals, swallows, butterflies, and other insects, as well as examples of Lalique's glass work, the latter executed between 1890 and 1892. Included in the glass works was an oval cameo with a nude female motif.

Vever reports there was much criticism of Lalique's Renaissance style brooch with the full length nude figure (Fig. 9). Many salon goers, including the critic Charles Blanc, found it "déplacée et 'malséante', inconvenante même" to have a nude figure on jewelry. Vever specifically states that this Renaissance style brooch, exhibited in 1895, was executed between 1893 and 1894. The importance of this
statement is that is suggests a pattern for dating Lalique's exhibited works, at least until 1902.35

The Salon was not the only place Lalique exhibited in 1895. In the same year he exhibited eleven pieces of jewelry at Samuel Bing's Salon de l'Art Nouveau. His works, found in the catalogue under numbers 503 to 513, included a Flacon or et perles fines (number 504) and a Broch, émail, emerandes et brillants (number 508).36 The importance of Lalique's exhibiting in Bing's Salon at this time will be discussed later.

Lalique continued to achieve success at the official Salons, winning a second place medal in 1896 and a first place medal in 1897. In 1896 Lalique introduced the use of horn as a new material for jewelry. The first piece of horn jewelry he exhibited was a bracelet made of white horn decorated with silver.

In 1897 Lalique's exhibit won the praise of Emile Galle. After seeing Lalique's exhibit Gallé called him "...les plus incontestable vainquer en Beaux Arts."37 Lalique's 1897 showcase included horn and ivory combs decorated with silver. Figure 10 shows two combs which were published in the English periodical The Artist in 1898. These two combs fit descriptions given by Vever of combs purchased by La Ville de Paris and Le Musée du Luxembourg,38 and they represent Lalique's work with horn and silver at this time. His 1897 exhibit also included a gold and enamel diadem of hanging fuchia, three bracelets, two of horn and silver and one decorated with an iris motif, a "dog collar" necklace of gold, pearls, and enamel,
two pendants, and seven buckles (Figs. 82, 89, 90, and 101). 39

Lalique also exhibited at the Exposition Universelle at Brussels in 1897 where he was awarded the grand prize and the "croix de chevalier de Légion d'honneur." His popularity at this time may be measured by the fact his atelier was insufficient to meet orders even though his "maître ciseleur, Deraisme" had five workers under his direction.

The reviews of Lalique's Salon exhibit of 1898 indicate varied reactions to his highly imaginative work. In Revue des Art décoratifs L. de Fourcaud criticized Lalique's combs as pretentious and stiff works made only for theatrical hairdos. De Fourcaud acknowledged Lalique's popularity but regretted the "école d'exotisme, d'archéologisme, et de fantaisisme excentrique" his example had fostered. 40 This highly critical review of Lalique's 1898 exhibit was the exception and not the rule as most reviews praised Lalique's work for its imaginative treatment. Henri Frantz's review in the British Magazine of Art found Lalique's work both useful and original: "...his necklaces, earrings, brooches and comb tops show Lalique's advance, because M. Lalique, while preserving a remarkable degree of originality and artistic sense, never loses sight of the purpose of each object." 41 Henri Vever's review of the jewelry at the Salon of 1898 praised Lalique for having created a place for artistic jewelry. 42

This 1898 exhibit by Lalique which evoked such contrasting reactions from reviewers consisted of at least sixteen pieces. There were five pendants, a bracelet of gold and diamonds with
a vine and star motif, two corsage ornaments and a vase of milky-white glass with a snake motif (Figs. 11, 12, and 142). Nine combs made of horn and ivory were also exhibited. These combs were decorated with various subjects, including fish, peacocks, human figures (three combs had figure motifs), and flowers (Figs. 63, 64, 73, 83, and 109).

Lalique's exhibits continued to attract attention and generally favorable responses. In 1899 Gustave Soulé noted that "C'est à bon droit que cette année encore la vitrine de Lalique aimante, pour ainsi dire, tous les regards et attire tous les suffrages." In the same year Roger Marx referred to Lalique as the "inventeur et le héros glorieux" in the revival of imaginative jewelry.

The climax of Lalique's success in France was at the Exposition Universelle in 1900. Vever stated, "Il est presque superflu de rappeler ici les succès remportés par Lalique lors de l'Exposition de 1900...." Léonce Bénédicté compared Lalique's 1900 exhibit to the "splendeur des Mille et une Nuits." Several articles in popular periodicals were devoted exclusively to Lalique's exhibit. These included Pol Neuveux's "René Lalique" in Art et Décoration and Léonce Bénédicté's "La Bijouterie et La Joaillerie a l'Exposition Universelle de 1900. René Lalique" in Revue des Art décoratifs. Lalique was awarded the grand prize in the Joaillerie et Bijouterie section of the Exposition and he was named as an Officier de Légion d'honneur.

Lalique's exhibit of 1900 consisted of some forty pieces.
of jewelry. While some of these had been exhibited earlier (such as the comb with the ombelles decoration and the bracelet of irises, Figs. 73 and 90) most were new. Some of Lalique's most unusual and fantastic jewelry was also exhibited at this time. These included the famous dragonfly corsage ornament often worn by Sarah Bernhardt, the Hydra-like coil of snakes and the cock's head hair pin (Figs. 52, 72, and 135).

The greater part of Lalique's 1900 exhibit was made up of combs and pendants. Of the nine combs exhibited only two had been seen before and they were those in Figures 73 and 83 left. Included in the new combs were those in Figures 94 and 100. None of the ten pendants in this exhibit had been previously exhibited. Figure 13 reproduces one of those new pendants. The next largest section of Lalique's exhibit was necklaces. There were five necklaces, three of which were a sort of collar plaque attached to a chain. Two of the necklaces exhibited in 1900 may be seen in Figures 14 and 15. The remainder of this exhibit consisted of five hair pins, two bracelets, the peacock brooch in Figure 138, an antique bronze diadem, an enamel decorated picture frame, a watch case, four rings, and several designs for combs and pendants. Figure 16 shows a selection of the pieces included in this 1900 exhibit.

Even Lalique's showcase, a masterpiece of Art Nouveau design, was considered to be of such quality as to exclude all others from competing with his imaginative exhibit (Fig. 17). The articles devoted to Lalique's exhibit gave almost as much
attention to describing the showcase as his jewelry. The case, designed by Lalique, had a frosted glass display surface on which the jewelry was arranged. The decoration of the case included an iron grill with bronze statues of women, a gray valance appliqued with black velvet bats, a painted panel of sylphs, and two tall narrow mirrors framed by two bronze serpents.\textsuperscript{51}

In the early 1900s Lalique continued to exhibit in the yearly salons, but the nature of his exhibits changed somewhat as he began to introduce more non-jewelry items. This indicated a gradual lessening of his interest in jewelry after 1900. It should also be noted that reviews of Lalique's exhibits at this time were somewhat less adulatory. In 1901 his work was cited as bizzarre and criticized because it was "not for wearing."\textsuperscript{52} In Lalique's exhibit of 1901 were various kinds of jewelry, including a corsage pin composed of jasmin blossoms and leaves (Fig. 93). He also included a dagger with a carved rhinoceros horn handle in the same 1901 exhibit (Fig. 18). Lalique's interest in glass at this time is demonstrated by his use of crystal decoration on the elaborate show case he designed for his 1901 exhibit. This showcase was described as "...une étrange conception, en vérité, que ces quatre serpents de cristal qui se dressent, en rampant, la gueule ouverte, en ses angles."\textsuperscript{53}

Lalique's designing of his own exhibition cases in 1900 and 1901 is another indication of his decreasing interest in jewelry and his increasing interest in other fields of design.\textsuperscript{54}
In 1902 this interest in furniture design was coupled with architectural design and they became a major part of Lalique's work. Aided by the architect, M. Feine, Lalique renovated a building on Cours-la-Reine for his home and atelier. For the many windowed facade Lalique designed wrought iron balconies based on a pine branch motif and incorporated tree trunk and limb motifs on the facade surface (Fig. 19). The door Lalique designed was of glass and iron (Fig. 19a) and the pine branch and cone motifs were used on the interior. Lalique also designed and built the furnishings for his workshop. Despite this work on his home he did have a Salon exhibit of jewelry in 1902 which included the pieces in Figures 96, 97, 124, and 147.

The bulk of his exhibit in 1903 still consisted of jewelry. Included were bracelets, pendants, the combs in Figures 20 and 21, and the pin in Figure 62. But Lalique continued to introduce other works such as hand mirrors and purses (Figs. 22 and 23).

Lalique's works were also shown outside of France. These exhibits were predominantly of jewelry but most of the pieces had been previously exhibited in France. Lalique participated in the Turin Exposition of 1902 and his exhibit (and the whole French section) was criticized for consisting of only "known works." Lalique's work was included in the French section at the World's Fair of 1904 in St. Louis, Missouri. His exhibit at St. Louis, entered in the section of Original Objects of Art Workmanship, was listed in the catalogue as
"objets d'art" (which usually refers to jewelry) but the specific items were not enumerated. In 1903 and 1905 Lalique had two one-man shows in London at the Grafton Gallery and the Agnew Gallery respectively. Included in the jewelry in the latter exhibit were a silver belt buckle and three combs (Figs. 24, 94, and 98). There were also many non-jewelry items, including the horn handle dagger exhibited at the 1901 Salon, two cups, a silver, horn, and enamel decorated box, silver ink stand, and embroidered collar with silver ornaments (Figs. 18, 25, 26, and 140).60

Lalique's interest in jewelry decreased even further after 1906. The review of his Salon exhibit of that year noted a lanterne and hand mirror as the most unusual entries in his exhibit, and after 1908 lanternes, mirrors, and glass vases made up the bulk of Lalique's exhibits. In 1909 the models for perfume bottles Lalique had created were so well received by large perfume manufacturers that he leased a glass factory of his own at Combes-la-Ville. By 1910 Lalique's Salon exhibit consisted mostly of glass work and he purchased the glass factory he was then leasing.

Following World War I Lalique devoted himself less to jewelry and more to the design and execution of glass ware. In 1920 he located his glass factory in Alsace-Lorraine where he remained, producing Lalique Cristal, until World War II. First the war and then Lalique's death in 1945 caused the production of Lalique Cristal to cease. It was not until 1951 that Lalique Cristal was again resumed and then under
the direction of his son, Marc Lalique.64

During the height of Lalique's jewelry career (from 1895 to 1908) he had several collaborators who worked under his direction. Four of these have already been mentioned previously. They were Briançon, the overseer of Lalique's atelier; Deraisme, his master chisler in 1897; and the two Ledru sculptors.

When the demand for his jewelry increased, especially between 1897 and 1900, Lalique took more collaborators into his workshop. He apparently preferred his assistants to have a background in sculpture, perhaps so they could work for him in the manner the two Ledrus had done, that is, transferring designs into reliefs. Vever cites one collaborator as "Hoffman ... un sculpteur d'une habilîété extraordinaire et de grand imagination. Ill mourat jeune, il y a peu d'années."65

M. Chardon, another collaborator cited by Vever, fared somewhat better. In 1898 Chardon entered a design contest and won third prize with his buckle designs. Two of his winning designs demonstrate the impact of his association with Lalique (Figs. 27-28). The similarities between these buckles designed by Chardon in 1898 and the jewelry exhibited by Lalique in 1897 include the general shapes, the arrangement of the motifs within the shape, and the use of the stylized prickly leaf motifs (Fig. 101).

Eugene Feuillâtre was another of Lalique's collaborators in the late 1890s. In his "Decorative Art in the Paris Salon of 1898" in the Magazine of Art Henri Frantz praised Lalique's
exhibit and then noted "M. Feuillâtre... who has been till now working under Lalique, exhibits some pleasant enamel work and jewelry, under his own name." This exhibit, which Frantz described as "pleasant", won an honorable mention in the 1898 Salon. Feuillâtre was still with Lalique in 1901 for again in that year his exhibit was mentioned in conjunction with Lalique's. By 1904 Feuillâtre had won a third class medal at the Salon and in 1905 he won a second class medal. This suggests he eventually became a competitor of Lalique's rather than a collaborator.

Still another sculptor who worked with Lalique was Gaston Lachaise. Hilton Kramer states that at some point early in 1905 Lachaise "...interrupted his career to take a job doing precision work for the famous jeweler René Lalique..." But Lachaise remained with Lalique only long enough to earn money for passage to America.

These men and the roles they filled -- overseer, master chisler, transferer of Lalique's designs, enamellor, and precision worker -- indicate the work structure of Lalique's atelier and suggest that Lalique concentrated on designing, leaving much of the execution to workers. Furthermore, Lalique believed that mechanical means of reducing his large scale designs allowed the truest rendering of details. This also suggests he allowed much of the final work to be done by others working with mechanical equipment he had perfected.

This biographical information prepares a foundation for an examination of Lalique's work in light of the traditions
of nineteenth century French jewelry design and his choice of source material.
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CHAPTER II
RENE LALIQUE'S RELATIONSHIP TO FRENCH
NINETEENTH CENTURY JEWELRY DESIGN

Two traditions of jewelry design flourished in France in the second half of the nineteenth century. They were designated as joaillerie and bijouterie. ¹ Joaillerie, the accepted tradition by the late 1860s, was characterized by the use of expensive materials, such as diamonds and precious stones. The popularity of the diamond began in the eighteenth century with the opening of the diamond mines in Brazil in 1725. ² The opening of the South African diamond mines in 1867 made this stone even more available at less expense to nineteenth century jewelers. ³ Another important factor in the popularity of diamonds in the late nineteenth century was the increasing use of electric lights under which the sparkle of diamonds was especially effective. ⁴

The designs of joaillerie tended to be conservative and traditional. The high investment in materials of joaillerie may have been a factor in the conservative design tendency, ⁵ and these conservative designs placed emphasis upon the expensive material rather than originality of form. This concern with emphasizing the opulence of the precious stones was continued from the jewelry traditions of the eighteenth century. Jewelers of that period were also predominantly interested in settings which would emphasize the sparkle of the gems. ⁶ The following criticism of popular jewelry
written by Lewis F. Day in 1880 demonstrates the extent

**joaillerie** emphasized display of precious material:

Our ideas of jewelry is altogether the reverse of this. [He is comparing western jewelry with that of India.] We must have fine and flawless stones and thick masses of heavy gold.... We throw rare diamonds together, *en masse*, producing at a fabulous cost, an effect less gorgeous than the comparatively inexpensive Eastern work. With regard to diamonds, the greater the quantity of precious stones, the more closely they seem to have been put together.... The root of all evil here, and in so many other arts, is the innate and seemingly irrepressible passion for display....

Another conservative aspect of **joaillerie** designs was the use of highly stylized motifs from nature. The utilization of motifs from nature in jewelry design was revived in the second half of the nineteenth century. As they had been in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries diamonds were once again set in the shapes of flowers, birds, and stars. Nineteenth century **joaillerie** did not develop new shapes and settings but rather tried to increase the number of stones to add to the value of the jewelry. The motifs from nature in Figure 29 are so completely stylized they no longer serve as specific motifs but rather as decorative shapes upon which are placed precious stones. Figure 30 further demonstrates the choice of natural motifs as shapes for the massing of precious materials. The expression of specific characteristics of the various animals and insects is completely subordinated to the display of precious stones.

**Bijouterie,** which developed in the mid-nineteenth century, is quite different from the **joaillerie** concept of emphasizing
precious material. The emphasis in bijouterie was upon unusual settings, novel designs, and the use of semi-precious or new and curious materials.

René Lalique began his career in 1876 in the joaillerie tradition with his apprenticeship to Louis Aucoc, a "bon joaillier." After his apprenticeship Lalique continued to work in the joaillerie tradition, supporting himself by submitting designs to established houses of joaillerie from 1880 to 1886. Vever specifically describes these two dimensional designs as having been sketched on a dark background "avec de la gouache d'un jaune vif et cru...pour bien imiter l'or." The desire to imitate gold in his designs is typical of the joaillerie concern with the display of precious materials.

This interest is also demonstrated in Lalique's jewelry of the early 1880s. An involvement with costly materials is especially illustrated in the bracelet in Figure 31. A comparison of Lalique's grasshopper pendant in Figure 31 with that in Figure 30 demonstrates how similar it is to the traditional joaillerie style. In each the grasshopper becomes a decorative form for various designs of precious stones (notice the variation of surface pattern between the body of the insects and their legs). Although there is an interest in novelty in Lalique's joaillerie designs of the early 1880s which does suggest his mature style, at this point the fantasy of design is still subservient to the materials (Fig. 32).

