

## ***Criticism on Canvas – Baudelaire's Critic as Painter of Modern Life***

Elizabeth Harper  
Philosophy  
The University of North Carolina Asheville  
One University Heights  
Asheville, North Carolina 28804 USA

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Duane Davis

### **Abstract**

Oscar Wilde once said concerning the art of the critic versus that of the artist: "It is very much more difficult to talk about a thing than to do it ... Anybody can make history. Only a great man can write it." While Wilde's exaltation of the critic may seem to belittle the artist, it nevertheless reveals a larger debate concerning the purpose of art criticism and its viability as an art form. Through his famous essay on the street artist and reporter Constantin Guys, "The Painter of Modern Life," Charles Baudelaire reveals a similar view concerning the relationship between the art critic and the artist. Baudelaire not only elevates the critic to the position of an artist, but to the position of the penultimate artist – the Painter of Modern Life, one who captures the "eternal and transitory," the "absolute and particular" beauty of his epoch.

### **1. Introduction**

"Il est vrai que la grande tradition s'est perdue, et que la nouvelle n'est pas faite," remarked Baudelaire in his conclusion to the *Salon de 1846*.<sup>1</sup> Within this simple phrase lies a complex social, political, literary, and artistic climate in which all aspects of society surged in unison toward the ever-elusive ideal of progress. However, the loss of *la grande tradition* began well before Baudelaire's *Salon de 1846*. For centuries art had been a luxury exclusively available to the gentry. Public galleries and exhibitions were virtually non-existent, and therefore there was very little need for art criticism, which, like journalism, depends on a wide public audience.<sup>2</sup> This is not to say that art criticism did not exist, for as Wilde claims, "the Greeks were a nation of art-critics," and since art is an essential part of culture, it has been discussed in various ways for centuries.<sup>3</sup> However, the term "criticism" as a conscious genre was not employed until the early 18<sup>th</sup> century by the English painter and writer Jonathan Richardson the Elder who developed a score system for determining the value of paintings.<sup>4</sup> Although Richardson the Elder may have coined the term, it was in 18<sup>th</sup> century France that art criticism truly flourished, as art became a veritable national past-time. The first opportunity for the general public to participate in the art world began in 1737 when Louis XV used art to French progress under his reign.<sup>5</sup> While the motivation for these free exhibitions through the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture may not have been for the sake of the public good, the Salons, as they were called, nevertheless allowed the French people to participate in the arts of their time. The French revolution furthered this participation as more museums became public and more artists began to exhibit their work.<sup>6</sup> As the Salons increased in popularity among the uneducated French public, so did the demand for instruction. Thus modern art criticism was born as a literary genre, serving as the vital link between the public and the artist in terms of taste, originality, and value.<sup>7</sup> Although critics claimed to voice public opinion, there was often some degree of bitterness on the part of artists, who felt mistreated or misunderstood by the critics, and therefore, unsupported by the public. However, critics also promoted their favorite artists, undoubtedly aiding in their rise to fame. The most important figure in 18<sup>th</sup> century art criticism was Denis Diderot who published criticisms, also referred to as *Salons*, from 1759 to 1767 and

who greatly influenced 19<sup>th</sup> century art critics, including Charles Baudelaire.<sup>8</sup> Every facet of 19<sup>th</sup> century France was marked by instability and frenetic innovation. Over the course of the century, eight political regimes rose and fell, the industrial revolution plodded forward, and Napoléon III ordered the dramatic *haussmanisation* of Paris by Baron Haussman to which Baudelaire responded in lament, “Le vieux Paris n’est plus (la forme d’une ville/Change plus vite, hélas ! que le cœur d’un mortel).”<sup>9</sup> Just as the political and social structures of the age were in constant upheaval, so artists and critics alike disagreed on the proper esthetic to define the age. Neo-classicism, Romanticism, Realism, and, later, Impressionism and Post-Impressionism all claimed to represent the ideal esthetic. Even within each of these separate movements, there was much disagreement. In the midst of the Neo-classicism, Romanticism, Realism debate, Charles Baudelaire appears as a figure who, according to Joseph Sloane, “escape[s] classification” and who was truly devoted to developing a completely modern esthetic, both in his art criticism and his poetry.<sup>10</sup> In short he “[s’est plongé] au fond du gouffre, Enfer ou Ciel, qu’importe?/Au fond de l’Inconnu pour trouver du nouveau.”<sup>11</sup> In his art critical writings, Baudelaire develops complex criteria for what it means to be a modern artist, culminating in his 1863 essay, *Le Peintre de la vie moderne*. Although Constantin Guys is the official hero of the essay, it is the critic, Charles Baudelaire, who best achieves the ideal of the *peintre de la vie moderne*, through the essay itself.

## 2. The Artist

Before approaching the subject of *Le Peintre de la vie moderne*, which was published only four years before his death, it is important to understand how Baudelaire defines the artist. While this question is extremely complex and will by no means be discussed exhaustively, Baudelaire makes several clear demands on the artist. These demands help explain why it was essential that he write the essay on Guys. Thus it is impossible to discuss the role of the artist in Baudelaire’s works without immediately mentioning Eugène Delacroix, whom Baudelaire professed to be “le peintre le plus original des temps anciens et des temps modernes.”<sup>12</sup> For Baudelaire, an artist must be original. Complaints of artists who have nothing new to say are a recurring theme in his art criticisms, as demonstrated in the introduction to his *Salon de 1859*: “Nulle explosion ; pas de génies inconnus. Les pensées suggérées par l’aspect de ce Salon sont d’un ordre si simple, si ancien, si classique, que peu de pages me suffiront sans doute pour les développer.”<sup>13</sup> Baudelaire expects an explosion of originality, an expression of individualism, not a repetition or imitation of what has already been done. Because Baudelaire considers Delacroix to be the most original of painters, it is unsurprising that he is a proponent of Romanticism, but he supports a Romanticism after his own definition: “Le romantisme n’est précisément ni dans le choix des sujets, ni dans la vérité exacte, mais dans la manière de sentir...Qui dit romantisme dit art moderne, – c’est-à-dire intimité, spiritualité, couleur, aspiration vers l’infini, exprimées par tous les moyens que contiennent les arts.”<sup>14</sup> These definitions express Baudelaire’s distaste for realism. The true artist does not merely copy nature, but is able to embellish the natural world with his own passions, to sign his works with “son âme éclatante.”<sup>15</sup> In this way, the artist must create unity from a duality between the subject and himself: “Qu’est-ce que l’art pur suivant la conception moderne ? C’est créer une magie suggestive contenant à la fois l’objet et le sujet, le monde extérieur à l’artiste et l’artiste lui-même.”<sup>16</sup> As a means of creating this “magie suggestive,” Baudelaire requires harmonious color, for “la couleur est composée de masses colorées qui sont faites d’une infinité de tons, dont l’harmonie fait l’unité...”<sup>17</sup> This is not to say that color may not express anything that is unharmonious. Indeed, Baudelaire is known for finding beauty in the obscene. Nor does it indicate that line should be completely abandoned for the sake of color, since every painting is made of a fusion between “le goût de la ligne” and “le goût de la couleur.”<sup>18</sup> Rather, the artist must possess the knowledge to manipulate color and line in order to attain the desired effect.

