



Dix-Neuf

Journal of the Society of Dix-Neuviémistes

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ydix20>

'Nous sommes tous nés nomades.' The Pictorial Compasses of Fromentin's *Dominique* and Flaubert's *Salammbô* of 1862

Mary Orr

To cite this article: Mary Orr (2023) 'Nous sommes tous nés nomades.' The Pictorial Compasses of Fromentin's *Dominique* and Flaubert's *Salammbô* of 1862, *Dix-Neuf*, 27:2-3, 114-133, DOI: [10.1080/14787318.2023.2218210](https://doi.org/10.1080/14787318.2023.2218210)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14787318.2023.2218210>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 01 Sep 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

‘Nous sommes tous nés nomades.’ The Pictorial Compasses of Fromentin’s *Dominique* and Flaubert’s *Salammbô* of 1862

Mary Orr

University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

ABSTRACT

This article takes its lead from Barbara Wright’s simple yet profound literary-critical imperative, “‘Only Connect’...” (2010), to reflect Fromentin’s *Dominique* critically in Flaubert’s *Salammbô* – and vice versa – by means of the aesthetic compasses of critical reader response in 1862, and their authors’ earlier travel writing. In therefore arguing by example for renewed examination of important works in word and image in Second Empire France that appear the same year, the article reorientates twenty-first-century critical debate concerning the status and aesthetic perspectives of mature, representative, enduring and canonical works in nineteenth-century French and Francophone Studies.

KEYWORDS

Flaubert; *Salammbô*;
Fromentin; *Dominique*; 1862;
critical word and image
study; vanishing points

Of the enduring but very different French literary works that saw publication in 1862, Victor Hugo’s *Les Misérables*, Eugène Fromentin’s *Dominique* and Gustave Flaubert’s *Salammbô* are indicative. They are rarely compared let alone critically connected, because specialists of one look deeper into its author’s corpus to explain its textual, inter-medial and interdisciplinary ramifications, rather than interrelate its possibilities for wider review in its immediate contemporaries. Overlooked in this case is also the fact that all three authors had spent significant earlier periods of their artistic lives outside metropolitan France, recording these travel experiences and sojourns in non-fictional and visual art forms. If the space of this Special Issue concentrates focus on the latter two works in light of Barbara Wright’s interconnected research as a foremost expert on Fromentin (Wright 2000) and *Dominique* (Wright 2002), she did not extend it to include *Salammbô*. Significantly, however, she quoted Flaubert’s wisdom – the folly of concluding – at the outset of her intervention, “‘Only Connect ...’” (2010), to outline the vital importance for the future of critical nineteenth-century French studies of informed, reflective engagement with word and image, the locus of their study exemplified in her pithy title quotation (borrowing the epigraph to E. M. Forster’s *Howard’s End*). Wright’s literary-critical wisdom in the simple yet profound statement and imperative of her title, reflecting as it does her life’s work in research, also inspires the title image of this article. It will plot for the first time – as in the navigator’s or

CONTACT Mary Orr  mmo@st-andrews.ac.uk

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

geometer's use of (a pair of) compasses – the compositional-representational similarities and connections between Fromentin's *Dominique* and Flaubert's *Salammbô*. In that neither is a realist text, their inter-reflections in 1862 map shared aesthetic priorities in their depictions of Second Empire France.