By 1886, however, Lalique had established his own firm and designated himself "un fabricant bijouterie." The
choice of this term indicated his break with the tradition of jewelry design in which he was trained. When Lalique chose the designation "fabricant bijouterie" he was associating himself with a tradition of jewelry design which developed after the mid-nineteenth century when jewelers began to break away from joaillerie concepts and to experiment with imaginative settings and unusual materials.

The concern for jewelry consisting of something other than just expensive stones was begun in the 1850s by the French jeweler F.D. Froment-Meurice. He produced jewelry in which the motif and the style dominated and determined the material in which the piece was executed. The pendant in Figure 33 is typical of his jewelry. The stylistic association of this pendant with such Renaissance jewelry as the sixteenth century brooch by Erasmus Hornick is clear (Fig. 34). Similarities include the following: a mythological theme, The Birth of Venus; a classically derived scene in the center rendered like an ancient cameo or a Greek vase motif; flowers and fruit clusters as secondary motifs; nude female figures as supporting forms on the sides; side bracket motifs; and three baroque pearl drops below the main area. By utilizing past styles and literary motifs Froment-Meurice began the move away from the nineteenth century jeweler's single minded dependance upon precious materials.

The idea of creating jewelry based on motifs from the past had become popular earlier in the century. The interest in antique jewelry was stimulated by Napoleon's deliberate
revival of antique art forms and costumes. As early as 1814 the Castellani firm was producing imitation antique jewelry by careful utilization of ancient goldsmithing methods and direct copying from excavated examples of ancient jewelry.\textsuperscript{15} In contrast to this direct imitation of the past, Froment-Meurice's work demonstrates a personal interpretation of past sources.

Froment-Meurice's experiments were not confined to subject matter. He worked with various types of metals, including iron, steel, copper, and antiqued silver.\textsuperscript{16} In 1878 enamelled jewelry by this master was exhibited at the Paris Exposition (Fig. 35). Such experimentation with a variety of materials further indicates Froment-Meurice's role in the development of a tradition of jewelry design diametrically opposed to the restrictive principles of \textit{joaillerie}.

The experimental approach to jewelry design was continued in the 1860s by the Paris jeweler Oscar Massin. Instead of a personal interpretation of past styles Massin turned to nature and his own imagination for new motifs. By 1861 he had begun to experiment with unusual mountings for diamond pins.\textsuperscript{17} Throughout the 1860s Massin executed diamond jewelry in the forms of flowers, plumes, and ribbons (Figs. 36-40). Although somewhat reminiscent of late eighteenth century jewelry, Massin's work is less formal and stylized. He also utilized more common types of flowers, such as wild roses and daisies (see the center group of flowers in Figure 40 and compare it to Figures 41 and 41a).
Massin's showcase at the 1878 Exposition demonstrates the extent to which he carried the use of fanciful shapes for diamond jewelry (Figs. 40 and 40a). A comparison of this work with the work of a non-experimenting joaillier, Frederick Boucheron, (Fig. 29) illustrates the novelty and imaginative quality of Massin's jewelry. Through his experiments in unusual mountings and novel motifs for diamonds Massin demonstrated the importance of an artist's imagination. By continuing Froment-Meurice's practice of allowing the motif to dominate the material, Massin helped break the joaillerie dependance upon the use of a valuable stone for the piece's basic appeal.

This same concern for unusual forms and novel motifs can also be seen in the work of Eugene Fontenay. His use of animals and insect motifs combines characteristics of both bijouterie and joaillerie traditions (Figs. 42-44). The beetle in Figure 43 exemplifies some tendencies of these two traditions. In the bijouterie fashion the subject matter is novel and exotic, being related, perhaps, to the sacred beetle of Egyptian art. The joaillerie concern for display of precious stones is also quite evident in the choice of jade and diamonds for the materials. Likewise, in the grasshopper in Figure 44 Fontenay has suggested specific characteristics of the insect in the legs and body composition. This indicates he was working with more that just the idea of displaying precious materials.

Also important in the development of bijouterie in the
nineteenth century was the Falize firm. In the 1860s Alexis Falize and his son Lucien experimented with enamels and were influential in the revival of enamelling techniques. This interest in enamelling is often attributed to the mid-nineteenth century romantic fascination for the Middle Ages. Falize's concern with enamels, however, was specifically related to oriental cloisonné rather than western Medieval techniques.

The two Falizes collaborated with the enamellor D'Tard in the production of cloisonné enamels and their enamelled medallions represent the most complete break with the traditional concepts of joaillerie up to this point (Figs. 75 and 78). Devoid of precious stones, the appeal of these enamels was entirely dependent upon the artist's ability. The joaillerie positions of importance have been completely reversed in bijouterie, for it is not the value of a stone which is emphasized in this jewelry but the imagination and creativity of the jeweler.

Despite his 1885 designation of himself as a "fabricant bijouterie" there was no abrupt change in Lalique's work at that time. He continued to submit designs to established firms of joaillerie after 1885 and he continued to produce jewelry of precious stones, especially diamonds, as late as 1894. The diamond necklace in Figure 45 fully exemplifies the joaillerie concern with display of precious stones.

There are suggestions of fantasy in some of Lalique's early joaillerie; the combination of butterflies and flowers
on the pendant in Figure 46 and the motif of the spider and the fly in Figure 47 exemplify this. But this novelty of subject matter, as demonstrated previously, remains subserviant to the display of the diamonds. In the pendant the butterfly and flower motifs have been so stylized they are simply shapes covered with diamonds rather than specific forms of motifs from nature (Fig. 46).

Lalique's experiments with jewelry may be said to have begun in the early 1880s with the works he executed after the manner of Oscar Massin (Figs. 48-50). Massin's influence was still strong in the 1880s and his style was quite acceptable by the time Lalique began working in this manner.23 Therefore, this work can not really be thought of as a radical departure from his joaillerie training. It does, however, represent Lalique's increasing interest in novelty of design and concern with developing a personal interpretation of Massin's basic ideas in that each piece by Lalique is more elaborate and complicated, as in the use of several birds on a flowering branch, or the combination of different types of flowers with ribbons (Figs. 49 and 50).

After 1886 Lalique's work showed a growing awareness of the bijouterie tradition and an increase in the experimental elements which characterize that tradition. Some of his hesitancy to leave the accepted tradition could possibly have resulted from a desire to maintain the financial security which he probably had as long as he continued to design in the fashion acceptable to the established houses of joaillerie.
In the late 1880s Lalique's commitment to the ideals of bijouterie became stronger. His interest in fantasy of design increased to the degree that at least one design of his was unacceptable to an established house of joaillerie and they refused to commission the work. Lalique began to experiment with enamels and the use of glass on jewelry in the late 1880s.

Another aspect of Lalique's experimentation was his development of special stamps and punches for use in his workshop. He utilized machines to reduce his models to the working size of the jewelry. This method, previously used only by engravers, enabled Lalique to obtain a high degree of accuracy and finish.

Lalique referred to his desire in the 1890s to create new kinds of jewelry:

Je travaillai sans relâche, dessinant, modelant, faisant des études et des essais techniques de tous genres, sans interruption, avec la volonté d'arriver à un résultat nouveau et de créer quelque chose qu'on n'aurait pas encore vu.

In 1896 at the salon exhibition he did indeed introduce something which had not been seen before. It was jewelry made of horn. The following year he exhibited a whole showcase of horn and ivory combs. Lalique's continued use of horn and ivory as well as the more unusual semi-precious stones and platinum suggests a full commitment to bijouterie in his mature work. He did use precious materials such as diamonds and gold in his mature work but these materials were also usually combined with non-precious materials such as glass.
and enamel (Fig. 51).

Throughout his later work Lalique's materials were subserviant to the motif. Compare the famous corsage ornament in the shape of a dragonfly, executed c. 1900, with a brooch of the same subject by L. Masriere and M. Hermanos made c. 1910 (Figs. 52 and 53). Lalique has combined precious and non-precious materials (gold, enamel, and chrysoprase) in this ornament. He has subordinated material to the motif by emphasizing specific details of the insect, such as the thin, diaphanous surfaces which suggest the quality of dragonfly wings. The concern in the dragonfly brooch in Figure 53 is clearly with a display of precious stones rather than characterizing the insect itself. Lalique's dragonfly ornament of 1900 demonstrates the extent to which he moved away from his joaillerie work of the early 1880s (compare Figure 52 to the grasshopper pin in Figure 31).

Following this analysis of the two traditions of French nineteenth century jewelry design and Lalique's development it is now necessary to assess his relationship to joaillerie and bijouterie to clarify his position. It has been established that he began his jewelry career as a joaillier through his training, early work, and his association with joaillerie firms. It has also been established that most of his mature work, that is from 1889 on, is in the bijouterie tradition. His experiments of the 1890s with various materials and machines further place him in the bijouterie tradition rather than in the tradition in which he was trained. It would be
simple enough to explain this switch as a rebellion against his training and the restrictive nature of joaillerie. But one must consider Lalique's continued submitting of designs to firms of joaillerie and his occasional executing of pieces of joaillerie after the late 1880s. This does not imply a rebellion against this tradition. Rather it seems that he preferred to keep his ties with both traditions and thereby perhaps insured his financial security. 30 By the Exposition Universelle of 1900 Lalique's reputation with the public was based almost entirely on the imaginative and unusual jewelry he had created. 31 He no longer needed the security of his joaillerie associations and from this point on until his switch to glass work in 1910 Lalique safely devoted his attention to bijouterie.
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CHAPTER III

RENÉ LALIQUE'S USE OF CLASSICAL SOURCES

In 1899 the critic Roger Marx published a review of René Lalique's jewelry which cited nine sources of influence with which Lalique worked. Among other sources of inspiration this list included "...les decouvertes des fouilles... grecques..."1 Although Marx cited these sources, he did not specify examples of Lalique's jewelry in which they could be found nor did he give reasons for Lalique's use of them. This chapter will establish a background for Lalique's use of classical motifs and analyze examples of his jewelry which are related to classical art.

The nineteenth century's taste for classical motifs and antique jewelry types like the cameo had begun with the Neo-Classical movement. In the early nineteenth century imported antique jewels and their copies were widely sold in France.2 Napoleon III's acquisition in 1869 of the Campana Collection, which included pieces of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman jewelry, was an important factor in continuing the influence of antique styles throughout the nineteenth century. F.D. Froment-Meurice's mid-century revival of Renaissance jewelry styles also helped to continue an interest in classical motifs.3 Philipe Burty's book on Froment-Meurice, published in 1883, re-emphasized the use of classical and renaissance styles as motifs for jewelry at an opportune time.

49
Knowledge of classical art was dispersed throughout Europe in the nineteenth century in various ways. Publications on this subject included articles and books like Wincklemann's *History of Ancient Art* (1764) which was translated into French by 1802; Furtwängler's studies on Greek sculpture were first published in 1892; and Lübke's *History of Art* (1869) was widely known by the late 1880s.

Public and private collections of classical art were formed and exhibitions of these collections stimulated the growth of general knowledge about the classical period. England and France both had extensive collections of original Greek and Roman statues and casts of statues; the Elgin Marbles were in the permanent collection of the British Museum by 1816 and sections of relief sculpture from Halicarnassus were there by 1865. The Campana Collection brought not only jewelry but statues and vases to the Louvre. In 1905 Furtwängler listed fifty-nine pieces of Greek marble sculpture in the Louvre collection.

Not only were these collections on exhibition in the museums, they were also available through illustrations and descriptions in guide books and catalogues published by the museums, such as the British Museum's *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum's Department of Greek and Roman Antiques. The Sculptures in the Elgin Room, Part II* (1881). Periodicals published articles on the various museum collections of antique art. For example, the *Gazette des Beaux Arts* published a series of articles on the bas-reliefs, statues, and
vases in the Campana Collection (1862-1864), and in 1885 they published an article on the antique figures in the Louvre collection.⁷

Greek vases were also available to Lalique through museums⁸ and publications. The books on Greek vases often furnished information, descriptions, and diagrams of Greek vase decoration. One example was Solomon Reinach's Répertoire des Vases Peints Grecs et Étrusques (Paris, 1899). On pages V and VI Reinach lists forty-seven primary sources he used in finding diagrams and descriptions of Greek vases. Included in this list are German, English, and French publications. The French sources included Pottier's Vases antiques du Louvre (n.d.)⁹, H.D. Luynes' Descriptions de quelques vases peints étrusques, italiotes, siciliens et grecs (1840), Millin-Reinach's Peintures de vases antiques (1891), and the periodical Revue archéologique. These few examples clearly illustrate that classical art was not only available to Lalique but it was also a subject receiving much attention in the late nineteenth century.

Lalique's early academic training provides a more specific contact with classical art. The curriculum of the École des Arts décoratifs, which Lalique attended in 1886, included human figure drawing. The most accepted method of teaching figure drawing in nineteenth century academic schools was drawing from plaster casts which were almost always casts of classical sculpture. In his study of decorative artists' training in the nineteenth century Nikolaus Pevsner reports,
"There was more drawing from casts and nature in the schools than there had been fifty years earlier...." 10 Pevsner further states:

The schools for decorative art were meant to educate artists-craftsmen, such as goldsmiths, or designers for industry. And for them the study of drawing from plaster and life, from flowers and ornament seemed more important and also more dignified than actual handwork. 11

Encouragement for using classical sources may have also been suggested to Lalique by the work of his contemporaries. The late nineteenth century revival of interest in classical art was reflected in both the fine arts and the decorative arts by a return to classical themes and stylistic tendencies. Among the painters who turned to classical art for inspiration was Pierre-Auguste Renoir. 12 Following his trip to Rome in 1881, Renoir's style displayed the influence of classical art he had seen. This influence may be seen in his late paintings of bathers, especially Les Grandes Baigneuses (1884–1887), in the hard outlines, the frieze-like arrangement of the figures, and the large heavy figure types.

An artist associated with the decorative arts who used classical sources in the late nineteenth century was Auguste Rodin. 13 Although today Rodin is recognized almost exclusively for his sculpture, he was also very active as a decorative artist during his career. In the 1860s Rodin depended upon decorative art for his livelihood. From 1863 to 1866 he supported himself by doing decorative ornaments for architecture and wax models of jewelry. The architectural ornaments, made in conjunction with an ornament maker named
Bies, included "...caryatids for the Gobelins Theater, a chimney ornamentation for the Gaite-Lyrique Theater, a pediment for the Panorama des Champs Elysees and decorative reliefs for the Salle du Rubens in the Louvre." His works in jewelry consisted of making wax models of earrings and buckles for the jeweler Fanières.

In 1866 Rodin took a part time position at the Sévres Porcelain Manufacture. By 1869 he had left this position but his association with the decorative arts did not stop. From 1878 to 1880 Rodin again depended upon the decorative arts to earn a livelihood. During this time he designed jewelry and did furniture decoration. Rodin also made a set of decorative masks which were used on the keystones of an arcade at the Trocadéro Palace Fountain. These masks were made in the studio of a sculptor named Laouste and when entered in the Industrial Arts section of the 1878 Salon in Laouste's name they were awarded a gold medal. In 1878 Rodin returned to Sévres to work as a vase decorator. In this capacity he made sculptured friezes for vases, including works entitled Nymphs and Bacchantes, The Elements, Winter, Illusions, Day, and Night.

Rodin's use of classical themes is evident from the titles of these vases, especially the one entitled Nymphs and Bacchantes. The style of the sculptured frieze on the vase entitled Night further shows Rodin's use of classical art in the centaur figure and the somewhat heavily proportioned female figures (Figs. 54-56). Likewise the general shape and the various
border designs on this vase suggest the bands of decorative designs on classical vases or architraves of classical buildings.

Rodin's ceramics were exhibited in Paris in the late nineteenth century and therefore were available to Lalique. Most of the pieces Rodin executed were in the Musée du Sévres' collection but various ones were shown in other exhibitions. In 1884 the Union centrale des Arts décoratifs exhibited *The Elements, Winter, and Day*. Rodin's vases were also exhibited at the Exposition Universelle in 1888 and at the Salon and the Musée du Luxembourg in 1902. Rodin's designs and sketches for vases were also known and collected; Philipe Burty and Taxile Doat were two collectors of his sketches. Illustrations of Rodin's vases and drawings were published in popular magazines in the late nineteenth century. *Revue des Arts décoratifs* published examples of his ceramic work in 1884 and *l'Image* published an article on Rodin's designs in 1897.  