This ability comes from the imagination, which Castex calls “[le] sixième sens, propre à l’artiste”<sup>19</sup> and which Baudelaire deems “la reine des facultés.”<sup>20</sup> Baudelaire considers the imagination to be the foundation of “l’analogie universelle” or “la correspondance” and, therefore, the source of artistic creation:<sup>21</sup>

C’est l’imagination qui a enseigné à l’homme le sens moral de la couleur, du contour, du son et du parfum. Elle a créé, au commencement du monde, l’analogie et la métaphore. Elle décompose toute la création, et avec les matériaux amassés et disposés suivant des règles dont on ne peut trouver l’origine que dans le plus profond de l’âme, elle crée un monde nouveau, elle produit la sensation neuve.<sup>22</sup>

Through the use of imagination the artist is able to create an entirely new world that provokes a new sensory experience for the viewer. Castex considers this new sensory experience to be the vocation of the artist according to

Baudelaire which, “consiste à dépasser les données grossières des sens, dont se satisfait l’homme vulgaire, à éprouver en lui les synesthésies, à les exprimer dans le langage qui leur est propre et à suggérer ainsi la réalité une et caché que recouvre la mensongère multiplicité du sensible.”<sup>23</sup> The veritable manifesto for these “synesthésies” is found in Baudelaire’s unforgettable sonnet, “Correspondances:”

La Nature est un temple où de vivants piliers  
Laissent parfois sortir de confuses paroles;  
L’homme y passe à travers des forêts de symboles  
Qui l’observent avec des regards familiers.

Comme de longs échos qui de loin se confondent  
Dans une ténébreuse et profonde unité,  
Vaste comme la nuit et comme la clarté,  
Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent.

Ayant l’expansion des choses infinies,  
Comme l’ambre, le musc, le benjoin et l’encens,  
Qui chantent les transports de l’esprit et des sens.<sup>24</sup>

The Baudelairean concept of *correspondances*, that is the synesthetic dialogue between the senses, is essential to Baudelaire’s esthetic, and without it the artist fails to attain this new world of sensation that Baudelaire requires. Castex puts an enormous amount of significance on the sonnet for art in general, claiming that it “doit nous apparaître comme une justification métaphysique de l’Art en général, le mot *métaphysique* étant pris ici dans son acception littérale : l’Art est un moyen d’attendre à une réalité qui se trouve située au delà de l’apparence physique des choses.”<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, without imagination all possibility of creating a significant work of art is lost because it is through this, “la reine des facultés,” that the artist achieves innovation. A thirst for the *new* permeates the entirety of Baudelaire’s corpus. However, this is hardly surprising as Baudelaire’s chief aim is to form a truly modern esthetic. In this aim, Delacroix falls short. While Baudelaire’s intense admiration for Delacroix never wavers, Sloane explains that “[Delacroix] might well be the most original [painter] in the century, but he was not *new*, nor was he interested in the contemporary scene.”<sup>26</sup> Delacroix, while brilliant and decidedly modern in technique, belongs to the generation before Baudelaire and is still painting classical literary figures such as Dante or Sardanapalus, and even *Liberty Leading the People* is highly metaphorical. Herein lies the shortcoming – Baudelaire is in search of an artist who expresses and creates the particular beauty of the present:

Le passé est intéressant non seulement par la beauté qu’ont su en extraire les artistes pour qui il était présent, mais aussi comme passé, pour sa valeur historique. Il en est de même du présent. Le plaisir que nous retirons de la représentation du présent tient non seulement à la beauté dont il peut être revêtu, mais aussi à sa qualité essentielle de présent.<sup>27</sup>

Just as the venerated artists of the past portrayed their present, so artists of the mid-nineteenth century ought to capture their own age. It is this dream of a new, modern artist that stirred Baudelaire to make his prophecy of “le *peintre*, le vrai peintre, qui saura arracher à la vie actuelle son côté épique, et nous faire voir et comprendre, avec de la couleur ou du dessin, combien nous sommes grands et poétiques dans nos cravates et nos bottes vernies.”<sup>28</sup> He would have to wait another fifteen years before he finally found this painter in Constantin Guys.

### 3. The Critic

In his essay, *The Critic as Artist*, Oscar Wilde asks, “Why should the artist be troubled by the shrill clamour of criticism? Why should those who cannot create take upon themselves to estimate the value of creative work? What can they know about it?”<sup>29</sup> Perhaps the reader asks the same of Baudelaire. It is all very well to generalize a few artistic requirements provided by a mid-nineteenth century French poet with no official “credentials.” Werner emphasizes that “Baudelaire had no art historical training,”<sup>30</sup> but why should his or any other critic’s opinions matter? It may seem more beneficial to view the artwork from a given period and draw one’s own conclusions, particularly because the plastic arts are meant to be seen and experienced. If this is the case, then reading criticism would surely spoil the *frisson* the viewer experiences when confronted with a Delacroix. However, this reasoning greatly underestimates the significance of the new, modern literary genre of art criticism. While Werner maintains

that “art criticism, though a new development, had already deteriorated” when Baudelaire began his art critical career at age twenty-five, he also emphasizes that Baudelaire “laid down rules for criticism that have not lost their validity.”<sup>31</sup> Baudelaire’s criticisms are still valid because they are works of art in themselves, much like his poetry. As Wilde says: “Why should [criticism] not be [a creative art]? It works with materials, and puts them into a form that is at once new and delightful. What more can one say of poetry? Indeed, I would call criticism a creation within a creation.”<sup>32</sup> The vocation of the critic is to translate a work of art onto the page in such a way that the reader experiences that work of art through the eye of the critic. Upon reflection it becomes clear that Baudelaire is able to fulfill his own criteria for what it means to be an artist through his criticism and even demands that the critic be an artist: “Quant à la critique proprement dite, j’espère que les philosophes comprendront ce que je vais dire : pour être juste, c’est-à-dire avoir sa raison d’être, la critique doit être partielle, passionnée, politique, c’est-à-dire faite à un point de vue exclusif, mais au point de vue qui ouvre le plus d’horizons.”<sup>33</sup> In these requirements for true criticism, the notion of originality reappears. Just as the artist must find his own, unique way of expression by pouring his passion and ideas into his artwork while maintaining an “aspiration vers l’infini,” so must the critic. Baudelaire detests dry, scientific criticisms that methodically describe a work of art, thereby robbing it of all emotion and beauty:

Je crois sincèrement que la meilleure critique est celle qui est amusante et poétique, non pas celle-ci, froide et algébrique qui, sous prétexte de tout expliquer, n’a ni haine ni amour, et se dépouille volontairement de tout espèce de tempérament, mais – un beau tableau étant la nature réfléchie par un artiste – celle qui sera ce tableau réfléchi par un artiste – celle qui sera ce tableau réfléchi par un esprit intelligent et sensible.<sup>34</sup>

Once again, the duality between nature and the artist mirrors that of the original work of art and the critic. In his way, the critic must also unify “le monde extérieur” to him (the original work of art) and “lui-même” (his passionate, subjective opinions), thereby creating a new work of art.<sup>35</sup>

However, this vehemence for subjective criticism, charged with the passions of the critic, is not to be confused with narrow-mindedness, which disregards talent when a particular artist’s esthetic clashes with that of the critic. For example, in regard to the feuding schools of Daumier, Delacroix, and Ingres, Baudelaire proclaims:

Daumier dessine peut-être mieux que Delacroix, si l’on veut préférer les qualités saines, bien portantes, aux facultés étranges et étonnantes d’un grand génie malade de génie ; M. Ingres, si amoureux du détail, dessine peut-être mieux que tous les deux, si l’on préfère les finesses laborieuses à l’harmonie de l’ensemble, et le caractère du morceau au caractère de la composition, mais ... aimons-les tous les trois.<sup>36</sup>

Baudelaire’s extraordinary assertion that we should appreciate all three of these artists belonging to very different schools does not mean that he does not passionately champion Delacroix as the best of the three artists. After all, Baudelaire devotes more works of criticism, if not outright *hommages*, to Delacroix than to any other artist. However, Baudelaire recognizes the very real talent of all three artists even though only one suits his personal esthetic. The critic must find a way to make a work of art by creating unity out of the duality between the original work of art and himself even if the original work of art is not in agreement with his sensibilities.

Similarly, on the subject of color and line, Baudelaire demonstrates that just as the artist ought not abandon line for color or color for line, for the critic, “exalter la ligne au détriment de la couleur, ou la couleur aux dépens de la ligne, sans doute c’est un point de vue ; mais ce n’est ni très large ni très juste, et cela accuse une grande ignorance des destinées particulières.”<sup>37</sup> However, the critic is not limited to merely discussing the prospective unity of line and color in a particular painting, for he too must attain this unity in the medium of words. As Wilde says:

Words have not merely music as sweet as that of viol and lute, colour as rich and vivid as any that makes lovely for us the canvas of the Venetian or the Spaniard, and plastic form no less sure and certain than that which reveals itself in marble or in bronze, but thought and passion and spirituality are theirs also, are theirs indeed alone.<sup>38</sup>

Words are a powerful medium no less, if not more, expressive than paint, clay, or charcoal, and Baudelaire does not waste his medium on dry criticism. Beginning with line, like the artist, the critic must provide order to his criticism to orient the reader and reveal the basic shape of the subject, which will then be embellished with the colorful passions of the critic. By way of example, it is undeniable that Baudelaire’s description of the day in his veritable treatise on color from the *Salon de 1846*, reaches the complex beauty of a colorist painting:

La sève monte et, mélange de principes, elle s'épanouit en *tons mélangés* ; les arbres, les rochers, les granits se mirent dans les eaux et y déposent leurs *reflets* ; tous les objets transparents accrochent au passage lumières et couleurs voisines et lointaines. À mesure que l'astre du jour se dérange, les tons changent de valeur, mais, respectant toujours leurs sympathies et leurs haines naturelles, continuent à vivre en harmonie par des concessions réciproques. Les ombres se déplacent lentement, et font fuir devant elles ou éteignent les tons à mesure que la lumière, déplacée elle-même, en vaut faire résonner de nouveau. Ceux-ci se renvoient leurs reflets, et, modifiant leurs qualités en les *glacant* de qualités transparentes et empruntées, multiplient à l'infini leurs mariages mélodieux et les rendent plus faciles. Quand le grand foyer descend dans les eaux, de rouges fanfares s'élancent de tous côtés ; une sanglante harmonie éclate à l'horizon, et le vert s'empourpre richement. Mais bientôt de vastes ombres bleues chassent en cadence devant elles la foule des tons orangés et rose tendre qui sont comme l'écho lointain et affaibli de la lumière. Cette grande symphonie d'hier, cette succession de mélodies, où la variété sort toujours d'infini, cet hymne compliqué s'appelle la couleur.<sup>39</sup>

The quotation is perhaps excessively long, but to omit any part would destroy the dramatic atmosphere of color that Baudelaire desires to create. Here, Baudelaire uses the medium of words to *paint* the day, unifying “le goût de la ligne” and “le goût de la couleur.”<sup>40</sup> In this way, Baudelaire is able to create a painting, as affirmed by Hannoosh: “Comme le signalent les mots que Baudelaire met en italique, le paysage vraisemblablement naturel est devenu ici un tableau. Tableau réel – nous sommes dans la critique d’art – ou bien métaphorique, comme la symphonie métaphorique de la fin de l’extrait.”<sup>41</sup> Like the artist, the critic must not copy nature, but transform it into a work of art.

Like all artistic creation, this transformation is governed by the imagination. The critic also possesses this “reine des facultés” and, “doit être capable de retrouver cette expérience authentique [de l’œuvre d’art originale], de la définir avec des mots et ainsi de la transposer de la toile sur le papier, de l’interpréter une seconde fois.”<sup>42</sup> Criticism must not function as a simple imitation of the original work of art, but as a reinterpretation. Criticism must create yet another “monde nouveau,” another “sensation neuve.”<sup>43</sup> As is evident in the color symphony from the *Salon de 1846*, like the artist, the critic equally accomplishes the goal of producing *synesthésies*, “en employant et soulignant le discours technique de la peinture – tons mélangés, reflets, glacis –, Baudelaire place la perception des correspondances dans l’expérience picturale.”<sup>44</sup> However, the idea of *correspondances* is not limited to the constant perceptual discourse between the senses, but extends into the arts themselves. As Hannoosh affirms, it is “la correspondance des arts qui fonde la théorie des correspondances chez Baudelaire – peinture, musique, poésie, même critique se mêlent et s’échangent dans l’écriture, comme dans l’expérience, des correspondances.”<sup>45</sup> This intermingling of the arts is prolific in the entirety of the Baudelaire corpus. In criticism Baudelaire often describes a particular art form through another art form, thereby causing the reader to re-evaluate his or her understanding or preconceptions of the former, thereby once again attaining the goal of newness. For example, Baudelaire claims: “les purs dessinateurs sont des philosophes et des abstrateurs de quintessence. Les coloristes sont des poètes épiques.”<sup>46</sup> Here the correspondence between the arts is simply presented, although it is important to note that it is still founded on synesthetic sensory experience. *Dessinateurs* are “philosophes” and “abstrateurs de quintessence,” just as *coloristes* are “poètes épiques,” and vice versa, because of the effect they have on the viewer. In this way, there is constant dialogue between the arts – the different disciplines respond to one another, constantly creating new experiences. For example, Baudelaire claims that the best criticism is “amusante” and “poétique,” in which the painting is “réfléchi par un esprit intelligent et sensible,” then “le meilleur compte rendu d’un tableau pourra être un sonnet ou une élégie.”<sup>47</sup> Therefore the critic can also employ different art forms to make a work of criticism, depending on how the critic wishes to express himself. Indeed, Castex claims “de la critique d’art à la poésie, le passage se fait donc directement, parce que sa poésie est encore critique d’art.”<sup>48</sup> In this way it is difficult to separate Baudelaire the critic and Baudelaire the poet because his criticism is often poetry and his poetry often criticism. In fact, Baudelaire asserts that poets inevitably mature into critics, although the converse is impossible: “Ce serait un événement tout nouveau dans l’histoire des arts qu’un critique se faisant poète, un renversement de toutes les lois psychiques, un monstruosité ; au contraire, tous les grands poètes deviennent naturellement, fatalement critiques.”<sup>49</sup> Mayne views this maturation from poet to critic as an indication of criticism and creation merging, and in fact, “...they turn out to be merely different aspects of the same process.”<sup>50</sup> If criticism and creation are essentially parts of the same process, then criticism must indeed represent an art form. The critic, then, as the author of criticism, must be an artist.