To address the seemingly self-contained contiguity of these two iconic French texts – their circles of interest in nineteenth-century French Studies rarely overlap – is an immediate lesson in critical reconnecting as modelled by Wright (2010). Bibliographical searches uncovered no previous comparative analyses of *Dominique* and *Salammbô* despite, or possibly because of, extensive investigation of French Orientalism(s) in the wake of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Fromentin and Flaubert find only glancing cross-reference or independent mention in important studies of French Orientalist travellers (Lowe 1991), travel writers (Thompson 2012) and artists (Mickel 1994–95; Peltre 2004). Moreover, the critical optics of genre (Segal 1988), myths of the exotic (Kabbani 2008) and race (Moussa 2003), or of nineteenth-century geopolitics concerning Egypt (Moussa 2004), Algeria (Goellner 2018) and French metropolitan material cultures (Green 2011) and their 'colonial comedy' (Yee 2016) militate against the pairing, and hence cross-comparison of *Dominique* and *Salammbô*. Although Richard B. Grant and Nelly H. Severin (1973) and Laurent Jouannaud (2003) for example compare Fromentin's *Dominique* with other works by Flaubert – *Madame Bovary* and *L'Éducation sentimentale* (of 1845 and 1869) respectively – they do so to claim the greater literary standing of Fromentin's text. Such alignments and evaluation of authors and texts mainly for qualitative difference and distinction reveal what is moot in the critical advocacy of precedence: it operates according to modern preference in ever-recalibrating scales of aesthetic and sociocultural value. What is often overlooked is the time(s) of first production. Otherwise different works in contents and form may be revelatory as responses to cultural values of their time, if they share larger underpinning aesthetic similarities, sensibilities and priorities.

In 'only connecting' the possibilities of this latter vantage point to cross-examine (now iconic) textual and visual works appearing the same year in national corpora, such an approach has further critical advantages. First, it precludes questions of (causal) influence, imitation and competition by also excluding (positivist) models of hierarchy and 'firstness'. Second, it encourages more careful lateral attention to informed perspectives in major works which, when concertedly put together, locate shared aesthetic priorities irrespective of medium. In short, inductive investigation – our metaphor is compasses – reveals and connects what deductive analysis cannot. But to address contiguous artistic productions critically also calls for textual-intermedial approaches that operate independently of (self-selecting) aesthetic privilege, whether by genre, artistic medium and aesthetic 'school', or by class, gender, ethnicity for artists. In actor-network theory as reconfigured for literary critique by Rita Felski (2015) and prosopography (Stone 1971) are two alternative models, albeit that each still relies upon pre-given social status or other ranking for 'artists', and upon predetermined orders of success established by cultural-aesthetic standing. In 'only connecting' Flaubert's and Fromentin's known, mutual (inter)textual exchanges upon publication of their 1862 works as my critical starting point, I bring to these exchanges the further necessary (contiguous) critical turn that is the work of compasses. Also insufficiently considered to date are recorded first insights and reactions to both *Dominique* and *Salammbô* in 1862 by

contemporary French critics operating outside the ‘artist’ set and regular circles of their authors.

Reciprocal first encounters therefore frame this first critical cross-examination of the striking 1862 prose works of Fromentin and Flaubert as intermediating portraits and landscapes of Second Empire France. I use these visual arts metaphors advisedly, the better to connect and investigate the shared pictorial poetics of *Dominique* and *Salammbô* that underpin their very different prose genres and modes of expression (as *récit personnel* and *roman historique* respectively). That both texts galvanize surprisingly similar plot, character and representation devices – the appendix collates a list to stimulate further study and curriculum development concerning iconic works appearing in the same year – is revelatory of their authors’ shared aesthetic vision as our principal concern. The second section of the article focuses on three techniques common to the pictorial poetics of both *Dominique* and *Salammbô*: (i) the compositional coalescence of subject and ground; (ii) dominant perspective as a guiding vantage point and hence (iii) its location and expression of visual-textual vanishing points. That these three techniques were informed, developed and honed through their authors’ earlier travels and their recording is the subject of the final part of the article. It plots the overlapping aesthetic concerns and priorities of their authors in the endings of their 1862 texts as inter-reflecting compasses for their later writing of 1874, for Flaubert of the *Tentation de saint Antoine* and for Fromentin his *Préface* to the re-edition of *Un été dans le Sahara* and *Une année dans le Sahel. Journal d’un absent*. In consequence, the value of studying pivotal 1862 ‘mature’ works by two authors with differently critical reflections on Second Empire France brings representative, enduring and canonical works in nineteenth-century French and Francophone word and image studies back to twenty-first-century critical debate. Let us now look more connectively at *Dominique* and *Salammbô* in 1862 for the reciprocities of their first reception as preeminent works of pictorial poetics and politics.