Rodin did not confine his use of classical sources to his ceramic work. In the late 1880s and early 1890s he did many pieces of sculpture with classical themes and figures, including *The Minotaur* (1886), *Female Centaur* (1889), *Orpheus and Eurydice* (1893), and *Apollo Crushing the Serpent Python* (1895). Lalique would certainly have known Rodin's sculpture as it was exhibited at Samuel Bing's Salon de l'Art Nouveau in 1895, the same exhibit in which Lalique participated. The fact that Rodin's sculpture was included
in this exhibit of "new art" could have been an indication to Lalique of the general receptiveness of classical themes and styles.

It would appear, therefore, that René Lalique was neither alone by 1899 when he chose to use classical sources, nor was he working against general tastes and interest when he utilized classical themes and stylistic devices. While it is not unusual for an artist associated with Art Nouveau to utilize historical sources it will be shown in this paper that Lalique's treatment of classical art was not of a revival nature but rather a unique and personal interpretation. Having established a background for Lalique's awareness of classical art, examples of his jewelry may now be examined for the results of this influence. The works are not arranged in chronological order since there was not a consistent chronological development in Lalique's use of classical motifs. Instead they have been arranged on the basis of their stylistic similarity to classical art, beginning with those works reflecting the closest similarity to the classical source.

Lalique's knowledge of classical art is demonstrated in the scene depicted on the hair pin in Figure 57. The motif on this work appears to represent a struggle between three satyrs and a resisting nymph. The interpretation of the figure on the far left of the group as a female is due to the more slender and rounded body forms, the lack of a beard, and the different hair style. The theme of a struggle between satyrs and nymphs is common in Greek archaic, c.500 B.C., art and
the designation of satyrs with the use of a pointed beard and a tail is a characteristic often found in Greek vase painting (Fig. 58).

Other Greek characteristics may also be seen on this ornament. The rigid, frieze-like arrangement of the figures is typical of 6th Century Greek sculpture and vase decoration. The somewhat awkwardly leaning figure on the far right of the piece is especially similar in pose to the leaning male figure on the outside of the cup in Figure 59. The same leaning figure is seen in the row of figures depicted on the neck of the krater in Figure 60. As stated earlier, Greek vases and relief sculpture were available to Lalique through the Louvre collection and illustrations published in popular magazines and books.

The striding satyr closest to the female on this hair pin further exemplifies classical tendencies. He is posed in a manner suggesting a figure from Greek sculpted friezes (Fig. 61). Especially similar is the exaggerated stride and the "frozen" character of arrested motion in his position. Because of the lack of factual information on Lalique's stay in England it is not possible to say conclusively that he did see the collection of Greek sculpture in the British Museum, which included the section of the Halicarnassus relief shown in Figure 67. However, it is difficult to believe Lalique would not have taken advantage of the opportunity to see the famous collection in London. It should be remembered there were ample opportunities for Lalique to have seen illustrations
and casts of Greek relief sculpture.

Even in this piece so obviously indebted to classical sources Lalique has used fastidious elements to heighten the elegance of the ornament. One example of this is seen in the use of the small rounded areas in the ends of the leaf forms around the center section. These small areas, where diamonds are placed, echo the larger play of spaces between the legs of the figures. Another indication of Lalique's refinement may be seen in the relationship between the "busyness" of the feet and that of the scalloped design at the bottom of the pin. This heightened elegance of purely decorative areas, somewhat in contrast to the more narrative center, is very typical of Lalique's personal style.

The influence of classical art is also seen in the pendant in Figure 62. The standing female figure is reminiscent of Greek sculpture in its relaxed controposto pose, the supporting pedestal at the left of the figure, and the indication of drapery. Lalique has retained the slightly heavy proportions of classical sculpture in this female figure but the emphasis upon the curving contours suggest his interest in stylizing the figure type rather than reproducing an exact replica of a Greek statue. In this respect the figure is somewhat reminiscent of the heavy female bathers in Renoir's paintings in the late 1880s.

Another association with classical sources is suggested by the foliage around the figure in the pendant. The exact nature of the foliage is difficult to ascertain from the
illustration but the arrangement of the small round shapes and the leaves suggest clusters of grapes. These could indicate an association between the female figure and the rites of Dionysus and possibly explain the slight sensuousness in the form.

The combs in Figures 63 and 64 continue to suggest an influence of classical art. The classical source suggested by these pieces is not so much Greek art as Roman, and especially Roman wall decoration such as those at Pompeii. The association between Pompeian reliefs and Lalique's jewelry was first noted by Jean Lorrain in Le Journal, May 27, 1898, when he referred to a comb in Lalique's exhibit of that year as "...le peigne aux trois graces: un vrai motif de bas relief pompeien...."21

The comb to which Lorrain referred might have been the one in Figure 63. Especially Roman-like is the frieze arrangement of the three figures. The use of a framed shallow space with decorative panels above and below the figures and the geometrical border (behind their heads) could further associate the style of this comb with Pompeian reliefs. In the Dionysiac Mysteries at the Villa of Mysteries at Pompeii the figures are placed in shallow spaces which are divided into panels with smaller panels and borders above and below the main frieze of figures. That this was a typical method of composing a wall painting at Pompeii is established by the similar use of framed panels for the paintings at the House of Vetti at Pompeii.
Although not cited by Lorrain, the comb in Figure 64 also utilizes a Roman theme—a dancing figure with a flower wreath. The use of the flower swags or wreaths on these two combs is another indication of Lalique’s awareness of Roman art. This characteristic, typical of Roman sarcophagi decoration and wall paintings, was known by 1881 when it was cited in a discussion of Roman painting by Wilhelm Lübke. 22

In each of these combs, however, Lalique has given an individual interpretation which characterizes his personal style. The decorative panels above and below the figures on the comb in Figure 63 are not related to Roman designs but rather are stylized blossoms closely resembling sunflowers and their leaves. The flowers Lalique used on the swag and the wreath are also characteristic of his style in that they suggest rather common flowers, perhaps daisys, which he has made extraordinarily dainty with the use of diamonds for the centers (Fig. 64). The serpentine curve of the flower wreath in Figure 64 is another non-Roman stylistic device. This undulating wreath which not only dominates the comb top but also almost completely engulfs the figure with its pulsating movement is very characteristic of the Art Nouveau style. 23

Furthermore, there is a strong sensuousness in the female figures on these combs which is unlike even the Hellenistic renderings of female figures. Lalique has emphasized the curving body forms beneath the clothing and stylized the contours of the figures with a flowing linear treatment which echos the flowing lines of the wreaths.
That the inspiration for Lalique's bracelet in Figure 65 was a Greek vase is determined through the use of amphora-like shapes for the mountings, the frieze arrangement of the female figures, and the decorative bands of geometric designs at the top and bottom of each vase. The use of a light colored figure on a dark background suggests the "red figure" style of Greek vase painting. A similar treatment is found on the corsage ornament in Figure 66 but the vase shape used here resembles a Greek krater rather an amphora (note the handles).

Lalique's treatment of female forms on these two pieces represents a point of departure from classical art. The female in Greek art is usually clothed in thin clinging robes or shown with drapery nearby (Figs. 67 and 68). Lalique has used neither thin robes nor any indication of drapery. He has elongated the female forms and placed them in somewhat sensuous positions which are accented by the curvilinear contours. The obvious display of the nude forms through this lack of drapery and the sensuous stylization of the figures adds a note of elegant refinement to these works. It also suggests Lalique was aware of the elegant and erotic type of nude characteristic of late French Mannerism (as in the School of Fontainbleau) and the eighteenth century Rococo period. Lalique would certainly have had access to this elegant stylistic treatment of the nude through the Fontainbleau stucco decorations or Jean Goujon's Nymphs on the Fontaine des Innocents in Paris (1548-1549). The Rococo's sensuous and erotic nude had been revived by the Symbolist painters
of the late nineteenth century and was used by many artists, including Odilon Redon and Gustave Moureau. That this type of erotic nude was popular with Art Nouveau artists is evident from her appearance in the works of Aubrey Beardsley, Eugene Grasset, and Gustave Klimpt.

French Mannerism, Rococo art, and Symbolist paintings may have been influential in Art Nouveau's, and Lalique's, sensuous treatment of female figures but another more related possible influence was the sculpture and ceramics of Rodin. Not only was the late nineteenth century the period in which Rodin worked with classical and mythological themes as Lalique was doing, but it was also the period of Rodin's "refined erotic" style. Between 1884 and 1894 Rodin produced Eternal Springtime (1884), The Kiss (1886), The Eternal Idol (1889), and The Fall of an Angel (1894). All of these works present sensuous themes depicted with elegantly refined nudes and highly finished surfaces. Similar nudes and sensuous themes were used on Rodin's ceramics of the 1880s (Figs. 70 and 70a). This sensuousness is very similar to that seen in Lalique's bracelet and corsage ornament in Figures 65 and 66.

There are also non-classical-non-Rococo elements in this bracelet and corsage ornament which illustrate Lalique's desire to produce a personal stylistic elegance. The heart shaped arrangement of the diamond covered pod-like forms around each "vase" is an especially personal motif. These forms, in no way related to a Greek vase, emphasize the
"preciousness" of each mounting, both in the use of diamonds and in their arrangement which accents the sharp tapering of the amphoras. This tapering, in turn, echoes the tip-toe daintiness of the female figures on each "vase" and adds to the extreme elegance of the work.

Two other works by Lalique which are related to classical sources are the comb in Figure 71 and the corsage ornament in Figure 72. While the original source of the Medusa image on the comb in Figure 71 is Greek mythology, Lalique may have found encouragement for the use of mythological subjects in Symbolist paintings, such as Gustave Moreau's Oedipus and the Sphinx (1864). Similarly, the coil of snakes in Figure 72 is reminiscent of the Greek mythological Hydra. This was also a subject used by Moreau in 1864 in the painting Hercules and the Hydra of Lerna.27 In Lalique's Hydra ornament a non-classical decadent effect results from the sensuous writhings of the opulent bodies of the snakes and the depiction of strings of pearls spewed from their mouths. These pieces represent Lalique's most complete transformation of classical images into personal motifs which characterize his own time period.

This analysis of Lalique's use of classical motifs and styles illustrates that he was not merely interested in reviving antique art. He freely combined influences from other periods and artists in a single piece of jewelry. It should be noted that while these works have been arranged on a sliding scale beginning with Lalique's most strictly classical
and ending with his most freely interpretive use of classical motifs, this does not in any way reflect a chronological stylistic development. Lalique was not consistent in his use of classical motifs and he did not develop from a strict classicist to a freely interpretive borrower of classical ideas or vice versa.

Explaining Lalique's use of classical sources only in relation to the general nineteenth century interest in antique art is not sufficient. It must also be understood in relation to his personal career. The dates of these pieces, 1898 to 1905, do not indicate Lalique depended upon the acceptance of classical motifs while trying to build up his reputation and following. He was fairly well established by 1897, having won a first place medal at the salon of that year.\(^28\) Neither can these pieces be explained as a reaction to the criticism he began receiving in 1901 as most of these pieces were done before that time and of those done after 1901, especially the bracelet and corsage ornament in Figures 65 and 66, most demonstrate great departures from classical tendencies.

These somewhat conservative pieces derived from classical sources are possibly understood in the context of Lalique's apparent concern for financial security. This desire, which was noted in Chapters I and II, again seems to be expressed here. It should be remembered Lalique was purchasing and redecorating his new home and atelier in 1902-1903 and perhaps his conservatism at this time, especially obvious in the pendant in Figure 62, was related to these added financial
demands. Certainly his Salon exhibits of 1902 and 1903 did not include as many unusual pieces as it had in 1900. The general public appreciation of classical art, as reflected in museum collections, publications, and acceptance of artists who utilized classical styles and themes, could have been an indication to Lalique that the market for classically derived works could be pushed to include jewelry. The suggestion that Lalique was astutely responding to a lucrative popular taste rather than developing a personal interest is supported by the relatively few pieces utilizing classical elements.

The number of classically inspired works seems especially small in comparison with the number of works analyzed in Chapter IV which show influences of Japanese art. The lack of chronological stylistic development and the consistency with which Lalique altered the classical motifs he used further indicate he was not a strict "classicist." Rather it seems he turned to the accepted classical motifs when he needed them. Capitalizing upon public taste for classical subjects would have enabled Lalique to attract the conservative and historically minded sector of the public who might have objected to his more unusual creations incorporating insects and flowers. Lalique's buying audience perhaps was not as limited as it would have been had he not utilized this traditionally accepted style.
FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER III

1 Roger Marx, "Les Maîtres Décourageurs Français René Lalique," Art et Déroration, VI, 1899, pp.17-18. The complete list of sources cited by Roger Marx was:
   Il n'ignore ni les découvertes des fouilles égyptiennes, grecques ou étrusques, ni les trésors du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance, ni les créations si particulières de Byzance, du Caucase, de l'Extreme-Orient, voire même de l'Amerique;..."

2 See page 39.

3 See pages 38 and 39.

4 Adolf Furtwängler, Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik, Berlin, 1892. The English edition, Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture, was published in London in 1905.

5 Wilhelm Lübke's History of Art was first published in 1860 in Stuttgart. By 1881 there were seven editions of this book and it had been translated into several languages.


7 Gazette des Beaux Arts, June, 1885, pp.465-472.

8 It should be remembered that independent study at the Louvre was very popular in the nineteenth century. In view of this general interest in studying museum collections the Louvre collection of antique art should not be underestimated as a possible source of ideas for Lalique. See Theodore Reff's article "Copyists in the Louvre, 1850-1870," in The Art Bulletin, XLVI, 1964, pp.552-563.

9 Edmund Pottier wrote many other books in the late nineteenth century on Greek vases including: A quoi sert un musée de vases antiques (Paris, 1894); Les Céramiques de la Grèce propre (Paris, 1885-1910); and Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines d'après textes et les monuments (Pottier did section D to E in 1892 and section F to G in 1896.)

65
10 Academies of Art, Past and Present, University Press, Cambridge, 1940, p.257. Concerning this method of teaching figure drawing from casts Pevsner states:
The first educational task must be to transmit to the student the general principles of art and these have never been more perfectly expounded by the Greeks. Hence a school must introduce pupils to antiquity before the study of nature is begun.
He further states:
And since drawing from life, one has to leave out ugly accidental features, casts from antiquity are the most stimulating interpretation of the human body that any school of art or decorative can possess.

11 Ibid., pp. 258-259.

12 The most recent study of this is Barbara E. White's article, "Renoir's Trip to Italy," The Art Bulletin, LI, 1969, pp.333-352.

13 Rodin serves here as an example of many artists working throughout the nineteenth century with classical motifs. He was selected because of the possible association he and Lalique might have had in 1895. See page 54.


16 Elsen, Rodin, p.207.

17 Ibid., p.208. It should also be remembered that in 1880 Rodin was awarded the commission to execute the doors of the future Musée des Arts décoratifs.

18 In 1905 Art et Décoration published an article entirely devoted to Rodin's ceramics. This same article by Roger Marx was published as a book in 1907. Roger Marx was the one who cited the articles in Revue des Arts décoratifs and in l'Image. See Art et Décoration, XVII, 1905, pp.117-128.
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The role of historicism in Art Nouveau is discussed in S. Tschudi Madsen's Sources of Art Nouveau, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1955, pp. 84-85.

As quoted by Roger Marx in "Les Maitres Décorateurs...," pp. 20-21.


Toulouse-Lautrec's posters of popular dancers in Paris in the late 1890s often contained similar concepts of dancing figures engulfed by pulsating linear motifs. Jane Avril and Loie Fuller were two dancers which Lautrec depicted in this manner. Loie Fuller's act consisted of moving sections of her very full skirt in serpentine patterns around her. Under colored lights she indeed seemed engulfed in the linear patterns of her skirt.

Compare the figure facing forward on the fourth "vase" from the left on the bracelet to Goujon's Nymph in Figure 69.

The inference of a direct relationship between Rodin and Lalique is based on their both exhibiting in Bing's 1895 Salon.


Gustave Moreau was quite well known at the end of the nineteenth century. He exhibited in the Salon from 1852 to 1868 and in 1892 he accepted a teaching position at the École des Beaux Arts. His work was also exhibited at the 1900 Exposition Universelle.

Not only was Lalique's reputation well established by 1898 but it was shown in Chapter I of this paper that his reputation and following were built upon his unusual creations for theater stars and his joaillerie work for established jewelry firms. (See pages 14-18.)

See page 23.