#### 4. The Question

If the critic is an artist, then a critic who chooses to exalt a poor artist must also be a poor artist. Following this logical deduction, Baudelaire's famous homage to Constantin Guys, *Le Peintre de la vie moderne*, is a subject of much contention. The problem that intrigues scholars lies in the personality of Guys himself: Constantin Guys was a minor French illustrator who fought in the Greek War of Independence and chronicled the Crimean War for the *Illustrated London News* before settling in Paris as a sketch artist of Parisian fashionable life.<sup>51</sup> The question, then, is why Charles Baudelaire, who has been called "the father of modern art criticism" and whose poetry is of international acclaim, chooses an arguably mediocre sketch artist as his *peintre de la vie moderne*? The answers are manifold. Indeed, because the essay is vital not only to understanding Baudelaire, but also to our modern conception of art, there have been an extraordinary number of explanations for Baudelaire's choice, but none can boast of certainty. It is not inconceivable that Baudelaire's admiration for Guys is genuine. As Castex remarks, "la grande vertu de Baudelaire est d'avoir su, d'emblée, partout les signes du vrai talent."<sup>52</sup> Perhaps Baudelaire truly recognizes talent in Guys, as an artist who tirelessly portrayed the brouhaha of modern society. This is the position which Hiddleston takes, suggesting that the only disparity between Guys' sketches and Baudelaire's descriptions lies in the wood engravings published by the *Illustrated London News*: "If one were unacquainted with [Guys'] original drawings, [the wood engravings] would provide an uninspiring introduction to his work."<sup>53</sup> Hiddleston describes Guys' original drawings, however, as evocative of, "a highly imaginative, suggestive, and on occasions disturbing visual experience."<sup>54</sup> He praises Guys for his genius, noting that Baudelaire's study on Guys is not the first time Baudelaire chooses to praise the minor arts, citing specifically his essays on caricature and laughter.<sup>55</sup> Perhaps scholars should trust the judgment of one who "correctly foretold Delacroix's, Corot's, Meryon's, Boudin's and Manet's future acceptance, and just as correctly foretold Vernet's and Scheffer's obscurity."<sup>56</sup>

Nevertheless, many scholars do not share Hiddleston's enthusiasm for Guys and, therefore, find it difficult to accept the notoriously paradoxical Baudelaire's choice at face value. These scholars tend to view *Le Peintre de la vie moderne* as a mistake, a failure in critical judgment. As Carrier bluntly states: "Guys was a bore. Great critics can be dead wrong."<sup>57</sup> The preferred choice for the majority of scholars would have been Manet, who is now regarded as the artistic bridge leading to modernism. For example, Castex states, "Baudelaire aurait-il pu trouver une matière plus riche, sinon pour une analyse de la modernité au sens où il entendait cette notion, du moins pour une analyse du génie moderne en peinture, dans les œuvres d'Édouard Manet."<sup>58</sup> There are many studies discussing why Baudelaire should have recognized Manet's genius, or why he did not. These will not be discussed here as this paper is concerned with the reason Baudelaire chose Guys, and not with the reason he failed to choose Manet. What is important is that there is a general sense of disappointment in Baudelaire, implying that his seemingly infallible critical judgment was slipping in *Le Peintre de la vie moderne*, one of his last art critical writings. The shadow of this supposed error even casts gloom over an extremely complimentary essay written by fellow poet Paul Valéry on "The Position of Baudelaire." In the midst of affirmations of Baudelaire's importance to modern literature, one sentence falls flat: "Perhaps he exaggerated the value of Constantin Guys."<sup>59</sup> In defense of this exaggeration and his exclusion of Manet, Castex emphasizes Baudelaire's lack of options between 1859 and 1860, when the essay was written, and also his failing health.<sup>60</sup> Castex proposes that Baudelaire settles for Guys: "Baudelaire n'est pas responsable si, pour peindre la vie moderne, le siècle n'a pas trouvé son Rembrandt et s'il a dû se contenter de Constantin Guys."<sup>61</sup> There seems to be a great deal of truth in this theory, especially in light of Baudelaire's clear frustration with the state of the plastic arts in his *Salon de 1859*: "Que dans tous les temps, la médiocrité ait dominé, cela est indubitable ; mais qu'elle règne plus que jamais, qu'elle devienne absolument triomphante et encombrante, c'est ce qui est aussi vrai qu'affligeant."<sup>62</sup> As an art critic, Baudelaire relies on the plastic arts to create his own work of art. It is therefore understandable that the critic, as an artist, would be embittered if his medium, the plastic arts, were to plunge completely into mediocrity. Just as a painter desires a rich, complex palette, so a critic desires rich, complex works of art with which to mark his or her canvas.