Critical Exchange and Change of View: Lessons for Reading Contiguous Artistic Productions

As Flaubert was finally completing *Salammbô* in April 1862 he had also been reading Hugo’s *Les Misérables*. He communicates his mixed responses to it in letters to two of his stalwart correspondents and supportive critics, Amélie Bosquet (on April 14, 1862) and Mademoiselle Marie-Sophie Leroyer de Chantepie (on April 24, 1862). To the latter Flaubert also conveyed the news she eagerly awaited, a publication date for *Salammbô* (end of October) and his assurances of her early copy. This letter also contextualizes their important ongoing discussion about change of location, including its wider benefits for *bien-être* (existential, physiological, mental, critical, artistic). On April 14, 1862 Leroyer de Chantepie had sent Flaubert a long letter, articulating the gamut of symptoms of her winter-long misery in Angers (including *ennui*) and its reliefs, in reenergizing ‘bibliotherapy’ – her rereading of the early works of George Sand – as well as in her plans to rent a house in Tours (as possible staging post to visit Paris and Flaubert). Her further letter (of June 13, 1862), confirming that she was still stuck in Angers, remained unanswered by Flaubert until August 29, when he was in Vichy (on a *cure* with his mother). His reply supplies the title quotation of this article:

Vous êtes-vous enfin déterminée à quelque chose d'*énergique*, à un voyage, à un séjour à Paris? Sortez donc du milieu funeste où vous vous rongez l'âme. Vivre attaché au même endroit ne vaut rien ni pour le corps ni pour l'esprit. Nous sommes tous nés nomades. On ne manque point à ses origines impunément.

Il n'y a pas longtemps que nous étions des Barbares!

En revoyant de loin des montagnes, mon vieux sang de voyageur a bondi dans mes veines [...] Pourquoi parmi vos lectures, ne vous lisez pas plus de voyages? Cela ouvre l'imagination délicieusement, on vagabonde au coin de son feu. (Flaubert 1991, 243, emphasis in the original)

If Flaubert's reply clearly reveals its interest for reframing the 'Barbares' of *Salammbô*, Leroyer de Chantepié's reply from Tours of September 8, 1862 anticipates, and potentially informs, Flaubert's important personal encounter in early 1863 both with *Dominique* and with its author Fromentin:

Je ne puis vous dire le soulagement que j'ai éprouvé en ne voyant plus les mêmes objets. C'était une vraie délivrance, on eût dit qu'une montagne s'enlevait de sur mon cœur. Je me sentais libre [...] Tandis qu'en pensant aux bords du Nil, vous disiez comme tout change! je me disais comme tout est changé! J'ai passé ici il y a vingt ans les heures les plus idéales de ma vie! La maison que j'habite est un agreste jardin, où on m'offrait un bouquet de jasmin auquel j'attachais alors un grand prix et que maintenant je jetterais au ruisseau. Je n'ai même plus le charme du souvenir! En existe-t-il pour ce qui n'a jamais existé! L'édifice brillant créé par mon imagination n'est plus qu'une hideuse ruine. Le rêve a fait place au réalisme, et pourtant la vérité n'est-elle pas plutôt dans le songe que dans la réalité. Il est certain que j'ai aimé, admiré, cela est vrai, seulement l'objet n'a jamais existé! [...] Il y a deux choses, dont je ne me consolerais point: la souffrance et la mort! [...] Je poursuis la lecture des *Misérables* qui m'ont sauvé bien des mauvais moments. Il y a aussi dans la *Revue des Deux Mondes* 'Dominique', dont la première partie est pleine de poésie. Je lis *Autour de la table* de G. Sand [...] *Lélia* reste mon livre de prédilection. (Flaubert 1991, 245–246)

It is then early 1863 (January 31) when Flaubert writes to Fromentin to congratulate him on *Dominique* after reading it in one intensive sitting – 'J'ai commencé à 8 h du soir et j'ai fini à 2 h du matin' (Flaubert 1991, 304) – and to secure their earliest meeting to discuss it. We have no record of their conversation, including Flaubert's response to Fromentin's earlier fulsome verdict of November 29, 1862 on *Salammbô*:

J'achève *Salammbô*. C'est beau et robuste, éblouissant de spectacle et d'une intensité de vue extraordinaire. *Vous êtes un grand peintre, mon cher ami, mieux que cela, un grand visionnaire*; car comment appeler celui qui crée des réalités si vives avec ses rêves et qui nous y fait croire. [...] De nouveaux horizons plus vastes, une mise en scène prodigieuse ont permis à votre manière de se mettre au large; et votre exécution déjà si ferme a pris une âpreté et un relief qui font de vous un praticien consommé. Je parle ici seulement du métier. (Fromentin 1995, 1273, emphasis in the original)

If the small section in italics is often cited by critics of Flaubert (for example Jullien 2013) and of Fromentin (such as Kraume 2013) to champion one or other artist, it is never contextualized and probed further. Importantly, Flaubert and Fromentin had not previously corresponded, nor met to discuss their work. To gauge the immediate and larger effects (and affect) of their reciprocal admiration, to which this exchange between fellow writers attests, it is not enough to place side by side the clear evidence above from the voluminous correspondence of both writers. They again pass thereafter as very different ships in

the night. Rather, to access Flaubert's and Fromentin's shared 'intensité de vue extraordinaire' (also never commented upon in either Flaubert or Fromentin criticism) that they clearly appreciate in the other is to seek out additional informed contemporary critical insight on *Dominique* and *Salammbô* together in 1862. As is visible in Leroyer de Chantepie's letter of September 8, 1862 to Flaubert above, she is not only *his* attentive reader (Zielonka 2012), but also their important contemporary evaluator in terms of their (shared) aesthetics.

Leroyer de Chantepie has also been overlooked strikingly in Flaubert-*Salammbô* as well as in Fromentin-*Dominique* criticism. On December 3, and back in Angers, she writes to thank Flaubert for her personal copy of *Salammbô*, by articulating her redoubled personal and public responses to it:

Ce n'est que du côté du cœur que je puis prétendre à votre sympathie, car je comprends le vôtre, son exquise sensibilité et sa bonté! J'ai lu en grande partie *Salammbô*, et ce n'est pas sans peine! C'est un livre si terrible que je craignais d'en devenir folle, surtout dans mon état maladif et nerveux. Si, comme je le crois, l'auteur s'identifie avec son sujet, vous avez dû cruellement souffrir, c'est une œuvre de titan et qui va soulever bien des polémiques, le bruit sera grand, comptez-y. Si vous le permettez, j'écrirai un petit compte rendu de *Salammbô*, il n'aura d'autre mérite que celui de vous avoir compris [...]. Votre récit est homérique et rappelle souvent *Illiade*. Vous avez fait revivre tout un monde évanoui, votre livre est si nouveau, si impossible à imiter qu'il fera une immense sensation. (Flaubert 1991, 266–267)

Despite this letter's lengthy report of her worsening (mental) health, general physiological debilitation and self-isolation Leroyer de Chantepie completes her review. Indeed she writes to Flaubert again (March 20, 1863) to confirm its publication after her several readings of *Salammbô* to complete it. Her March letter in its tone, and coextensive with her state, is however redolent of the 'poésie' of *Dominique* (identified in her earlier letter above of September 8, 1862):

Je me sens comme une barque perdue sur une mer inconnue, sans boussole, sans une lueur dans les ténèbres. Le passé m'apparaît comme une vie qui n'est pas la mienne, je me cherche moi-même et ne me trouve plus; à chaque instant, je me sens perdue sans retour, et je le suis, sans un secours providentiel, je ne l'espère pas. [...] C'est à croire qu'il n'existe plus rien de bon, ni de beau sur la terre. La nature elle-même est en deuil, les plaintes du vent dans mes arbres verts, la pluie, le brouillard, les branches dépouillées, tout est lugubre. (Flaubert 1991, 311)