It is to be remembered, of course, that this is based on
the examples of Lalique's work illustrated in the popular magazines of his time. Perhaps further investigation will produce more examples of Lalique's work with classical motifs and themes.
CHAPTER IV

RENE\' LALIQUE'S RELATIONSHIP TO AND USE OF NINETEENTH CENTURY JAPONISME

The influence of Japanese art on Rene\' Lalique's jewelry was first noted by Henri Vever in 1898. In his review of the jewelry at the Salon of that year, Vever referred to the "d\'écors d'ombelles qui rappelle certaines laques du Japon" noticeable on the comb in Figure 73. Before examining this comb and other examples of Japanese influenced work by Lalique it is necessary to determine Lalique's relationship to the Japonisme craze in France in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The cult of Japan began in the Parisian art world in the late 1850s with the opening of small import shops such as Mme. de Soye's La Porte Chinoise. Soon other import shops selling Japanese objects opened along the Rue de Rivoli and the department stores and small shops along the Seine began selling Japanese prints. The knowledge of Japan and its art was disseminated in France through various mediums. There were exhibitions such as that at the Paris World's Fair in 1867. Several types of publications on Japan appeared in the 1860s, including travel guides, scholarly cultural studies, and articles in popular magazines. Among the authors of these publications was Leon de Rosny, Professor at the College of France, who taught courses on Japan and the Japanese language in the 1850s and 1860s. In 1861 he also published a textbook on Japanese culture. Five years later Zacharie Astruc published
two articles on Japan under the title "l'Empire du Soleil levant" and somewhat later he wrote a play with a Japanese setting entitled L'Ile de la demoiselle.5

The popularity of Japanese art with the leading painters of France was firmly established by the late 1860s. This is demonstrated by the use of Japanese motifs in their paintings, such as in Monet's The Green Wave (1864) and The Lady with Fans (1867), Manet's Portrait of Zola (1868), and Degas's Madame Camus (1869). The formation of the Société du Jing-lar and the collecting of Japanese prints by leading French artists further demonstrate the popularity of Japanese art in Paris in the 1860s.6

It was not, however, only the painters who found inspiration in Japanese art; its impact was almost as strong on the French decorative artists in the 1860s. It should be noted that the first exhibitions of Japanese art in France were predominantly made up of objects such as folding screens, furniture, and bronzes (Fig. 74). The early collections of Japanese art by Frenchmen predominantly included decorative art work.

In 1868 Philipe Burty recorded the French decorative artists' interest in Japanese art in his book Les Emaux cloisonnés anciens et moderne by noting the use of Japanese motifs in French jewelry and ceramics.7 His reference to the use of Japanese motifs in ceramics may well have been related to Félix Bracquemond's Rousseau Service, also known as "le service Japonais." Burty had reviewed this service after it
was exhibited at the 1867 Fair. In the Rousseau Service
Bracquemond utilized animal motifs and poses from Hokusai's
Mang-wa, a fifteen volume collection of wood block prints
depicting many subjects including plants, animals, fish,
insects, wrestlers, and people.  

An example of jewelers using Japanese motifs and tech-
niques was the father and son team of Alexis and Lucien Falize.
Their firm was instrumental during the 1860s in initiating
an interest in Oriental cloisonné enamel techniques. A
specific use of Japanese motifs by Lucien Falize may be seen
in the enamel works in Figures 75 and 78. The chatelaine is
especially Japanese inspired in the use of the chicken motif
(Fig. 75). This motif is taken from Hokusai's Mang-wa and
Falize's rendering of the legs and feet of the small chicks
is especially similar to Hokusai's treatment of the legs of
the chicks in the upper right corner and the lower right
corner of Figure 76. The cloisonne medallions in Figure 78
further demonstrate Lucien Falize's use of Japanese motifs
and principles of art. The flat, two dimensional treatment
of the forms, the objects presented from oblique angles, and
the clearly defined areas of color suggest the style of
Japanese prints (compare Figs. 78 and 79). Lucien Falize
acknowledged his admiration and use of Japanese art in an
article in 1880 in Artistic Japan by stating that he had
borrowed ideas from Japanese designs. 

Other decorative artists whose work in the late 1860s
showed an influence of Japanese art included Bouilhet,
Barbedienne, Emile Reiber of Christofle and Co., and Eleanor Escallier. This last artist designed and exhibited a dinner service in 1867 which incorporated Japanese-like plants and birds on a white background.\textsuperscript{13}

In the 1870s the popularity of Japanese art in Paris increased. This is evidenced by the opening of more import shops, including August Sichel's *Maison Sichel* and Samuel Bing's shop.\textsuperscript{14} Appreciation of Japanese art continued to be a popular literary subject in the 1870s: Philippe Burty wrote a series of articles on *Japonisme* for *La Renaissance littéraire et artistique* (1872-1873); and Ernest Chesneau wrote "Le Japon À Paris" for *Gazette des Beaux Arts* in September of 1878.

The increasing public interest in Japanese subjects is reflected in the books, periodicals, and plays which come out in the 1870s intended for the public audience. These included Aime Humberts' *Le Japon Illustre*, D'auDiffret's *Globe Trotter à Japon* (a travel guide), Steenacker's *100 Proverbs of Japan*, the periodical *Revue des Deux-Mondes* (1874-1881), and the play *La belle Sainara* written by Ernest d'Hervilly.

Another indication of the increasing interest in Japan was the number of Frenchmen who traveled to Japan in the 1870s. Included among those were Theodore Duret (art critic), Samuel Bing and August Sichel (dealers in art objects), and Émile Guimet and Henri Cernuschi (collectors of Japanese art).

Similarly, Parisian exhibitions of Japanese art continued during the 1870s. In 1873 Cernuschi's collection of Chinese and Japanese bronzes was exhibited at the Union Centrale des
Arts décoratifs. This same collection was exhibited at the Exposition Universelle of 1878 and then given to La Ville de Paris. 15

The widely dispersed knowledge and growing public appreciation of Japanese art increased the impact of Japonisme on French decorative arts of the 1870s. Ernest Chesneau referred to this impact in his article of 1878 in the following way:

Le Japon nous emprunte nos arts mécaniques, notre art militaire, nos sciences, nous lui prêtons ses arts décoratifs. Si le moins du monde on se piquait de pêdantisme, on pourrait écrire un mémoire solennel sous ce titre: "De l'influence des arts du Japon sur l'art et l'industrie de la France." Cette influence qui est considérable manifeste, avouée et même proclamée avec une certaine ostentation dans nos industries du bronze, du papier peint, de la céramique, pour ne citer que les principales, s'est exercée d'une façon latente, plus violée, mais non moins effective sur le talent de certains peintres en possession de la faveur publique. 16

Examples of this impact may be seen in Ernest Chaplet's experiments in the early 1870s to develop Japanese-like glazes. From 1872 to 1881 the ceramics of Haviland and Company were decorated with Japanese inspired designs and glazes under the direction of Chaplet and Félix Bracquemond. Artists working with Bracquemond and Chaplet at Haviland and Company included Habert, Midoux, Lambert, and Albert Dammouse. 17

Another artist whose work reflected a Japanese influence in the late 1870s was Émile Galle. His experiments with glass of a transparent amber color and his use of insects in 1878 indicate his interest in Japanese art at this time. 18

The works of these artists were shown along with Japanese art in the late 1870s. At the Exposition Universelle of 1878
there was not only a large Oriental section, but also many French works which were Japanese in style. Included among these was Félix Bracquemond’s Service Parisisan which combined Japanese and Impressionist motifs in a new style. It should be remembered that Lucien Falize’s enameled chatelaine utilizing motifs from Hokusai’s Mang-wa had been shown in 1876 (Fig.75). These events and examples of artists influenced by Japanese art demonstrate that Japonisme was well established in the Parisian art world by 1875 when Rene Lalique began his apprenticeship.

The interest in Japan within the French environment is only one aspect of the Japonisme in Lalique’s background. In 1878 Lalique left Paris for England but he remained within an environment interested in the Far East. The English interest in Japan had begun with the Japanese participation in the World Exhibition of 1862 in London. Awareness of Japanese art was dispersed in England in a manner similar to that of France, that is, through import shops (Farmers and Rogers’ opened in 1862 and Liberty’s shop opened in 1875), exhibitions (as the 1862 exhibition in London), and use of Japanese motifs in paintings.

The artist especially influential in developing an appreciation of Japanese art among English artists was James McNeil Whistler. Whistler’s role in the English Japonisme is explained by William M. Rosetti in discussing the beginnings of Japanese influence in England in his book Some Reminiscences:
...the Japanese mania...began in our quarters towards the middle of 1863, and later in that year I wrote for The Reader an article on a certain book of Japanese woodcuts. They are the work of Hokusai.... It was Mr. Whistler who first called my brother's attention to Japanese art; he possessed two or three woodcut blocks, some colored prints and a screen or two....

Examples of Oriental motifs found in Rosetti's work include an embroidery border of Japanese bamboo leaves and a large red and gold enamel ornament in The Beloved, painted in 1865. The influence of Japanese art upon British painters was noted by John Ruskin in a letter dated February 18, 1867. He wrote, "There has been an increasing interest in Japanese art, which has been very harmful to many of our own painters...."

English publications on Japan also played an important role in cultivating an interest in the Far East. These began in 1859 with Cornwall's Two Journeys to Japan. Charles Eastlake's Hints on Household Taste (1869 and 1872) called attention to the high quality of Japanese taste. A series of four articles on Japanese art written by Sir Rutherford Alcock appeared in The Art Journal from 1875 to 1878. These articles were compiled into a book entitled Art and Art Industries in Japan published in 1878, the year Lalique arrived in England.

As the French industrial artists had used Japanese motifs in their work so did the English industrial artists use Japanese motifs. Whistler's interior decoration for the Leyland house had begun in 1867 with the staircase panels "imitating lacquer decorated with sprigs of pale rose and white flowers in the Japanese taste."

The famous Peacock
Rooms were complete in 1877, the year prior to Lalique’s arrival in England. In 1876 The Art Journal noted a gilt silver dinner and dessert service made by R. and S. Garrard and Company for the Japanese ambassador. This service was designed by Mr. William Taylor who”...has adhered strictly to Japanese notions of ornament and decoration."29 Other English decorators utilizing Oriental decoration and furnishings included Edward Godwin, William E. Nesfield, R. Norman Shaw, and Henry Jekyll.30

When Lalique returned to Paris in 1880 the Japonisme craze was even more firmly established than when he left. The French ceramic sections of the Paris Universelle Exhibition of 1878 had been singled out for comment in the 1880 Magazine of Art because of the "amazing number of reproductions of old faience, and even of the porcelain of China and Japan."31 In 1883 there were two major exhibitions of Japanese art: the "Ancient Art of Japan" was held at la Rue de Seze32 and the "Salon annual des peintres japonais" was at the Gallery Georges Petit. This latter exhibition was organized by Louis Gonse for the Union centrale des Arts décoratifs and the catalogue for it was written by Samuel Bing.33 By 1889 l’École des Beaux Arts had exhibited Japanese prints, and the Musée Guimet, devoted entirely to Oriental art, had been established in Paris.

Two major periodicals devoted exclusively to Japanese art and its appreciation appeared in the 1880s. These were Louis Gonse’s L’Art Japonaise and Samuel Bing’s Artistic Japan (1888-1891).

In 1888 Bing published an article in Artistic Japan on
the art of jewelry "...as practiced in Japan." The author, Lucien Falize, cited the Japanese use of nature as inspiration for jewelry and praised it as "free, picturesque, and daring." Falize explained that the Japanese craftsman were not bound by the values of gold and silver but rather they saw the precious materials as colors to be mixed with iron, copper, lead, and other semi-precious materials. Acknowledging his own use of Japanese art Falize stated he had borrowed "...from Japanese designs the idea of cloisonne enamels which I made..." This article on Japanese jewelry is typical of the articles in Artistic Japan in that it combines both information and appreciation of the Far East.

The literary appreciation of Japanese art continued in the 1890s. In 1891 Roger Marx wrote an article entitled "on the Role and Influence of the Arts of the Far East and of Japan" for Artistic Japan. Samuel Bing's article "La vie et l'oeuvre de Hok'sai" appeared in 1896 in La Revue Blanche and Louis Gonse's "L'Art Japonaise et son Influence sur Le Gout Europeen" appeared in Revue des Art décoratifs in 1898. The extent of Western knowledge in the 1890s of Japanese art and culture is ascertained from the introductory paragraph of Arthur L. Liberty's article "The Industrial Arts and Manufacture of Japan":

During my three months' stay in Japan observation convinced me that there is little to add to our technical knowledge of the Japanese industrial art which has not already been exhaustively detailed by the eminent and well known authorities long resident in the country.

The relationship between Japanese art and French decorative art of the 1890s is best illustrated in the person of Samuel
Bing. Bing's role in developing the appreciation of Japanese art in France had begun in the early 1870s with the opening of his import shop. He continued to be active in Japonisme through his trip to Japan, his collection and sale of Japanese objects, his association with French exhibitions of Japanese art (in his own shop and in preparing catalogues for other exhibitions), and his publishing a periodical devoted to the appreciation of Japanese art and culture.

As early as 1888, however, Samuel Bing had demonstrated an interest in the decorative arts. In the introductory article of Artistic Japan Bing wrote that his publication was "especially addressed to those persons who, on any grounds, are interested in the future of the industrial arts....." In 1895 Bing established himself as patron of the decorative arts by turning his Japanese import shop into a shop for decorative arts. To announce publicly his new role Bing held Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau. This exhibit, which consisted mostly of decorative arts, was held in his renovated Japanese import shop at 22 Rue de Provence. Along with Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau was a smaller companion exhibition of Japanese art. It is interesting to note that many of the decorative artists invited to exhibit in Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau were admirers of Japanese art.

Samuel Bing's companion exhibitions of "art nouveau" and Japanese art are important aspects of the Japonisme in René Lalique's background for he was one of the French decorative artists invited to exhibit in this 1895 salon. The associa-
tion with Bing at this time definitely places Lalique in a position to have seen Japanese art in Bing's shop and to have been aware of the admiration for the art of the Far East by Bing, his friends, and decorative artists. In 1895 in Bing's salon Lalique was in a position not only to have seen Japanese art but also contemporary Western work which was influenced by Japanese art. Among those artists included in Bing's exhibition was Albert Dammouse who had been creating Japanese influenced ceramics since the late 1870s. Auguste Delaherche, a co-worker of Ernest Chaplet's in the late 1880s, exhibited Japanese-like ceramics in Bing's show. Other artists interested in Japanese art included in Bing's salon were Emile Galle, Eugene Grasset, and Aubrey Beardsley.

Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau was not the only place where Lalique was able to study Japanese influenced work. Lalique also exhibited at the annual Salon of 1895 in the section of decorative arts. Here too, Lalique was in a position to see works by French decorative artists utilizing Japanese motifs, including ceramics by Dammouse and Delaherche. The inlaid panels in Figures 80 and 81 by Schuller and Chevrel were exhibited in the section of decorative arts. The animal motifs (especially the frogs, rabbit, and swimming fish) and the water lilies and pads are all motifs found in Hokusai's Mang-wa. These two 1895 exhibitions in which Lalique participated, Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau and the annual Salon, allowed him to see Japanese inspired works in two artistic milieus - the avant garde setting and the accepted Salon setting.
It was three years later that Lalique's awareness of Japonisme in France and England was documented by Henri Vever in his review of the jewelry at the 1898 Salon.\textsuperscript{44}

The relationship between French decorative art and Japonisme is not the only aspect of this influence on Lalique's jewelry style. It will become evident in the study of Lalique's jewelry that the one consistent element in his style is a use of nature. Lalique's interest in nature is within the French nineteenth century tradition where the rendering of nature was a consistent theme in French art beginning with the Barbizon painters. It was still a major concern of French art at the end of the nineteenth century as demonstrated by the Impressionist movement and the botanical interests of Symbolists painters, such as Odilon Redon. However, it should be noted that the Impressionists' concern with nature was influenced by Japanese prints. This influence is seen in the types of views the Impressionists chose to depict, the various angles of viewpoint used, and the colors used.\textsuperscript{45}

Similarly, nature as a source of inspiration was the subject of writings in the nineteenth century. One of the first writers to deal with the use of nature in ornament was Owen Jones in his The Grammar of Ornament (1856).\textsuperscript{46} In 1858 Christopher Dresser expressed a similar concern in his article "Botany as Adapted to the Art and Art Manufacture" in the Art Journal.\textsuperscript{47} Dresser further developed these theories in his books Unity in Variety, as Deduced From the Vegetable Kingdom
(1859) and *Principles of Decorative Design* (1873). It is interesting to note that both of these authors also wrote on the Far East. In 1867 Owen Jones's *Examples of Chinese Ornament* was published. Dresser's *Japan-Its Architecture, Art and Art Manufacture* was published in 1882. Dresser's association with Japanese art predates his book for he served as art advisor to a Japanese import firm in London in the 1870s. His knowledge of Japanese art was of such repute at that time that only upon his approval were goods placed for sale by the firm.