In contrast to both Hiddleston and Castex, Raser considers the discussion of Guys' worthiness to be the *peintre de la vie moderne*, whether positively or negatively, to be evidence of close-mindedness on the part of readers, to whom "the question is embarrassing as long as they consider aesthetic judgment a matter of recognition."<sup>63</sup> Raser goes on to claim that "for them, the value of Baudelaire's criticism stands or falls on his recognition of talent and here, Baudelaire's judgment is faulty: it fails to gain universal assent."<sup>64</sup> Raser's accusatory tone draws a parallel between current "admirers and critics" and those who originally shunned and, indeed, prosecuted Baudelaire before his poetry finally received "universal assent."<sup>65</sup> Davis more clearly links the unaccepted beauty portrayed in Guys' works with that found in Baudelaire's own poetry and essays, going so far as to say that "His essay, *The Painter of*

*Modern Life*, is at once homage to the artist, Constantin Guys, as well as an account of the role of the artist in decadent modern society – and hence is also indirectly autobiographical.”<sup>66</sup> Like Guys, Baudelaire is an artist, indeed an *homme du monde*, who unabashedly immerses himself in the mire of modern society to an extent that shocks and appalls conventional esthetic sensibilities. Similarly, Raser suggests that “Baudelaire made this choice [i.e. Guys] as a provocation, an effort to unsettle received notions of beauty, and first among them, the notion that beauty is recognized.”<sup>67</sup> Davis’ and Raser’s points are important ones, for it is evident that Baudelaire had been calling for a new esthetic, one that celebrates the “héroïsme de la vie moderne,” since his first *Salon* in 1845, and his poetry constantly challenges classical notions of beauty and morality. Through Guys, Baudelaire once again calls accepted notions of beauty into question by showing that the *poetae minores* deserve consideration.<sup>68</sup> In combination with the fact that Baudelaire tried to promote Guys’ works on several occasions and owned many of them himself, the essay suggests a true admiration for Guys as an artist who drastically differs from those discussed in the *Salons*. Pichois addresses this fact by stating, “Quelle qu’ait été l’admiration de [Baudelaire] pour Guys, l’artiste a surtout été pour le critique-poète un prétexte, le germe au moyen duquel Baudelaire a cristallisé une nouvelle esthétique, celle de l’esquisse, de la fixation de l’impression instantanée grâce à la précision et à la rapidité de l’exécution.”<sup>69</sup> In this way, Pichois presents yet another reason for which Baudelaire chose Guys. Perhaps Guys was a convenient tool through which Baudelaire was able to found the new esthetic.

## 5. Le Peintre de la Vie Moderne

Within these last three opinions lies an additional possibility for Baudelaire’s extraordinary choice – if Guys is merely a “prétexte,” a “germe” that Baudelaire fashions into a new esthetic, who then is the *peintre de la vie moderne*? It is true that the essay proclaims Baudelaire’s discovery of the penultimate artist – *le peintre de la vie moderne* – yet it is not the artist, Guys, who earns this title, but the critic, Charles Baudelaire. Since “il semble qu’aucun peintre n’ait voulu ou n’ait pu répondre pleinement à l’appel de Baudelaire et devenir, en peignant son temps avec relief, le Balzac de la peinture ...,”<sup>70</sup> Baudelaire fulfills his own prophecy through art criticism, itself a *modern* artistic genre. Even Hiddleston, who so warmly praises Guys, makes a similar suggestion, albeit in reference to the *Illustrated London News*’ wood engravings: “... one is inclined to suspect [Baudelaire] of using an artist of mediocre merit as a pretext to set off his own greater imagination and creativity.”<sup>71</sup> Hiddleston means for this comment to illustrate the extent to which the wood engravings ruined Guys’ sketches, but it is hardly inconceivable to apply it to Guys’ work in general. By returning once again to the idea of *correspondances*, this possible application becomes more viable. It has already been stated that *correspondances* are not limited to synesthetic sensory experiences, but extend into discourse between the arts. However, the implications of this *correspondance* in the realm of art criticism has not yet been discussed. Art criticism as an artistic genre relies on the other arts for its very being, for as Baudelaire says, “c’est de ses entrailles que la critique est sortie.”<sup>72</sup> Therefore, the critic is always drawing upon other works of art in order to create his or her own work of art. This is not to say that the critic imitates or employs a wide range of arts because he or she has no thoughts of his or her own, for these are *imitateurs* and *éclectiques* abhorred by Baudelaire: “Le doute a conduit certains artistes à implorer le secours de tous les autres arts. Les essais de moyens contradictoire, l’empiètement d’un art sur un autre, l’importation de la poésie, de l’esprit et du sentiment dans la peinture, toutes ces misères modernes sont des vices particuliers aux éclectiques.”<sup>73</sup> Rather than enlist the aid of other artists, the true critic is able to manipulate works of art, to use them as raw material. It has been established that the relationship between nature and the artist mirrors that of the work of art and the critic in that both critic and artist must create unity between object and subject to reach the aim of originality.<sup>74</sup> In order to attain originality, artist and critic alike must not *truthfully* portray their respective raw materials, for that would be mere imitation. In fact, truth, in the sense of representation, holds little interest for Baudelaire: “Je trouve inutile et fastidieux de représenter ce qui est, parce que rien de ce qui est ne me satisfait. La nature est laide, et je préfère les montres de ma fantaisie à la trivialité positive.”<sup>75</sup> It is, thus, through the artificial rather than the natural that beauty is found, for “le mal se fait sans effort, *naturellement*, par fatalité ; le bien est toujours le produit d’un art.”<sup>76</sup> The artifice of the imagination allows the artist and the critic to create the “monde nouveau” and the “sensation neuve” required for artistic creation.<sup>77</sup> This *goût de l’artifice* extends into Baudelaire’s criticism. Therefore criticism, as Wilde claims, “treats the work of art simply as a starting point for a new creation” and “does not confine itself ... to discovering the real intention of the artist and accepting that as final.”<sup>78</sup> For Baudelaire, criticism often becomes a vehicle for his personal philosophies, joys, and tribulations. As Castex remarks when referring to the poem “Sur Le Tasse en prison” d’Eugène Delacroix, “l’œuvre d’art est devenue le prétexte d’une confession personnelle.”<sup>79</sup> Such is the case with “Le Peintre de la vie moderne,” for the essay is a work of *meta-art*. That is to say that in the essay,

Baudelaire himself accomplishes everything he attributes to Guys as the *peintre de la vie moderne*. The reason for employing the rather vague term *meta-art* is because the essay, like Baudelaire, defies “classification” – the reader is unsure if he or she is dealing with a work of criticism, a poem, a painting, a sketch, a piece of music, a portrait, a biography, a philosophical treatise, or all of these expanding into an eternal *correspondance*.

Guys’ anonymity exemplifies how Baudelaire uses art criticism to his own ends. Guys does not appear in the essay at all until the third chapter, “L’Artiste, homme du monde, homme des foules et enfant,” and the essay never mentions Guys by name, but refers to him only as “M.G.” Baudelaire claims that this is in accordance with Guys’ own request, and indeed, according to a letter addressed to Auguste Poulet-Malassis, Baudelaire seems to feel some frustration with Guys’ modesty: “Ah ! Guys ! Guys ! si vous saviez quelles douleurs il me cause ! Ce maniaque est un ouragan de modestie. Il m’a cherché querelle quand il a su que je voulais parler de lui.”<sup>80</sup> In the essay, Baudelaire draws a great deal of attention to Guys’ anonymity. He begins with the fact that Guys himself does not sign his drawings, “mais tous ses ouvrages sont signées de son âme éclatante.”<sup>81</sup> This serves to confirm that Guys fulfills the artistic requirement of pouring one’s passions into a work of art, which is more important than signing one’s name. However, as the essay progresses, instead of admiring Guys’ noble modesty, the reader begins to doubt slightly that he is real: “La Bulgarie, la Turquie, la Crimée, l’Espagne ont été de grandes fêtes pour les yeux de M.G., ou plutôt de l’artiste imaginaire que nous sommes convenus d’appeler M.G. ; car je me souviens de temps en temps que je me suis promis, pour mieux rassurer sa modestie, de supposer qu’il n’existait pas.”<sup>82</sup> Baudelaire not only protects Guys’ identity, but also pretends that he does not exist at all. While this may well be hyperbole on Baudelaire’s part, the suggestion that M.G. does not exist is extraordinary for an essay of exaltation such as this. Furthermore, while Guys remains all but nameless, both Baudelaire (*je*) and the reader (*nous*) are explicitly named. This suggests a communion between author and reader from which Guys is removed. On another occasion devoted to reassuring Baudelaire’s evidently sensitive conscience, he claims that “on supposera que tout ce que j’ai à dire de sa nature, si curieusement et si mystérieusement éclatante, est plus ou moins justement suggéré par les œuvres en question ; pure hypothèse poétique, conjecture, travail d’imagination.”<sup>83</sup> While Baudelaire is still claiming submission to Guys’ request for anonymity, he is also admitting that the essay is a work of art in itself. After all, the imagination is the foundation of artistic creation, and the critic must also pour himself into his work, thereby altering the original. In addition, if Baudelaire is founding a new esthetic, as Raser suggests, it would be much more appropriate to choose an unknown, unnamed artist than one who is already associated with a particular esthetic, like Delacroix or Courbet. Indeed, the fact that Baudelaire devotes the beginning of the essay, not to Guys, but to complex definitions of art and beauty, certainly suggests that his motivations surpass the humble street artist. On these definitions Baudelaire remarks, “j’ai plus d’une fois déjà expliqué ces choses ; ces lignes en disent assez pour ceux qui aiment ces jeux de la pensée abstraite ; mais je sais que les lecteurs français, pour la plupart, ne s’y complaisent guère, et j’ai hâte moi-même d’entrer dans la partie positive et réelle de mon sujet.”<sup>84</sup> In past criticisms, Baudelaire discusses many of the same ideas in an abstract way. Through the character of the *peintre de la vie moderne*, Guys provides Baudelaire with a concrete means of unfolding his own esthetic, which he hopes will appeal to the French public.

While Guys’ anonymity may be evidence that he is not the true *peintre de la vie moderne*, it would be erroneous to dismiss him and his works as entirely irrelevant. His vigorous documentation and participation in *modernité*, in combination with his lack of artistic pretention, set him apart from the great artistic masters of the Salons. While Guys may not truly fulfill the ideal of the *peintre de la vie moderne*, his art is still essential to Baudelaire’s essay as a symbol of the new esthetic. Baudelaire recalls that: “lorsque enfin je le trouvai, je vis tout d’abord que je n’avais pas affaire précisément à un *artiste*, mais plutôt à un *homme du monde*. Entendez ici, je vous prie, le mot *artiste* dans un sens très restreint, et le mot *homme du monde* dans un sens très étendu.”<sup>85</sup> This is to say that the *peintre de la vie moderne* is more interested in understanding and engaging in the world around him than devoting himself to an art that is disconnected from modern life. This is evidently a reprise of Baudelaire’s long awaited demand for a truly modern artist, and in writing this essay Baudelaire is showing himself to be an *homme du monde* since he is more interested in a self-educated street artist than a master. The *peintre de la vie moderne* is also characterized by curiosity and infantine convalescence so that “il voit tout en nouveauté ; il est toujours ivre.”<sup>86</sup> To maintain this state of novelty and drunkenness, he is a man of the crowd, “un *moi* insatiable du *non-moi*, qui, à chaque instant, le rend et l’exprime en images plus vivantes que la vie elle-même, toujours instable et fugitive.”<sup>87</sup> It is clear from Baudelaire’s poem “Les Foules,” that the poet also possesses the ability “[entrer], quand il veut, dans le personnage de chacun.”<sup>88</sup> Since each poet is destined to become a critic, it is reasonable that the critic also has this power. In fact, in the essay it is not Guys who presents himself to the reader or who leads the viewer through the fleeting, fugitive scenes of the crowd, but Baudelaire through his description of Guys. Surely it is no coincidence that at the beginning of the chapter, Baudelaire asks the reader to recall Poe’s “Man of the Crowd,” saying, “en vérité, c’est un tableau !,” for Baudelaire creates yet another such painting.<sup>89</sup> Baudelaire transforms the character of Guys by settling on him all his passions for modern life. As Sloane remarks, “[Baudelaire] elevated Guys to a position which he must



have realized was not entirely in keeping with the pictures themselves.”<sup>90</sup> However, if the essay is in fact a work of art, no matter what kind, then the reality of Guys’ talent is immaterial. “And so the picture becomes more wonderful to us than it really is and reveals to us a secret of which, in truth, it knows nothing.”<sup>91</sup> The secret which Guys reveals to us is Baudelaire’s new, modern esthetic, founded on the concept of *modernité*.