Further associations between these Western theories on nature and Japanese art were established in 1879 by Sir Rutherford Alcock. In a discussion on Japanese art in the *Art Journal* Alcock utilized Dresser's theories to emphasize the Japanese dependence upon nature for inspiration.

Similar writings appeared in France in the last decade of the nineteenth century. These included Ary Renan's article "Animals in Japanese Art" in *Artistic Japan* in 1890 and Eugene Grasset's *Les Plant et Ses Application Ornamentales* (1897-1899). Therefore, the emphasis placed upon nature by Lalique could be interpreted as another aspect of the Japanese influence, thus adding to the preponderate impact of this source upon his Art Nouveau jewelry.

Having established the environment which created the awareness of Japanese art in both France and England where Lalique worked, as well as his relationship to the *Japonisme* of the late nineteenth century, it is now possible to examine
his works to see results from this influence. Since the purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate Lalique's use of Japanese motifs and compositions the works have been arranged in groups based on a similarity of subject matter or stylistic treatment.

The comb cited by Vever in his 1898 review is not the first piece by Lalique which shows a Japanese influence (Fig. 73). In 1897 Lalique exhibited a diadem of hanging fuchia blossoms and repeated this motif in a more stylized design on a comb in 1898 (Figs. 82 and 83 right). The depiction of long slender forms gracefully hanging from a leafy branch or the curved top of the comb back is similar to the effect of Japanese renderings of wisteria branches. Another comb dated c. 1900 has an even more wisteria-like decoration (Fig. 84). In this comb the small buds are less stylized than the previous examples and their shape and arrangement more closely approximate a hanging wisteria vine. Hanging branches of wisteria are a characteristic motif of Japanese art and are found in prints, tapestries, and on ceramics (Figs. 85-87).53

Lalique not only utilized the motif of the hanging wisteria but he also adopted the principle of asymmetrical balance characteristic of Japanese compositions. On the diadem in Figure 82 the blossoms, placed predominantly on the lower right of the pin, are counter-balanced by the spread of leaves on the upper left of the pin thus establishing an asymmetrical organization. This same asymmetrical compositional principle was used in the arrangement of the lily-of-the-valley blossoms on
the comb in Figure 88.

The association between the floral forms Lalique used as motifs for jewelry designs and those typical of Japanese art was not confined to the hanging wisteria blossoms. He also utilized an iris motif as seen in Figures 89 and 90. The popularity of the iris in Japanese art may be determined from its extensive use in prints and on folding screens (Figs. 91 and 92). What is not similar to the Japanese approach in Lalique's use of the iris on his bracelet in Figure 90 is the manner in which he has twisted the stems and leaves to make a dominant pattern of sensuously curving lines. The translation of floral motifs, especially stems and leaves, into undulating linear patterns was a typical characteristic of the French Art Nouveau style. 54

Still another flower type Lalique used which suggests Japanese sources was a five petal blossom similar to the flower of fruit trees or shrubs (Fig. 93). The profusion of leaves around these blossoms further suggests a flowering tree or shrub as its source. Flowering trees were often found in Ukiyo-e prints and on Japanese textiles.

Although the inspiration for the use of a flowering shrub motif may have come from Japanese art, Lalique has treated his subject in an extremely personal way. The naturalistic branches of flowers have been arranged in a careful composition based on a continuously curving linear rhythm. The obvious indication of branches, the delicately pointed leaves, the depiction of the vein-patterns of each leaf, the careful
touching and overlapping of the leaf tips, and the directional arrangement of the blossoms all serve to establish a rhythmical pattern which encircles and thereby emphasizes the stone in the middle of the ornament. This eurhythmic pattern relieves any sense of static symmetry in this rather formal arrangement and the emphasis upon linear movement places this piece well within the stylistic tendencies of Art Nouveau.

The flowers in Figure 94 also suggest a Japanese source as they resemble a lotus blossom or water lily. Although partially the result of the enamel technique the flowers appear very Japanese in their flat, two dimensional rendering and arrangement. This type of flat, simple flower is characteristic of both Ukiyo-e prints and ceramics (Fig. 95). That Lalique was not interested in directly copying Japanese motifs is evident from his use of a leaf form which is not related to either a lotus flower or a water lily. There is also a contrast between the flat rendering of the flowers and the sculptural arrangement of the leaves in bunches which overlap each other.

It is evident from Figures 96 and 97 that Lalique considered even the most common plants as suitable motifs. The arrangement of the seed pods in Figure 96 recalls the hanging flowers of the diadem of 1897 (Fig. 82) especially in the balance of different length parts. The rendering of the specific surfaces of the pods, leaves, and twisting vines demonstrates Lalique's careful observation of nature. A similar concern with surfaces and patterns of the veins of the leaves is seen in Figure 97.
This focusing upon the details of nature was one characteristic of Lalique's jewelry which some nineteenth century critics attributed to a Japanese influence. In his article on Lalique's jewelry Gustave Geffroy said, "Comme les Japonais, il a demandé ses secrets à la nature."55

Landscape scenes were also utilized by Lalique in the design of jewelry. On the comb in Figure 98 he has used the free form shapes of Western foliage and while the trees themselves do not suggest Japanese influences, the spatial treatment of this grove of trees does. Lalique suggests spatial recession with a horizon line and a varied placement of the base lines of the tree trunks but the resulting effect is Japanese in its flatness and two dimensionality. The tree trunk pattern against the ground and the oblique viewpoint from which the trees are viewed counteract spatial recession. This type of pattern effect and viewpoint is often found in Japanese landscape prints, such as Hokusai's The View at Yotsuya (Fig. 99).

The decoration on the comb in Figure 100 is associated with Lalique's use of Western tree motifs in that the design is based on maple tree seeds. In the arrangement of the maple seeds, however, Lalique has incorporated Japanese-like graceful curving lines in an asymmetrical composition. The delicacy of this composition is accentuated by the interplay of positive and negative areas within the open spaces of the comb top.

Lalique's use of the typically Japanese compositional devices,
especially asymmetry, has already been noted in several works discussed in this paper. The buckles in Figure 101 represent still another aspect of his use of Japanese compositional devices. Here the carefully controlled interplay of negative and positive interior space and exterior shape is very similar to the negative and positive areas of Japanese sword guards (tsuba) (Figs. 102 and 103). The floral motifs of the buckle in the lower left corner of Figure 101 and those of the sword guard in the lower left corner of Figure 102 especially exemplify this shared concern.

This interest in Japanese compositional devices is also found in two comb cases by Lalique in Figure 104. The Japanese daggar cases from Louis Gonse's collection, reproduced in L'Art Japonaise in 1883, provide a similar shape for comparison with Lalique's comb cases (Fig. 105). Lalique's vertical elongation of the subject was not necessitated by the shape of the comb for he could have utilized a horizontal composition on this type of comb case. His choice of a tall narrow decoration suggests a conscious imitation of the Japanese vertical composition typical of scrolls, painted screens, and daggar cases. The motifs used by Lalique are also reminiscent of Japanese motifs and the placement of the bumblebees at the top of the case suggests Japanese asymmetry. One wonders if even the idea of making a somewhat common functional article - a comb case - into a decorative object was not strengthened by the Japanese penchant of making functional objects works of art.56
One more aspect of the Japanese influence in Lalique's jewelry cited in 1898 by Henri Vever was Lalique's use of the fish. His use of this motif was again commented on in 1905 by Gustave Geffroy. As neither man referred to the style of the fish forms it seems their association of this motif with Japanese art was on the basis of subject matter. Indeed, the illustration accompanying Theodore Duret's article "On Combs" in Artistic Japan in 1890 firmly establishes the use of the fish as a decorative element on Japanese combs (Fig. 106). This comb design used by Duret to illustrate his article is a reproduction from Hokusai's Imayo sekkin hinagate (New Models of combs and pipes) of 1825.

As shown in Figures 107-109 the style of Lalique's fish is also similar to Japanese renderings of fish (Figs. 110 and 111). Especially Japanese-like are the bent tails and turning bodies, the large open eyes, and the careful attention to the flowing fin-like forms around the mouths. The attempt to show the fish gliding in water is also rendered in the Japanese manner with lines to indicate the water (Figs. 112 and 113).

The jagged forms and widespread fins of the fish in Figure 109 suggest that Lalique was attempting to render a specific type of fish such as the Flying Fish. Likewise, the pose suggests a fish in the act of jumping or rising out of the water. This is a subject also found in Japanese art as demonstrated by Figure 110. There are, of course, differences between these two renderings in that Lalique's is much more stylized, especially in his treatment of the jagged edges of the fins.
Perhaps this was a conscious distortion to relate the teeth-like edge of the fish's fins to the teeth of the comb. This kind of integration between design and function was not uncommon in Art Nouveau.

The inclusion of the nine figures on the corsage ornament in Figure 103 is another non-Japanese element. While the symbolism of these figures could only be surmised they do suggest a narrative interest which is not related to the Japanese-like fish motif. The stylistic treatment of these figures is reminiscent of the anguished figures struggling on Rodin's Gates of Hell. This combination of two styles on one piece of jewelry demonstrates Lalique's determination not to make a direct copy of any source.

Another type of imagery utilized by Lalique which is related to the influence of Japanese art was insects. One of the best known sources of insect motifs in Paris was the sketchbook of Hokusai known as the Mang-wa. Not only were complete copies of it available in Paris but individual pages from it were published in periodicals. Figure 114 depicts an illustration from the Mang-wa reproduced from the 1888 volume of Samuel Bing's Artistic Japan. Such pages were also reproduced in English periodicals. Figure 115 depicts a page of drawings of insects from an unidentified Japanese sketchbook reproduced from the 1876 Art Journal. There was also much literature on the Mang-wa published by admirers of Japanese art, including Ary Renan's article "Hokusai's Mang-wa" in Artistic Japan and Samuel Bing's "La vie et l'oeuvre de Hok'sai" in La Revue Blanche.
That the Mang-wa was known to decorative artists in the second half of the nineteenth century is demonstrated by Félix Bracquemond's use of motifs from it on his Rousseau Service of 1867 and Lucien Falize's use of it was a source of motifs for his enamel jewelry of the late 1870s. 63

The Mang-wa was not the only Japanese source of insect imagery known in Paris in the late nineteenth century. Yet a second Hokusai sketchbook entitled Haya Shinan (Book of Quick Sketching) was known in Paris at this time and it provided "how to draw" diagrams of insects (Fig. 116). 64 Insects were also often the main motif in Japanese prints as the Utamaro print in Figure 117 demonstrates. This print was reproduced in 1897 in W. Von Seidlitz's Geschichte des Japanische Farbenholtzsnitts. 65

Sources in Western art have been cited for Lalique's use of insect imagery. These Western sources are the ceramics of Bernard Palissy 66 and the sculpture of Antoine-Louis Barye. 67 Palissy's sixteenth century ceramics did incorporate images of snakes, fish, frogs, insects, and plants as shown in Figure 118. Pieces of Palissy's work were available to Lalique through museums, for example the dish in Figure 118 was in the Louvre collection by 1877. 68 There was also much interest in Palissy's ceramics during the nineteenth century, as is indicated by the seventy-four books dealing with Palissy and his work published in the nineteenth century. 69 Two of these publications on Palissy especially related to Lalique were Gustave Geffroy's Bernard Palissy (1881) and Philipe Burty's
Bernard Palissy (1886). It should be remembered Geffroy was an admirer of Lalique's work and Burty was an important figure in Japonisme and a supporter of the decorative arts. Despite this interest in Palissy, it is difficult to accept the atypical example of his insect imagery on sixteenth century ceramics as the dominant influence upon Lalique in view of the more accessible and popular sources in Japanese art.

In reference to the animal sculpture of Barye it should be remembered that Barye was more interested in depicting larger animals such as stags, jaguars, and lions. Even more important is Barye's major concern with the expression of conflict and the romantic association of the forces of nature. This is not the expression of nature which is found in Lalique's insect imagery. He, like the Japanese artists, seems to express an admiration for the beauty of nature as expressed in its smallest beings.

The insect imagery used by Lalique included grasshoppers, beetles, butterflies, bumblebees, wasps, and dragonflies (Figs. 119-130). Most of these examples demonstrate fairly naturalistic renderings of the insect. Lalique has produced this naturalistic effect through the use of specific details, such as the thin legs of the grasshoppers and the long narrow bodies and diaphanous wings of the dragonflies. He has added to the naturalism of the insects by suggesting their natural habitat, as the flowers on the ornaments with bumblebees and wasps (Figs. 124 and 125). Attention to details and suggestions of natural habitat are two common characteristics of Japanese
renderings of insects as seen in the Utamaro print in Figure 117.

Lalique did not limit himself to Japanese-like naturalistic renderings alone. Insect forms were used to make decorative designs as shown in Figures 121, 123, and 129, and a "head-to-head" arrangement was often used (Figs. 119 and 120). This type of composition is found occasionally in Japanese art (on sword guards) but it is more common in Middle Eastern or Creten art (Fig. 131). This type of hierarchical arrangement denies the naturalism suggested by the detailing of the insects and, as with the grasshoppers and beetles in Figures 119 and 120, they tend to become elegantly "pretty" forms rather than a depiction of common ground insects. The "prettiness", which contrasts with the naturalistic rendering of the wasps in Figures 126 and 127, demonstrates Lalique's ability to depict a common motif in an elegantly refined manner and still retain a sense of the insect's natural characteristics. The fastidiously "refined naturalism" of Lalique's two brooches is obvious if they are compared with brooches of the same subject by Eugene Fontenay (Figs. 43 and 44). A similar synthesis of naturalism and elegance is seen in the butterfly brooch in Figure 123. Retaining the recognizable features of a butterfly Lalique has stylized parts of this insect to make a decorative design; this is especially evident in the elongation of the wings and the claw-like treatment of their ends. The formal symmetry of this piece emphasizes the design aspects of the motif instead of the naturalism.
One of Lalique's most unusual uses of an insect form is the dragonfly brooch in Figure 132. Although the dragonfly was a popular motif in Japanese art, the inspiration for this piece can not be attributed to that source alone. The startling combination of a female torso and a body of a dragonfly connects this piece with the imagery and iconography of French Symbolism. Similar combinations of a female torso and a serpent body are found in Odilon Redon's lithograph Death, Mine Irony Surpasses All (1898) and in Auguste Rodin's vase "Limbo and the Sirens" (Fig. 71a). But neither of these artists rendered this motif with the sharp detailing or popular symbolism that Lalique did. His female is neither a siren from the past (as Rodin's is) nor a subjective representation of the artist's dream imagery (as Redon's is); Lalique's female is a representation of the late nineteenth century's attitude toward the female personality:

The jewel depicting the half-swallowed woman presents precisely the blend of the morbid and the sordid which flourished in the 1890s. It illustrates the complete transformation of the female personality: Woman is now shown as one with the venomous and predatory creatures of the night.73

As with his other insect imagery, Lalique has depicted the naturalistic details of the dragonfly but he has exceeded the limits of naturalism in the richness of the wings and the exaggeration of certain features, such as the claws. The positioning of the insect's wings on the female's shoulders indicates the non-naturalistic aspects of the piece. Although at first glance the insect seems to be in the process of either devouring or discharging the female from its mouth, the positioning of the wings on her shoulders and the nonplused
expression on her face indicate that the female figure has actually become a part of the insect. The theme of bejewelling a common member of the animal kingdom combined with a sense of morbidness has a precedent, not in Japanese art where the insect is appreciated for its own shape and natural decoration, but in the bejewelled turtle of Des Esseintes in À Rebours. Of all the imagery used by Lalique this corsage ornament, in its theme and extremely elegant rendering, represents one of his most accurate expressions of the "decadence" of the fin du siècle. In relationship to his personal style this piece illustrates Lalique's ability to synthesize influences from several different sources into an image characterizing his own time period.