Baudelaire emphasizes that the *peintre de la vie moderne* is more than just a *flâneur sans but*, for he has a quest – to find *modernité*.<sup>92</sup> The word *modernité* is a neologism and thus requires definition: “La modernité, c’est le transitoire, le fugitif, le contingent, la moitié de l’art, dont l’autre moitié est l’éternel et l’immuable.”<sup>93</sup> It is significant that Baudelaire feels the need to choose a *new* word to describe the ecstasy and horror of modern life, for he is interested in an esthetic that has never been properly appreciated. This is not to say that he inspired inspired to create the term by Guys exclusively, as Castex indicates: “C’est à propos de Constantin Guys que Baudelaire invente le terme de modernité, pour recouvrir une notion sur laquelle il a médité pendant quinze ans.”<sup>94</sup> The notion to which Castex refers is *l’héroïsme de la vie moderne*, which interested Baudelaire from his critical début onward. Furthermore, it is important to note that Baudelaire’s *modernité* does not belong to any age in particular, but to every age. As Baudelaire explains, “il y a eu une modernité pour chaque peintre ancien.”<sup>95</sup> This word *modernité* contains the new esthetic for which Baudelaire has been searching, and therefore, it is irrevocably connected with Baudelaire’s conception of beauty: “Le beau est fait d’un élément éternel, invariable, dont la quantité est excessivement difficile à déterminer, et d’un élément relatif, circonstanciel, qui sera, si l’on veut, tour à tour ou tout ensemble, l’époque, la mode, la morale, la passion.”<sup>96</sup> Therefore the responsibility of the *peintre de la vie moderne*, that is the painter of any given present, is to unify the duality of *modernité* and of *beauté*: “Il s’agit, pour lui, de dégager de la mode ce qu’elle peut contenir de poétique dans l’historique, de tirer l’éternel du transitoire.”<sup>97</sup> Like the definitions of *modernité* and *beauté*, the job of the artist is made up of two, seemingly antithetical parts – the *éternel* and the *transitoire*. The artist must unify the eternal, abstract part of art and beauty, which reaches across the ages, and the ephemeral quality of his own time. This unity is formed by extracting all that is poetic from an age, that is to say, the *essence* of an age, no matter how ugly it may seem, and recognizing that essence as purely and infinitely beautiful in its particularity. As Carrier affirms, “this unnatural unity is the product of art.”<sup>98</sup> It is this complicated ordering of overlapping paradoxes that Baudelaire claims Guys is able to achieve: “Il a cherché partout la beauté passagère, fugace, de la vie présente, le caractère de ce que le lecteur nous a permis d’appeler la *modernité*. Souvent bizarre, violent, excessif, mais toujours poétique, il a su concentrer dans ses dessins la saveur amère ou capiteuse du vin de la Vie.”<sup>99</sup> From this, the final sentence of the essay, it seems that Guys has succeeded in his role as *peintre de la vie moderne*, for he has epitomized the essence of his age, which Baudelaire’s new esthetic requires. However, while discussing Guys as a *flâneur*, Hiddleston casts doubt on Guys’ success: “There is no question of imposing coherence on these random perceptions [i.e. Guys’ drawings], no question above all of acceding to a synthetic view, and indeed Guys seems very far from seeking it.”<sup>100</sup> This implies that Guys, rather than representing the *peintre de la vie moderne* – he who distills the *éternel* from the *transitoire* – is in fact an element of the transitory. Hiddleston goes on to say: “Curiously, this role has been passed from the artist to the critic, who thus becomes once again involved in a creative art, and it is Baudelaire the essayist who, in various chapters on the dandy, the soldier, woman, and carriages, scarcely mentioning any specific drawings, gives a synthetic portrait of each type.”<sup>101</sup> In fact, this phenomenon is not so curious, for Baudelaire is asserting himself, the critic, as the *peintre de la vie moderne*. It is Baudelaire who distills the *éternel* – the synthetic, critical portraits of modern life – from the *transitoire* – Guys’ original drawings.

It is true that Baudelaire accomplishes his goal of distilling the *éternel* from the *transitoire* through his passionate, synthetic “album” more or less derived from Guys’ sketches of the dandy, soldier, women, and carriages as Hiddleston suggests, but his even greater achievement as *le peintre de la vie moderne* lies in the legend that he creates around Constantin Guys. By acclaiming Guys’ sketches as a “traduction *légendaire* de la vie extérieure,” Baudelaire provides a “traduction *légendaire*” of Constantin Guys.<sup>102</sup> Because it is critic who declares Guys to be the *peintre de la vie moderne*, Baudelaire elevates the critic to an even higher level of artistic creation. That is to say that M.G. must be regarded as the *peintre de la vie moderne* because Baudelaire portrays him as such. It is the penultimate artist, the critic, who paints the *peintre de la vie moderne*. Baudelaire affirms that the critic has such a power in the *Salon de 1846*: “L’artiste reproche tout d’abord à la critique de ne pouvoir rien enseigner au bourgeois, qui ne veut ni peindre ni rimer, – ni à l’art, puisque c’est de ses entrailles que la critique est sortie. Et pourtant que d’artistes de ce temps-ci doivent à elle seule leur pauvre renommée ! C’est peut-être là le vrai reproche à lui faire.”<sup>103</sup> Baudelaire is responding to the general lack of appreciation for critics among artists, claiming that the only reason these artists are famous at all is because of the critic. Indeed, without Baudelaire Guys would remain *transitoire*; he would remain a mere *poeta minor*, completely ignored by all who pass on the way to the Louvre.<sup>104</sup> In short, forgotten. However, through the essay, Baudelaire has given Guys artistic form and, according to Baudelaire, “Toute forme créée, même par l’homme, est immortelle. Car la forme est indépendante de la matière, et ce ne sont

pas les molécules qui constituent la forme.”<sup>105</sup> Therefore, Baudelaire could say the same to Guys, the *peintre de la vie moderne*, as to his lover whom he immortalizes in his poetry:

Alors, ô ma beauté ! dites à la vermine  
Qui vous mangera de baisers,  
Que j’ai gardé la forme et l’essence divine  
De mes amours décomposés !<sup>106</sup>

Not only does Baudelaire claim to have the power of immortalization through artistic creation, but he succeeds. Guys is still venerated as an important art historical figure, not because of his own artistic merits, but because Baudelaire made him into a work of art. As Raser asserts, “Constantin Guys, despite efforts to circulate his works, remains an artist who emerges from obscurity under the light projected by Baudelaire’s article.”<sup>107</sup> While Guys may never, and perhaps should not, reach the artistic status of Delacroix or Manet, because of Baudelaire many extremely prestigious museums, such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Louvre, own some of his works. Even now, in simple biographical summaries found in museums, the name of Constantin Guys is irrevocably connected with Baudelaire’s *Peintre de la vie moderne*.

## 6. À Quoi Bon?

After faithfully plodding through this minute *exposé* on Baudelaire’s *Peintre de la vie moderne*, the reader may well ask, “À quoi bon?” Why do we need a painter of modern life? This is an extremely important question that is still viable today. Baudelaire seeks an esthetic that corresponds to the world around him. He wants to throw off the classically heroic garments of the past and redress art in “...la morale et l’esthétique du temps.”<sup>108</sup> But this is not simply the whim of a rebellious spirit. Because Baudelaire believes that each age has its *modernité*, he claims that the *anciens*, who are so often emulated, portray their own age. Therefore, the artists of every age ought to do the same: “En un mot, pour que toute *modernité* soit digne de devenir antiquité, il faut que la beauté mystérieuse que la vie humaine y met involontairement en ait été extraite.”<sup>109</sup> Baudelaire desires that his own epoch become *antiquité*, rather than be swept into oblivion because its beauty, its essence is ignored. He warns the artists of his day against falling into the trap of an idealized past: “Malheur à celui qui étudie dans l’antique autre chose que l’art pur, la logique, la méthode générale ! Pour s’y trop plonger, il perd la mémoire du présent ; il abdique la valeur et les privilèges fournis par la circonstance ; car presque toute notre originalité vient de l’estampille que le *temps* exprime à nos sensations.”<sup>110</sup> In this way, in order for artists to attain the *new*, they must submit themselves fully to their time, no matter how ugly it may be. Today we ignore art all too often. We dismiss it as simply beautiful and essentially unnecessary. If we do discuss art, we lament the great esthetics of the past, much like the viewers in Baudelaire’s time. In fact, we are the bourgeois to whom Baudelaire appeals so passionately: “Or, vous avez besoin d’art. L’art est un bien infiniment précieux, un breuvage rafraîchissant et réchauffant, qui rétablit l’estomac et l’esprit dans l’équilibre naturel de l’idéal.”<sup>111</sup> Like the bourgeoisie of Baudelaire’s time, we are parched. In order to drink of this “breuvage rafraîchissant,” we must create and capture our own age. In short, we too are in need of a *peintre de la vie moderne* to immortalize the beauty of our *modernité*.