Figure 133 demonstrates an example from another area of Japanese art which Lalique used extensively. The theme of birds in flight is found in all areas of Japanese art. It was used by Japanese artisans to decorate combs, as Theodore Duret's article "On Combs" demonstrates and it was a popular motif in Hokusai's Mang-wa. Along with the Japanese motif Lalique used a symmetrical composition on this hair ornament. The vertical elongation of the wings which forms the prongs of the comb is slightly off center and is balanced by the horizontal spread of the upper wings and the stalk of grain. Not only is this hair pin Japanese-like in its motif and composition, it is treated in a similar manner to a reproduction of a flock of birds used in conjunction with Ary Renan's article entitled "Animals in Japanese Art" in Artistic Japan in 1890.
Although the stylization of the shape of the birds is similar to those reproduced in *Artistic Japan* there is an important difference which represents Lalique's personal style. Lalique has strengthened the elegance of the stylized forms by emphasizing the details of the bird's markings and by adding a single stalk of grain in the beak of one bird. This addition of fastidious decoration to already decorative forms was a personal stylistic tendency of Lalique's and it will be seen in several of the following pieces presented in this paper. It seems to represent Lalique's effort to create a personal image out of a rather commonplace or standard motif.

Two other bird species popular in Japanese art which Lalique utilized were the cock and the peacock (Figs. 135, 138-141). While the original inspiration for the use of these birds was Oriental art, they had been popularized by England's Aesthetic Movement and by the time Lalique used them they were standard motifs. But the idea of using a cock for a hair pin or a peacock as a collar is unique with Lalique and these works demonstrate his ability to utilize a basic motif in a new fashion. With the cock, for instance, he did not use Japanese methods of "proud" poses, arched necks, and elongated tail feathers to indicate its ornateness (Fig. 136). Instead, Lalique expressed the richness of this bird by adding surface decoration, as in the intricate webbing of the comb and wattles. The addition of the diamond in the open mouth and the areas of enamel on the comb tips further stress the opulence of the bird.
Characteristically the attraction of the peacock as a decorative motif has been its long tail feathers. Japanese artists often used placement to emphasize the peacock's elegant tail feathers, as seen in Hokusai's rendering of a peacock on a branch (Fig. 137). But there is also an interest in the shape of the whole bird which is used here to counterbalance the diagonal direction of the branch. Lalique, like most Art Nouveau artists, was more interested in the tail feathers than in the whole bird (Figs. 138-141). He stressed the feathers by elaborately adding jewels (or satin on the embroidery collar) to indicate their eyes (Figs. 138 and 139) or by enlarging and elongating them until they serve as the dominant motif, especially in the collar and the pin in Figures 140 and 141.

The corsage pin in Figure 142 is another example of Lalique's ability to produce a personal interpretation of a standard Art Nouveau motif. The image of a female with long flowing hair was very popular in late nineteenth century Western art. This type of female representation had become popular during the Pre-Raphaelite movement and was used by many Art Nouveau artists. The graphic art of Lalique's British contemporary, Aubrey Beardsley, provides many examples of female images with long flowing hair. The drawing by Beardsley in Figure 143 was published in The Studio in April of 1893 and Beardsley's work was exhibited at Bing's Salon de l'Art Nouveau in 1895 so Lalique could have known some of his work.

Still another Western source where Lalique might have seen this type of emphasis upon decorative forms of hair was in the
work of Jan Toorop. The poster *Delftsche Slaolie* of 1895 demonstrates Toorop's use of long flowing strands of hair to form a decorative pattern (Fig. 144).

Similar images were also available to Lalique through *L'Art Japonais*, as demonstrated by the figures in the reproductions of two illustrations from this magazine (Figs. 145 and 146). The flowing forms in these examples result from the type of clothing worn by the figure rather than her hair but the drapery completely dominates the figure and serves the same decorative purpose as the long strands of hair in Beardsley's and Toorop's works.

The area at the bottom of Lalique's corsage pin (Fig. 142) strongly suggests Japanese influence. The forms curling inward to represent the ends of hair are similar to the type of swirling forms used by Japanese artists in depicting breaking waves. One example of this wave motif may be seen in the sword guard (middle row on the left in Fig. 103) reproduced in *Artistic Japan* in 1888. Neither Beardsley nor Toorop used such a deliberate pattern for the ends of hair in their work; instead they allowed the hair to integrate with the background.

Lalique's personal interpretation of this type of female image with long flowing hair is expressed in his complete elimination of a body. Both of the Western artists, Beardsley and Toorop, and the Eastern artists retained the body of the female. By eliminating the body Lalique focused attention on the delicateness and the decorative linear pattern of the hair. He then strengthened the fastidious elegance of the sensuously
linear hair patterns with the addition of small diamond flowers. This touch of fastidious decoration to an already decorative form is another example of the stylistic tendency which several of Lalique's works have shown, including the hair ornament with the two birds in flight (Fig. 133). 79

One of the most interesting examples of a combined Eastern and Western influence upon Lalique's jewelry is demonstrated in the pin in Figure 147. The depiction of human forms entwined with snakes immediately brings to mind the Greek Hellenistic Laocoön (Fig. 148), thereby suggesting this piece should have been included among the jewelry discussed in relation to Classical art. However, the reproduction of an engraving in the 1883 volume of L'Art Japonais (Fig. 149) establishes the inclusion of this pin among Lalique's works influenced by Japanese art. The illustration in Figure 149, which was taken from Hokusai's Mang-wa, has essentially the same subject as Lalique's pin and the Laocoön. A comparison of the three works shows that Lalique's stylistic treatment of the snakes seems closer to the rendering of the eels in Hokusai's work. The Greek artist and the Japanese artist have both represented three figures in their works. Although Lalique's pin utilizes seven figures, the design is actually composed of two groups of three figures arranged around the stone and a central figure between the two stones. Furthermore, the two side groups merely reverse the positions of the figures. A comparison of one of these groups of three figures with the figure grouping of the Laocoön and the Hokusai compositions shows the similarity.
between Lalique's figure grouping and Hokusai's. The emphasis upon a vertical movement in the figure grouping by Lalique and Hokusai is in contrast with the more horizontal grouping of the Laocoön.

The relationship of the figures to the snakes is similar in Lalique's pin and Hokusai's composition. In both the figures are closely entwined with the snakes. The poses of the individuals in these two works suggest that they are trying to climb up the bodies of the snakes by pulling against them. The figures in the Laocoön attempt to repel the snakes by thrusting them away.

The poses used by Lalique on the pin resemble Hokusai's poses more than those of the Laocoön figures. The figure on the bottom right corner of Lalique's pin is especially similar to the seated individual in the lower right corner of Hokusai's work. Both are shown in a back view with the left arm stretched out to clasp the body of a snake. Their heads are turned upward and the left leg has been placed over the snake's body. Although the figures in the Laocoön turn and twist, none are represented in a back view.

The emphasis in the Laocoön group is upon the articulation of the body and the expression of human anguish. The pyramid arrangement, the gestures, and the directional gazes of the young boys are the main compositional devices in the Laocoön. While the snakes aid in the composition they mainly serve a narrative role. The articulation of the body is less emphasized by Lalique and Hokusai and their compositions are more dependant
upon the curving forms of the snakes. This compositional
importance of the snakes is demonstrated in the use of sweeping
and more gentle curves by Lalique and Hokusai. This is in
contrast to the tight, almost zigzag pattern of the snakes in the
Laocoön.

That Lalique's pin is closer to Hokusai's rendering of
this subject should not be surprising. The realism and anguish
of the Greek work was not suited to the late nineteenth century
emphasis upon elegance and refinement. The emphasis upon
graceful lines and forms in the Japanese work is much more in
tune with the interests of Art Nouveau. Lalique's ability to
translate this somewhat gruesome subject into an elegant piece
of jewelry again demonstrates his ability to satisfy the
late nineteenth century's fastidious taste for sensuously
pleasing forms.

These forty examples of Lalique's use of Japanese motifs
and compositions definitely establish the importance of the
Japonisme influence in Lalique's jewelry. There are not only
more examples of Japanese inspired work than there were of
Classically inspired, but the dates of these pieces which
range from 1897 to 1908 indicate Japonisme was a longer lasting
influence. In view of the popularity of Japanese art in France
in the nineteenth century and Lalique's astuteness in working
with popular tastes, it is difficult to determine specifically
if Lalique was himself a Japoniste or if he was simply meeting
the taste of the public. However, the lack of significant
changes between most of Lalique's Japanese-like work and the
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possible Japanese source indicates a more sympathetic approach toward it than was expressed toward classical sources.

There is one aspect of Lalique's Japonisme which can not be conclusively proven but which is worth mentioning. He seemed to have drawn many of his Japanese motifs and ideas from magazine illustrations, and especially from Samuel Bing's Artistic Japan and Louis Gonse's L'Art Japonais. Of the comparative material on Japanese art in this paper all but nine of the illustrations are found in these two periodicals.

Because of Lalique's acknowledged importance in Art Nouveau his extensive use of Japanese motifs and stylistic devices suggests important implications concerning the French Art Nouveau movement. The recognition of Japanese art as a dominant source of Lalique's style suggests Japonisme played a more important role in the French Art Nouveau movement than has hitherto been indicated. Not only did Japonisme provide new motifs and stylistic devices, it gave support to the Art Nouveau belief in the importance of decorative arts. Lalique's extensive use of decorative combs is one example of this. Japanese combs were often cited as the source of inspiration for Lalique's interest in making a utilitarian object, such as the hair comb, into a work of art. Japonisme should no longer be considered a "fad" of the 1860s which led to Art Nouveau. Rather it should be recognized as a dominant influence active during the height of the Art Nouveau movement.
FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER IV


2 *Japonisme* was a term coined by Philippe Burty in 1872 to denote the appreciation of Japan in France.


5 Ernest Chesneau, "La Japon A Paris," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, XVII, 1878, p. 388. The play written by Astruc, although cited by Chesneau, can not be found.


7 G.P. Weisberg, "Félix Bracquemond and *Japonisme*," *Art Quarterly*, XXXII, 1969, p. 28. (The most recent study of Philippe Burty is G.P. Weisberg's article "Philippe Burty, a Notable Critic of the Nineteenth Century," *Apollo*, XCI, pp. 296-300.


9 See page 41.

10 Falize's familiarity with the Ukiyo-e albums was noted by Philippe Burty in his book of 1868. I am indebted to G.P. Weisberg for this information.

11 Lucien Falize might also have been familiar with Japanese motifs through Félix Bracquemond's etchings (Fig. 77) of Japanese motifs copied from Hokusai. Examples of Bracquemond's etchings of Japanese motifs were published in periodicals of the day, such as the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Falize was also
probably familiar with Bracquemond's Rousseau Service (1866-1867) which incorporated motifs from the Mang-wa. This service was exhibited at the Fair of 1867 and at the Union Centrale in Paris, in institution to which Lucien Falize devoted much time.

12 See page 77 and footnote 3\textsuperscript{4} below.

13 G.P. Weisberg, \textit{Seminar}.

14 Bing had one Japanese import shop at 22 Rue de Provence which he later renovated for Le Salon de l'Art Nouveau.


17 G.P. Weisberg, \textit{Seminar}.


19 \textit{Ibid}., p. 149.


27 Another English periodical which often published articles with reference to Japanese art and culture was *The Magazine of Art*. See the series of articles in 1880, III, on decorative art written by Lewis F. Day.


31 *Magazine of Art*, I, 1880, p. 235. G.P. Weisberg has pointed out to me that the Chinese and Japanese porcelains referred to were from the collections of Bing, Burty, and Gonse and that many of the journals were filled with information of these collections.


37 Bing's relationship to *Japonisme* and Art Nouveau is thoroughly discussed in G.P. Weisberg's articles in the October and December 1969 issues and the January 1970 issue of *Connoisseur*. I am indebted to these articles for most of the following information.


40 See page 18.

41 Henry Hope, *The Sources of Art Nouveau*, p. 137.

42 See *Art et Décoration*, XIX, 1900, p.52 for a discussion of Delaherche's Japanese influenced ceramics.


44 See page 69.


52 The relationship between Western interest in nature and admiration of Japanese art is a basic problem of Art Nouveau which is only sketchily outlined here. This is an area which needs more study.

53 The illustration of the tapestry here is reproduced from Samuel Bing's *Artistic Japan*, I, pl. B, 1888. It is a detail of a tapestry in Bing's private collection and would therefore have been available to Lalique.


56 See page 100 and footnote 82 below.


60 See page 71 and footnote 8 above.


63 See page 71 and Figure 75.


65 Published in Dresden by G. Kuhtman. See page 151.
66 Pol Neveaux, "René Lalique," Art et Décoration, VIII, 1900, p.130. It should be remembered Lalique attended a modeling class at l'École Bernard Palissy in the early 1880s.

67 Gustave Geffroy, "Des Bijoux a Propos de M. René Lalique," p. 185. It should be noted that a large book entitled L'Oeuvre de Barye by Roger Bailu with an introduction by Eugene Guillaume was published in Paris in 1890.


70 Geffroy's admiration of Lalique's work was expressed in his 1905 article "Des Bijoux a Propos de M. René Lalique," in Art et Décoration.

71 Burty's support of decorative arts began as early as 1868 with his book Les Emaux cloisonnés anciens et moderne. See page 70 and footnote 7 above.

72 Even the wasp motif itself may have had its source in Cretan art. The association between Lalique's extensive use of the wasp motif and Cretan art was suggested to me by Mrs. Janson. See footnote 81 below.


74 Robert Baldick, Transl. Against Nature, by J-K Huysman, Baltimore, 1959, pp. 53-62. There were jeweled insects in jewelry before Lalique (see Fontenay's beetles and grasshoppers in Figures 42-44) but the sense of "terror" and the implication this has toward females was not in the earlier jewelry. The associations between Lalique's work and Huysman's book are, of course, my own ideas and as yet I have not been able to specifically determine that Lalique actually knew Huysman's work.


Mr. Selz states, "...the peacock's tail feathers occur more often than the whole bird...."

Ibid., p. 16. Mr. Selz states:
Almost to the exclusion of men, it is the woman who dominates the Art Nouveau world and the aspect of woman which pre-occupies the artist is her hair - long, flowing hair which may merge with the drapery of become part of the general wavy configuration.

See page 94.

Two examples in which this tendency seems especially true were the hair ornament of the two birds in flight (Fig. 133) and the corsage ornament of the figures entwined with the snakes (Fig. 147).

Mrs. Dora Janson has also noted Lalique's use of magazines. In a letter to me she stated:
He apparently was a browser in all kinds of illustrated journals and books, as one can gather from his quick translation of ideas picked up from them into jewelry designs (I traced two of his pieces illustrated in Vever to a print by Jan Toorop which he must have seen shortly after it was issued, ca. 1893). And the whole wasp development which he started in the early 1900's, and which was so liberally copied by others, can be traced - I believe - to a Cretan brooch which was uncovered just about then by a French archeological expedition, and which must have been written about at the time. I also traced certain shapes and motifs (in my paper) to the Bell publication of Rossetti's works...."

Henri Vever, "Les Bijoux aux Salons de 1898," p. 273. Vever refers to Theodore Duret's article "On Combs" in *Artistic Japan*, V, 1890, pp. 335-342, which establishes the Japanese as the first to use combs as decorative ornaments. Vever supports this belief by stating that before Lalique's ornamental combs the only Western decorated combs were for liturgical use and not for everyday use. It is interesting to note that neither Duret nor Vever made any reference to the tall backed Spanish comb which must have been known in France at least since the revival of interest in Spain in the 1860s.
CONCLUSION

This analysis of René Lalique’s biography and jewelry has disclosed two dominant themes in his jewelry career. One theme, based on my own interpretation of events in Lalique’s life, was his cautious attitude toward his financial situation. This cautiousness was exercised in several ways, including his desire to obscure the less illustrious periods of his career, especially his English sojourn and early work. Henri Vever supports this interpretation of Lalique’s cautious attitude about information on his early career in his book *La Bijouterie française au XIXe siècle*.¹

The events surrounding Lalique’s decision to purchase his own jewelry manufacturing firm was also indicative of his reserved nature. He not only waited some time before deciding what to do, but even after accepting the new responsibility he tried to maintain his free lance associations with former patrons rather than depend entirely upon his own establishment.

Even Lalique’s participation in exhibitions exemplified this cautious aspect of his personality. He exhibited anonymously until assured of acceptance and then, with but one exception, he entered his jewelry only in accepted Salon exhibitions. The one time Lalique showed outside the Salon was in Samuel Bing’s Salon de l’Art Nouveau in 1895. While this exhibition did receive some adverse criticism, it was certainly not considered a scandalous show as, for example,
had been the Salon de Refusés. Furthermore, Lalique carefully built up a "following" with two different types of clientele before exhibiting on a large scale. These two types were the established manufacturers of joaillerie and the well known stars of the theater, including Sarah Bernhardt. In this way Lalique might have managed to keep ties with both the conservative and the imaginative traditions of nineteenth century jewelry design. Lalique's astuteness in business matters was again indicated in 1910. As his individuality in jewelry was being challenged by imitators of his style, he very shrewdly changed mediums and went into the production of glass.

The second theme established in my presentation of Lalique's jewelry career was his ability to respond to popular tastes. It was shown that Classical and Japanese art, the two sources investigated in this paper, were both quite prevalent with artists, critics, and the general public when Lalique was producing his jewelry. This combination of popular tastes and Lalique's caution in financial matters suggests René Lalique was not only a creative artist but a practical businessman as well. The selection of either of these sources assured Lalique of appreciation by their admirers -- the Japonistes and the Classicists. His working with both sources provided him with followers from both groups and indeed he did have them, as seen in the praise of his work by Henri Vever, a collector of Japanese art, and the unknown London reviewer for International Studio who found it a shame
Lalique used his talents for other than classical motifs. If Lalique was only responding to his personal concern for financial security and to popular tastes -- where then lies the basis for the recognition of his leadership in the style of Art Nouveau? Demonstrating, as I have attempted to do, where Lalique got his motifs and why he may have selected these particular ideas does not detract from the fact that Lalique did develop a distinctly personal approach whether he was working with Classical or Japanese sources. Although he was not revolutionary in his choice of forms, as both Classical and Japanese motifs were widely used at this time, the ways Lalique employed them were unique. Many of the subjects he used, human figures, flowers, birds, and insects, were common to Art Nouveau, but before Lalique, they were not predominantly found in jewelry in such naturalistic renderings, unexpected combinations, and unusual materials. A glance through the third volume of Henri Vever's *La Bijouterie française au XIXe siècle* will illustrate the school of exoticism and fantasy which Lalique was credited with having fostered in the early 1900s.

It was shown in Chapters III and IV that Lalique adopted specific motifs and compositional devices from his chosen sources. Although his debt to these sources is often quite obvious, Lalique did not actually copy either source directly. Neither did he depend on it entirely for he always added a personal interpretation to whatever source he used. Often this was by a subtle combination of several sources on one
piece of jewelry, as in the Rococo nudes on the classical vases, the Art Nouveau sunflowers as a border design in a Pompelian relief, the Rodin-like figures combined with Japanese style fish, or a Japanese dragonfly infused with Symbolist iconography. Lalique also synthesized Classical and Japanese motifs to make jewelry which was expressive of his own time. This was found especially in the last piece discussed in this paper, the brooch of figures entwined in the snakes.

Many Art Nouveau stylistic characteristics are found in Lalique's work. Examples of this are seen in the transformation of a classical wreath into a pulsating linear pattern encompassing a dancing figure or in the adaptation of a row of irises into sensuously linear designs to encircle the arm. Another characteristic of Lalique's style was the permeating of Classical and Japanese motifs with a sense of the morbidness and decadence of the late nineteenth century; this was especially evident in the Hydra-like knot of snakes and in the dragonfly devouring the female.

Two other personal distinctions of Lalique's style were noted in this paper. One of these was, what I have referred to as, "refined naturalism." This consisted of retaining specific identifying natural characteristics of his motif and then refining the motif to make an elegant rather than a naturalistic rendering. This was found especially in his insect imagery but may also be seen in the snakes in the Hydra ornament. The other distinctive quality of Lalique's personal approach to his jewelry was his repeated addition
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of fastidious details to already decorative forms as in the ornament with the satyrs, the bracelet of Greek vase shapes, the hair pins of the birds in flight and of the cock's head, the brooches of peacocks, and the corsage ornament of the female face with the long flowing hair. It is because of these qualities that his jewelry is more than just an indication of the popular taste of the late nineteenth century. By fusing the public's tastes with his own distinctive style Lalique created jewelry which was not only a personal statement but also an expression of the elegant and slightly decadent refinement of his time.

Another important aspect of Lalique's career was his influence on the public to accept his unusual jewels for personal adornment. Even his most fantastic creation, the dragonfly with the female in its mouth, was worn on several occasions by Sarah Bernhardt. Critics' opinions conflict on the extent to which Lalique's jewelry was actually for wearing, but each piece was capable of being worn. Furthermore, with the exception of Calouste Gulbenkian's collection, most of Lalique's jewels were not intended for large private collections when they were executed. Even if the jewels were not for wearing this would not greatly affect Lalique's role in Art Nouveau. The functional aspect of decorative arts was important to Art Nouveau artists but the major concern was with the aesthetic appeal of the object. Therefore, if Lalique's jewelry was not truly intended for wearing, it would still have a place in Art Nouveau as miniature sculpture;
as an *objet d'art* and it would remain an accurate reflection of the passion for elegance and refinement in the *fin du siècle*. Therefore, the answer to the question of where lies the basis for acclaiming Lalique as a leader in Art Nouveau is found in his ability to translate current trends and tastes into a style which was representative of his time. It is this ability which lends undeniable support to the designation of René Lalique as one of "...les plus représentatifs de l'Art Nouveau."
FOOTNOTES FOR CONCLUSION

1 On page 699 of volume III Vever relates Lalique's embarrassment over his early amatuerish works and his wish they be destroyed.

2 By 1900 Lalique's clientele included Mme Vanda de Boneza, Mme la Comtesse de Bearn, Mme Robert de Bonnières, and Mme Waldeck-Rousseau. (See Léonce Bénédite, "La Bijouterie et La Joaillerie a l'Exposition Universelle de 1900. René Lalique," Revue des Arts décoratifs, XX, 1900, pp. 200-210 and 237-244.) I have not been able to find any information on the first two names cited by Bénédite. It is possible that Mme Robert de Bonnières was the wife of Guillaume-Francois Robert de Wierre de Bonnières, a writer of political brochures, light operas, and novels in the late nineteenth century. (See La Grande Encyclopédie, VII, p. 348). Mme Waldeck-Rousseau might have been the wife of René Waldeck-Rousseau, the prominent statesman of the late nineteenth century (La Grande Encyclopédie, XV, p. 1365). If these identifications are correct they give some indication of the prominence of Lalique's clientele but this is an area which needs further investigation.

3 While it is not within the scope of this study, there are works by Lalique which indicate these were not the only popular tastes to which he responded. This characteristic of Lalique's career will need further development in future studies on Lalique's jewelry.

4 "The Exhibition of Jewelry by René Lalique," International Studio, XXVI, 1905, p. 126:
...and in looking at all this energy put into the manufacture of an ignoble form of sham, it seems a pitiful waste of talents in one whose hands have often modeled in the Grecian spirit."

5 See page 1.

6 See page 19.

7 In 1900 Elizabeth Burke explained the acceptance of Lalique's work in this way:
The fashion for wearing diamonds was so universal that it was bound to be followed by a reaction, and when the liking for them crept into the minds of the newly rich and the vulgar, the decay of fashion was
begun. It was a revolution of taste that gave Lalique his opportunity and he rose to it. "The Lalique Jewels," *House Beautiful*, VIII, 1900, p.68.

In 1903 G. A. Fournier explained it in this way: Thenceforward, by his annual exhibitions at the Salon, he gradually forced himself upon the minds and the taste of an unsympathetic public who at first would hardly give him fair consideration, but whom he conquered by sheer pluck and artistic merit.

"The Master Jeweller René Lalique and His Work," *Magazine of Art*, N.S.I, 1903, p.25. The continued support and praise Lalique received from well known critics, as Roger Marx, and the more than ample coverage his work was given in the popular magazines must also have been a factor in the public's acceptance of his work.


9 See page 1.
APPENDIX A
ILLUSTRATIONS TO CHAPTERS I-IV

Fig. 1. Henri Vever. Pendant. c. 1900. Enamel and long pearls. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 678.

Fig. 2. Rene Lalique. Brooch. c. 1900. Enamel and pearls. From Schmutzler, Art Nouveau, p. 156.
Fig. 3. René Lalique. Design for a diamond pin. c.1884. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p.693.

Fig. 4. René Lalique. Joaillerie design of dogrose motif. c.1883 From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p.692.

Fig. 5. René Lalique. Joaillerie design with geranium motif. c.1884. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p.694.
Fig. 6. René Lalique. Diadem. c. 1899. Aluminum with bas-relief in ivory. Executed for Mme. Bartet in role of Bernice. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 721.

Fig. 7. René Lalique. Design for a headpiece for Theodora. Published in 1905. From Art et Décoration, XVIII, p. 186.
ce caractère ; il a créé des bijoux modernes, alors que toutes les formes, toutes les combinaisons purent paraître étranges.

C'est la, si je m'insiste, la grande erreur. La nature est im pensable, et chaque artiste vient y découvrir, à son tour, des formes de la vie insoupçonnées jusqu'ici. La nature, j'ai dit, a des autres, qui c'est à la fois l'inspiration et le hasard. C'est aussi la simplicité et la complication. Les choses d'abord, puis les austères des choses, sont impossibles, et impossibles aussi les formes de la sensibilité chez les artistes qui créent et exécutent tout ce qui se présente au raisonnement le plus pur et à la persévérance de leur esprit. Ce que M. René Lalique a dû cesser de perfectionner les braves visions de la nature et de la force, c'est une grâce dont qui n'échappe pas la force, c'est une force tendre, douce, effacée, qui n'existe pas la richesse. Cette richesse se fait pur, donne, car c'est une vision mieux que qu'il est presque décrit. Elle n'a pas d'écus sans mon, d'ap- penances insensibles. Elle se dissimule à l'œil des choses définitives

avoir été ouvrier, puis chef d'atelier chez Bagues, au 23, place Faillon, un atelier de bouclier où la fabrication était très active. Il avait aussi un atelier en Algérie, dont l'exploitation ne fut pas facilitée par la distance ; aussi, vers la fin de 1893,

Fig. 9. René Lalique. Brooch. c.1895. Amethysts and opals. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III p.703.
Fig. 10. Illustrations of two combs by René Lalique published in *The Artist*, XXIII, 1898, pl. 6. Horn and silver.

Fig. 12. René Lalique. Pendants exhibited in 1898. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 174.

Fig. 12a. Detail of Fig. 12. Pendant. c. 1898. Enamel and Emerald.

Fig. 12b. Detail of Fig. 12. Pendant. Plique a jour enamel and pearl. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 708.
Fig. 13. René Lalique. Pendant. c.1900. Oxidized silver, glass, and pearl. From Hughes, *Modern Jewelry*, p. 95.

Fig. 15. René Lalique. Necklace plaque. c. 1900. Enamel. From Nijssen-Giltay, Jewelry, p. 22.

Fig. 16. Examples of René Lalique's jewelry exhibited at the 1900 Exposition Universelle. From Marx's La Décoration et Les Industries d'Art a L'Exposition Universelle de 1900, p. 75.
Fig. 17. René Lalique. Showcase at the Exposition Universelle of 1900. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 735.

Fig. 18. René Lalique. Dagger with carved rhinoceros horn handle. c. 1901. Horn, steel, and silver. From International Studio, XXVI, p. 131.
Fig. 19. Section of the facade of René Lalique's home located at Cours la Reine. 1902. From Art et Décoration, XII, p. 163.

Fig. 19a. Door designed by Lalique for his home at Cours la Reine. c. 1902. Glass and iron. From Art et Décoration, XII, p. 164.
Fig. 20. René Lalique. Hairpin. c. 1903. From Art et Décoration, XIV, p. 223.

Fig. 21. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1903. From Art et Décoration, XIV, p. 216.
Fig. 22. René Lalique. Purse. c. 1903. Leather. From The Magazine of Art, I, p. 459.

Fig. 23. René Lalique. Purse with snake motif. c. 1903. From Mourey, Histoire générale de L'Art française de la Révolution à nos Jours, III, p. 181.
Fig. 24. René Lalique. Comb. c.1905. Ivory and gold. From *International Studio*, XXVI, p.130.

Fig. 25. René Lalique. Cup. c.1905. Ivory, enamel, and gold. From *International Studio*, XXVI, p.128.
Fig. 26. René Lalique. Ink stand. c.1905. Silver. From International Studio, XXVI, p. 133.

Fig. 27. Chardon. Buckle Design. c.1898. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 157.

Fig. 28. Chardon. Buckle Design. c.1898. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 158.
Fig. 29. Examples of Frederick Boucheron's 1878 exhibit at the Paris International Exhibition. From *The Art Journal*, IV, p. 174.

Fig. 31. René Lalique. Design for a joaillerie bracelet and brooch. c. 1884. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 695.

Fig. 32. René Lalique. Page of joaillerie designs. c. 1884. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 691.
Fig. 33. Froment-Meurice. Pendant in Renaissance style. c. 1855. Enamel. From Burty, E.D. Froment-Meurice, p. 71.

Fig. 34. Erasmus Hornick. Sixteenth century pendants. From Connoisseur, CLXVI, p. 56.

Fig. 35. Froment-Meurice. Examples of his 1878 exhibit at the Paris International Exhibition. From The Art Journal, IV, p. 333.
Fig. 36. Oscar Massin. Design for a pin with a dogrose motif. c. 1863. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, n.p.

Fig. 37. Oscar Massin. Design for an aigrette of plumes. c. 1867. Diamonds. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, n.p.
Fig. 38. Oscar Massin. Joaillerie bow. c. 1878. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, n.p.

Fig. 39. Oscar Massin. Joaillerie bow. c. 1864. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, n.p.
Fig. 40. Oscar Massin. 1878 Salon exhibit. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, III*, n.p.

Fig. 40a. Oscar Massin. Joaillerie rose from his 1878 exhibit. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, III*, n.p.
Fig. 41. Eighteenth century diamond jewelry. From Bradford Four Centuries of European Jewellery, p. 92.

Fig. 41a. Detail of Fig. 40. Eighteenth century brooch. Diamonds.


Fig. 45. René Lalique. *Joaillerie* necklace. c.1894. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, III*, p. 702.

Fig. 46. René Lalique. Design for a *joaillerie* pendant. c.1883. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, III*, p. 690.
Fig. 47. René Lalique. Design for a joaillerie pin. c.1884. From Vever, *La Bijouterie*, III, p.693.


Fig. 49. René Lalique. Joaillerie brooch. c.1889. From Vever, *La Bijouterie*, III, p.698.
Fig. 50. René Lalique. Joaillerie brooch. c.1890. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 699.

Fig. 51. René Lalique. Pendant. c.1900-1907. Glass, gold, enamel, and diamonds. From Hughes, Modern Jewelry, p. 99.
Fig. 52. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c.1900. Glass, gold, enamel, and diamonds. From Madsen, Art Nouveau, p. 26.

Fig. 53. Luis Masriera, designer. Brooch. c.1910. From Hughes, Modern Jewelry. p. 95.
Fig. 54. Auguste Rodin. Vase. "Night". c. 1880. From Descharnes, Auguste Rodin, p. 66.

Fig. 55. Auguste Rodin. Vase. "Night". c. 1880. From Descharnes, Auguste Rodin, p. 66.

NIGHT - 1880-1881 - Pompeian vase, porcelain. 12½ x 8½ in. Rodin Museum, Paris. This vase, judged defective as a result of a baking accident, was relinquished to Rodin by the Sevres factory. It is one of a pair, day and night, executed between December, 1880 and December, 1882.

Fig. 56. Auguste Rodin. Sections of the sculpted frieze from "Night". c. 1880. From Descharnes, Auguste Rodin, p. 66.
Fig. 57. René Lalique. Hair ornament. c. 1900. From Art et Décoration, VIII, p. 134.

Fig. 58. "Hermes and Satyrs" from a pepskter by Duris, c. 500 B.C. From Buschor, Greek Vase Paintings, pl. LXXII.
Fig. 59. Sections of outside of a Greek cup by Makron, c. 490 B.C. From Arias, A History of 1000 Years of Greek Vase Painting, pl. 132.

Fig. 60. "Herkles against the Amazons" from a volute krater by Euphronion, c. 510-500 B.C. From Arias, A History of 1000 Years of Greek Vase Painting, pl. 113.
Fig. 61. Detail of the relief sculpture from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. Marble. British Museum. From Lullies, Greek Sculpture, p. 216.

Fig. 62. René Lalique. Pendant. c. 1903. Ivory, amethyst, and enamel. From Art et Décoration, XIV, p. 224.
Fig. 63. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1898. Horn. From _Art et Décoration, III_, p. 178.