## 7. Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Duane Davis, Dr. Cathy Pons, Dr. Olivier Gloag, and Dr. Sandra Malicote for their patience and expertise.

## 8. References

1. Charles Baudelaire, “Salon de 1846,” in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 493.
2. Kerr Houston, *An Introduction to Art Criticism*, ed. Sarah Touborg (New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013), 26.

3. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1015.
4. Kerr Houston, *An Introduction to Art Criticism*, ed. Sarah Touborg (New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013), 25.
5. Ibid., 26.
6. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 73-74.
7. Kerr Houston, *An Introduction to Art Criticism*, ed. Sarah Touborg (New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013), 26.
8. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 75-76.
9. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Cygne," in *Les Fleurs du Mal*, in *Œuvres complètes I*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 85.
10. Joseph Sloane, *French painting between the past and the present* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), 81.
11. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Voyage," in *Les Fleurs du Mal*, in *Œuvres complètes I*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 134.
12. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1845," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 353.
13. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in Ibid., 608.
14. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1846," in Ibid., 420-421.
15. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la Vie Moderne," in Ibid., 688.
16. Charles Baudelaire, "L'Art Philosophique," in Ibid., 598.
17. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," in Ibid., 455.
18. Ibid., 419.
19. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 71.
20. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 619.
21. Charles Baudelaire, *Correspondance I*, (France: Gallimard, 1973), 336.
22. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 621.
23. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 49.
24. Charles Baudelaire. "Correspondances," in *Les Fleurs du Mal*, in *Œuvres complètes I*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 11.
25. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 49.
26. Joseph Sloane, *French painting between the past and the present* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), 82.
27. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 684.
28. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1845," in Ibid., 407.
29. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1011.
30. Alfred Werner, "Baudelaire: Art Critic," *The Kenyon Review* 28, no. 5 (1966): 654, accessed January 24, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4334695>.
31. Ibid., 656.
32. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1027.
33. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 418.
34. Ibid., 418.
35. Charles Baudelaire, "L'Art Philosophique," in Ibid., 598.
36. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1845," in Ibid., 356.
37. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," in Ibid., 418.

38. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1019.
39. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 423.
40. *Ibid.*, 419.
41. Michele Hannoosh, "Peinture et correspondances dans l'œuvre de Baudelaire," *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises* 62, (2010): 213.
42. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 43.
43. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 621.
44. Michele Hannoosh, "Peinture et correspondances dans l'œuvre de Baudelaire," *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises* 62, (2010): 213.
45. *Ibid.*, 209.
46. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1846," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 426.
47. *Ibid.*, 418.
48. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 64.
49. Charles Baudelaire, "Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser à Paris," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 793.
50. Charles Baudelaire, Introduction to *The painter of modern life and other essays*, ed. Jonathan Mayne (London: Phaidon Press 1995), X.
51. Ian Chilvers, "The Oxford Dictionary of Art and Artists," Oxford Reference, 2009 accessed January 20, 2015, <http://0-www.oxfordreference.com.wncln.wncln.org/view/10.1093/acref/9780199532940.001.0001/acref-9780199532940-e-1085?rkey=4G6tzO&result=3>.
52. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 30.
53. J. A. Hiddleston, "Baudelaire and Constantin Guys," *The Modern Language Review* 90, no. 3 (1995): 604, accessed January 12, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3734318>.
54. *Ibid.*, 604.
55. *Ibid.*, 603.
56. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 155.
57. David Carrier, *High Art: Charles Baudelaire and the Origins of Modernist Painting* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 52.
58. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 78.
59. Paul Valéry, "The Position of Baudelaire," in *Baudelaire: A Collection of Critical Essays 1962*, ed. Henri Peyre (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), 18.
60. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 79.
61. *Ibid.*, 44.
62. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes II*, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 610.
63. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 155.
64. *Ibid.*, 155
65. *Ibid.*, 155.
66. Duane H. Davis, "The Philosopher of Modern Life: Baudelaire, Merleau-Ponty, and the Art of Phenomenological Critique," trans. Richard Simanke, *Natureza Humana: Revista de Filosofia e Psicanálise* Vol.11, n.2 (2009), 174.
67. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 155.
68. *Ibid.*, 157.

69. Charles Baudelaire, "Notes sur *Le Peintre de la vie moderne*," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 1418.
70. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 44.
71. J. A. Hiddleston, "Baudelaire and Constantin Guys," *The Modern Language Review* 90, no. 3 (1995): 604, accessed January 12, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3734318>.
72. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1846," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 417.
73. *Ibid.*, 473-474.
74. Charles Baudelaire, "L'Art Philosophique," in *Ibid.*, 598.
75. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 620.
76. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Ibid.*, 715.
77. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1859," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 621.
78. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1029.
79. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 57.
80. Charles Baudelaire, *Correspondance I* (France: Gallimard, 1973), 639.
81. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 688.
82. *Ibid.*, 700.
83. *Ibid.* 688.
84. *Ibid.* 686.
85. *Ibid.* 689.
86. *Ibid.* 689-690.
87. *Ibid.* 692.
88. Charles Baudelaire, "Les Foules" in *Le Spleen de Paris*, in *Œuvres complètes* I, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 291.
89. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 689.
90. Joseph Sloane, *French painting between the past and the present* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), 84-85.
91. Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist," in *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, (United States: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1994), 1029.
92. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 694.
93. *Ibid.*, 695.
94. Pierre Castex, *La critique d'art en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1958), 76.
95. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 695.
96. *Ibid.*, 685.
97. *Ibid.* 694.
98. David Carrier, *High Art: Charles Baudelaire and the Origins of Modernist Painting* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 63.
99. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 724.
100. J. A. Hiddleston, "Baudelaire and Constantin Guys," *The Modern Language Review* 90, no. 3 (1995): 614, accessed January 12, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3734318>.
101. *Ibid.*, 614.
102. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 698.
103. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1846," in *Ibid.* 417-418.
104. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Ibid.*, 683

105. Charles Baudelaire, "Mon cœur mis à nu" in *Œuvres complètes* I, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 705.
106. Charles Baudelaire, "Une Charogne," in *Ibid.*, v. 43-48, 32.
107. Timothy Raser, *A poetics of art criticism: the case of Baudelaire* (Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 1989), 155.
108. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Œuvres complètes* II, ed. Claude Pichois, and Jean Ziegler (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 684.
109. *Ibid.*, 695.
110. *Ibid.*, 696
111. Charles Baudelaire, "Le Salon de 1846," in *Ibid.*, 415-416.