Fig. 64. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1898. Ivory, enamel, and diamonds. From _Art et Décoration, III_, p. 173.
Fig. 65. René Lalique. Bracelet. c. 1905. Engraved glass and diamonds. From *Art et Decoration*, XVIII, p. 188.

Fig. 66. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1905. From *Art et Decoration*, XVIII, p. 9.
Fig. 67. Examples of representations of female figures as used in late-fifth century Greek sculpture. From Beiber, The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age, Figs. 793-799.

Fig. 68. A section from a Greek vase showing the representations of females in Greek vase paintings. From Arias, A History of 1000 Years of Greek Vase Painting, pl. 203.
Fig. 69. Jean Goujon. Relief from the Fontaine des Innocents, 1548-49, Paris. From Janson, History of Art, p. 403.
Fig. 70. Auguste Rodin. Vase. "Limbo and the Sirens." c. 1880. From Descharnes, Auguste Rodin, p. 65.

Fig. 70a. Auguste Rodin. Detail of "Limbo and the Sirens." c. 1880. From Descharnes, Auguste Rodin, p. 65.
Fig. 71. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1899. From Art et Décoration, VI, p. 14.
Fig. 72. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1900. Enamel and pearls. From *Art et Décoration*, VIII, p. 135.

Fig. 72a. René Lalique. Detail of snakes in corsage ornament in Fig. 72. From Vever, *La Bijouterie*, III, p. 729.
Fig. 73. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1898. Horn. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, III*, p. 713.

Fig. 74. Siamese and Japanese sections of the Exposition Universelle of 1867. From Weisberg, *Art Quarterly*, XXXII, p. 56.
Fig. 75. Lucien Falize. Chatelaine. c. 1876. Cloisonné enamel and gold. From Vever, La Bijouterie, II, n. p.

Fig. 76. Hokusai. Page of birds from the Mang-wa. From Weisberg, Art Quarterly, XXXII, p. 63.

Fig. 77. Félix Bracquemond. Etching of birds after Hokusai. c. 1870. From Weisberg, Art Quarterly, XXXII, p. 61.
Fig. 78. Lucien Falize. Medallions. c. 1876. Cloisonné enamel and gold. From Vever, *La Bijouterie, II*, n.p.

Fig. 79. Hokusai. "Bullfinch and Drooping Cherry." Woodblock print. Late 1820s. From Naruzaki, *The Japanese Print, Its Evolution and Essence*, pl. 85.
La marqueterie, qui n’avait jusque-là qu’un rôle décoratif, est devenue un art à part entière à l’époque des arts décoratifs. Les ébénistes, tels que M. Cuvier, ont collaboré avec les artisans de la céramique et le verre pour créer des œuvres uniques. Les motifs floraux et géométriques sont exécutés à la main avec des techniques délicates.

En céramique, l’artiste M. Héroux a créé des œuvres de grande beauté, notamment des vases décorés de motifs floraux et géométriques. Les formes sont élégantes et harmonieuses, révélant une maitrise du métier.

Fig. 80a. Detail of Fig. 80.

Fig. 80. Schuller and Chevrel. Inlaid panels exhibited at the Salon of 1895. From Le Salon de 1895, p. 87.

Les boîtes de la maison Schuller et Chevrel sont également mises en valeur dans le Salon de 1895. Les motifs sont exécutés à la main avec une grande précision, montrant la maîtrise des artisans.

Fig. 81a. Detail of Fig. 81.

Fig. 81. Schuller and Chevrel. Inlaid panel exhibited at the 1895 Salon. From Le Salon de 1895, p. 86.
Fig. 82. René Lalique. Diadem. c.1897. Gold and enamel. From Art et Décoration, I, p. 68.

Fig. 83. René Lalique. Two combs exhibited in the 1898 Salon. Horn and opal. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 172.
**Fig. 84.** René Lalique. Comb with wisteria blossom motif. c. 1900. From Schmutzler, *Art Nouveau*, p. 157.

**Fig. 85.** Hokusai. Study of wisteria. Published in *Artistic Japan* in 1889, volume III, pl. - Fig.
Fig. 86. A Japanese tapestry with wisteria blossom motif. Published in *Artistic Japan* in 1888, volume I-II, pl.8. A detail from a tapestry in Samuel Bing's private collection.

Fig. 87. A Japanese ceramic with wisteria blossom motif. Jar by Ninsei, 1630-1690. From *Miller, Japanese Ceramics*, p.90.
Fig. 88. René Lalique. Comb. c.1900. Horn with white enamel lily of the valley blossoms. From Rheims, L'Objet 1900, pl. 47.

Fig. 89. René Lalique. Buckle. c.1897. Enamel iris blossoms. From Art et Décoration, II, p. 160.

Fig. 90. René Lalique. Bracelet. c.1897. Mauve enamel and opals. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 707.
Fig. 91. Hiroshige. "Iris at Horikiri." Woodblock print. From Lee, Japanese Decorative Style, p. 111, Fig. 123.

Fig. 92. Watanabe Shiko. "Iris." Pair of six-fold screens. From Lee, Japanese Decorative Style, p. 36.
Fig. 93. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1901. From *Art et Décoration*, IX, p. 185.

Fig. 94. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1900. Enamel water lily blossoms. From *International Studio*, XXVI, p. 132.
Fig. 95. Japanese ceramic published in *Artistic Japan* in 1888, volume I-II, pl.-IA.
Fig. 96. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c.1902. From *Art et Décoration*, XII, p. 36.

Fig. 97. René Lalique. Brooch. c.1902. Opal, gold, silver, and enamel. From *Art et Décoration*, XII, p. 34.
Fig. 98. René Lalique. Comb. c.1905. From International Studio, XXVI, p.131.

Fig. 99. Hokusai. "The View at Yotsuya." Woodblock print. late 1790s. From Narazaki, The Japanese Print, Its Evolution and Essence, pl. 80.
Fig. 100. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1900. From Art et Décoration, VIII, p. 132.

Fig. 101. René Lalique. Buckles and bracelets from his 1897 Salon exhibit. From Art et Décoration, I, p. 69.
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Fig.102. Japanese sword guards published in L'Art Japonais in 1883, volume II, page 149.

Fig.103. Japanese sword guards published in Artistic Japan in 1888, volume I-II, pl.-ACA.
Fig. 104. René Lalique. Comb cases. c.1908. Horn. From Art et Décoration, XXIII, pp. 196-197.
Fig. 105. Japanese dagger cases published in *L'Art Japonais* in 1883, volume II, page 101.

Fig. 105a. Detail of Fig. 105. Japanese dagger case.
Fig. 106. Hokusai. Comb design from Imayo Sekkin hinagata. This was published in Artistic Japan to illustrate Theodore Duret's article "On Combs," V, p. 338.

Fig. 107. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1905. Emerald, crystal and enamel. From Art et Decoration, XVIII, p. 185.
Fig. 108. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1905. Ivory, crystal and enamel. From Art et Décoration, XVIII, p. 179.

Fig. 109. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1898. Ivory. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 170.

Fig. 110. Japanese rendering of a fish. Illustration from L'Art Japonais, II, 1883, p. 331. A piece of Tokio in the collection of Samuel Bing.
Fig. 111. Hokusai. Engraving of a fish. Illustration in *L'Art Japonais*, I, 1883, p. 279.

Fig. 112. Hokusai. "Ducks in a Stream." Brush painting, c. 1847. From Hillier, *Hokusai, Paintings, Drawings, and Woodcuts*, p. 93.

Fig. 113. Hokusai. "Fishers and Seaweed Gathers." Page from the *Mang-wa*, vol. 4. From Hillier, *Hokusai, Paintings, Drawings, and Woodcuts*, pl. 43.
Fig. 114. Hokusai. Page of insects from the Mang-wa published in *Artistic Japan* in 1888, volume I-II, pl.-DF.

Fig. 115. Page of insects from a Japanese sketchbook reproduced in *The Art Journal* in 1876, volume II, p. 113.
Fig. 161. Hokusai. Page of insects from Haya Shinan. From Theodore Bowie, Drawings of Hokusai, p. 127.

Fig. 117. Utamaro. "Grasshopper and Caterpillar." Woodblock print. Reproduced in W. V. Seidlitz's Geschichte des Japanischen Farbenholzschnitts in 1897, p. 151.
Fig. 118. Bernard Palissy. Large oval dish. Louvre. Published in *The Art Journal*, III, p. 273, 1877.
Fig. 119. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c.1903. From Art et Decoration, XIV, p.216.

Fig. 120. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c.1904. From Art et Decoration, XV, p.165.
Fig. 121. René Lalique. Hairpin. c.1903. From *Art et Décoration*, XIV, p. 222.

Fig. 123. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1904. From Art et Décoration, XVI, p. 171.
Fig. 124. René Lalique. Comb. c.1902. From Art et Décoration, XII, p. 38.

Fig. 125. René Lalique. Pendant. c.1908. Enamel wasps with transparent wings and light blue flowers. From Art et Décoration, XXIII, p. 199.
Fig. 126. René Lalique. Hair pin. c. 1900. Enamel and opal. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 727.

Fig. 127. René Lalique. Brooch. c. 1904. Enamel, crystal and gold. From Vever, La Bijouterie, III, p. 742.
Fig. 128. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c.1908. Crystal, gold and enamel. From Art et Décoration, XVIII, p.177.

Fig. 129. René Lalique. Pendant. c.1900. From Schmutzler, Art Nouveau, p.269.
Fig. 130. René Lalique. Comb. c. 1905. Horn, topaz, and enamel. From *Art et Décoration*, XVIII, p. 178.
Fig. 131. Creten Pendant with representation of wasps. Gold. From *The Encyclopedia of World Art*, IV, pl. 66.
Fig. 132. René Lalique. Detail of Lalique's corsage ornament in the form of a dragonfly with a female torso in its mouth. Exhibited in 1900. See Fig. 52. From Hughes, *Modern Jewelry*, p. 96.
Fig. 133. René Lalique. Hair pin. c.1908. Swallows sculpted in horn and tinted. From *Art et Decoration*, XXIII, p.195.

Fig. 134. Illustration from Ary Renan's article "Animals in Japanese Art," in *Artistic Japan* in 1890, IV, p.269.
Fig. 135. René Lalique. Hair pin. c.1900. Plique a jour enamel and yellow uncut diamond. From Art et Décoration, VIII, p. 131.

Fig. 136. Hokusai. Page of cocks and other birds from the Mang-wa published in Artistic Japan in 1888, I-II, pl.-AI.
Fig. 137. Hokusai. Engraving of a peacock published in *L'Art Japanais* in 1883, II, p. 273.
Fig. 138. René Lalique. Brooch. c. 1900. Gold and enamel. From Rheims, L'Objet 1900, pl. 48.

Fig. 139. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1903. From Art et Décoration, XIV, p. 383.
Fig. 140. René Lalique. Embroidered collar with silver ornaments. c.1905. From *International Studio*, XXVI, p.133.

Fig. 140a. René Lalique. Embroidered collar in outspread view. From *Art et Décoration*, XXI, p.28.
Fig. 141. René Lalique. Brooch. c. 1900. Engraved gold, enamel, opals and diamonds. From Hughes, Modern Jewelry, p. 216.

Fig. 142. René Lalique. Corsage ornament. c. 1898. Face sculpted in agate; gold hair; and diamond flowers. From Art et Décoration, III, p. 171.
Fig. 143. Aubrey Beardsley. "Salome with St. John's Head." Drawing. c.1893. From Aubrey Beardsley Drawings, pl. -43.

Fig. 144. Jan Toorop. "Delftsche Slaolie." Poster. c.1895. From Schmutzler, Art Nouveau, p.149.
Fig. 145. Illustration from L'Art Japonais, I, p. 175, 1883.

Fig. 146. Illustration from L'Art Japonais, I, p. 218, 1883.
Fig. 147. René Lalique. Pin. c.1902. Figures in ivory and snakes in enamel. From *Art et Décoration*, XII, p. 34.

Fig. 148. The Laocoön Group. First century Greek. From Janson, *Key Monuments of the History of Art*, p. 155.

Fig. 149. Hokusai. Engraving from the *Mang-wa* published in *L'Art Japonais* in 1883 volume I, page 100.
Dear Miss Booth:

What a shame! My husband is teaching the second half of summer school at the U. of N. Carolina and that is ending an Aug. 24! So the chances are that we won't be here by the time you have to terminate your short stay in New York.

Perhaps the loss is more mine than yours: I have not yet made my all-out attack on the present-day members of the Lalique family for more information about the founding father. This will have to wait until some vacation when I can spend a couple of months in Paris during the winter (summer is no good), cautiously working out the personal introductions upon which everything in France depends. I would hope to gain access to unpublished drawings and plaster models which may have been saved. Writing to them is no good: they are as close-mouthed as he was himself!

However, in the end the visual evidence is the most important. If you have a chance to go through a run of the English "Art Journal" which kept a rather complete running commentary of art school notes and awards, you will find that the "college de Sydenham" simply does not exist by that name. What it probably refers to is the art school which was installed in the Crystal Palace, ca. 1860 with high hopes, once it had been dismantled and moved to Sydenham. Because of the inconvenience of the location it did not flourish (special student discount fares were introduced, one gathers to induce more students to come out from London to work there); from the lists of awards, one gathers that it turned into classes in watercolors, mainly, for the young ladies of the immediate vicinity. Few boys' names appear in the awards lists (Lalique not at all), and by the time he got to England it was on its last legs, being officially closed in 1879 or 80 (I'm writing this off the top of my head). One wonders what he was doing there, or whether he attended the school at all! It is quite likely that he may have lived in Sydenham: there seems to have been a colony of French refugees established there (Zola lived there during his exile somewhat later). Perhaps it was just a white lie to cover up some other activity during his English stay which, later in life, he found demeaning! He might have attended one of the "workingmen's colleges" -- which are so labelled in the accounts of the period, and which might have struck him later on as almost too apt for his impeccable state at the time -- or maybe
simply an apprentice in some workshop. At any rate, it
seems to me that he undoubtedly picked up a lot of the
reform spirit which Wm. Morris was preaching just about
that time, but very little of the English (i.e. Pre-Raphaelite)
style during those years. Unless you had a very special "in"
with the members of the group, or their small list of patrons,
it would have been as hard to come by as my introduction to
the Lalique family today!

Nevertheless, I believe that he later showed some influence
from Rossetti; I think it came in two stages: the first
indirectly via the prints of Toorop, who got it from D.G.R.'s:
illustrations for "Goblin Market", or something of the sort;
the second, after the publication of Bell's catalog of Rossetti's
works which he could easily have seen by the last years of
the century. He had very cordial relations with England (2
one-man shows at the Grafton Galleries 1902 and (?) 1905).

To say that a turn of the century artisan was influenced
by Morris' theories, is a bit like saying that any artist of
that period was influenced by the Japanese; to some degree
they all were influenced by both. But I think that, in conjunc-
ton with Lalique's interest in glass (which I feel pretty
sure grew out of his enamelling, and which must have brought
him into the orbit of Galle who invented a lot of new enamels
for his own work, which were then adopted and adapted by the
jewelry trade), the Morris preachings probably had a decisive
influence at the time when the jewelry was going great guns
(but his own inventive force seemed to be levelling off!),
but when there was also a possible opening in the art glass
field. He was, by all accounts, an astute businessman and
I think it is probably not quite coincidence that he established
his first glass works the year that Galle died! It would be a
perfect example of French idealism with hard-headedness.
Of course, the critics who praise him only mention the idealism:
that he was tired of making costly toys for the idle rich and
wanted to ennable the lives of the common people by making
his art less costly and more accessible, and I don't doubt
that this was true. By then Morris' theories had found pretty
wide acceptance anyway among right-thinking people, both
producers and consumers, and his main virtue is in his canny
timing of the changeover...which is not to underestimate
the distinct forward step that his glass design represents
over Galle's in the light of his adapting the medium to
genuine mass production. Galle's approach to glass has more
in common with the bijoutier than the factory.

I hope that this will serve instead of an interview, and
I wish you good luck in building further information on these
scrap (which are, actually, just about all that I know on
the subject of Lalique's life history). If you want any more
documentation, aside from the Art Journal findings, I will
be happy to look through my file and give it to you. If you
have a carbon of your paper I'd love to see it and promise to return it to you.

I'm sure that you have spotted the sources of his work in earlier French jewellers of the mid XIX century, as well as the designs (some old-fashioned, some quite "advanced") being taught and produced by the Union des Arts Décoratifs in the early '90s, as well as with the Ecole de Nancy.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. H. W. Janson.
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