Her opening similes here also differently reflect back Flaubert's earlier assertion to her in his letter of August 29, 1862 that 'nous sommes tous nés nomades.' *Salammbô* and *Dominique* clearly share deeply moving, inter-reflecting, artistic qualities for Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie. After her first reading of both works (her letter of December 3) she explicitly pinpoints the 'exquise sensibilité' of authors self-identifying with their subject in the deep pain of its inspiration and execution, in order to produce art works that can then transport, and even transform the reader thanks to their (inimitable, 'terrible') intensity. To reread *Dominique* in the light of *Salammbô* (and vice versa) in the light of Leroyer de Chantepie's unusually well-informed contemporary art- and text-critical eyes (Brizemur 1960; Oliver 1982) is thus to look afresh with greater attention to the 1862 perspectives of their authors' (similar) artistic priorities beyond plot, description, cultural reference points and genre. The pivotal 'nomadic'

reorientation that is travel to very different climes and texts is what informs and inspires artistic production of seemingly different stripe in the same corpus: Flaubert had conceived *Madame Bovary* on his *Voyage en Orient* of 1849–50. Had Fromentin similarly grasped the ‘poésie’ in *Dominique* identified by Leroyer de Chantepie during his earlier travels and their writing as *Une année dans le Sahel* (1857) and *Un été dans le Sahara* (1859)? Wright (2002, 14, 19, 38) certainly made such connections, but did not elaborate upon them. As the exchanges above between Flaubert and Leroyer de Chantepie provocatively locate, past, present and future time and space can only properly be understood and articulated in text and image through their contingent and intermediating term: movement (between) is the space for being moved. Let us now take up Chantepie’s lead in reading *Dominique* and *Salammbô* contiguously, to address what motivates their authors’ shared artistic priorities. The first we address in each is the compositional coalescence of subject and ground. The second we identify is the dominant perspective guiding interpretative viewpoint. In connecting them as the legs of the compass we can then locate the visual-textual vanishing points in both works, and their modes of representation and expression.

Techniques of Contiguity as Artistic Practice 1. The Canvas of *Dominique*

As a Flaubert rather than Fromentin specialist, my return to *Dominique* (Fromentin 1984) for this Special Issue after not teaching it for some years alerted me afresh to its intensity of pictorial detail and ‘inscape’, to use the term of Victorian poet Gerald Manley Hopkins aligning with Leroyer de Chantepie’s ‘poésie’. Four different indicative mood descriptions epitomize the compositional coalescence of subject and ground that locate Fromentin’s insistent positioning and articulation of his *sujet*, *Dominique/Dominique*:

Le soir venait. Le soleil n’avait plus que quelques minutes de trajet pour atteindre le bord tranchant de l’horizon. Il éclairait longuement, en y traçant des rayures d’ombre et de lumière, un grand pays plat, tristement coupé de vignobles, de guérets et de marécages, nullement boisé, à peine onduleux, et s’ouvrant de distance en distance, par une lointaine échappée de vue, sur la mer. (373–374)

Dominique avait assez peu de goût pour la mer, il avait grandi, disait-il, au milieu de ses gémissements, et s’en souvenait avec déplaisir [...] D’ailleurs, vu de la côte élevée que nous suivions, ce double horizon plat de la campagne et des flots devenait d’une grandeur saisissante à force d’être vide. Et puis, dans ce contraste du mouvement des vagues et de l’immobilité de la plaine, dans cette alternative de bateaux qui passent et de maisons qui demeurent, de la vie aventureuse et de la vie fixée, il y avait une intime analogie dont il devait être frappé plus que tout autre, et qu’il savourait secrètement, avec l’âcre jouissance propre aux voluptés d’esprit qui font souffrir. (386)

J’y comptais un peu pour me distraire, mais pas du tout pour m’étourdir, et encore moins pour me consoler. Le campagnard en outre persistait et ne pouvait se résoudre à se dépouiller de lui-même, parce qu’il avait changé de milieu. N’en déplaise à ceux qui pourraient nier l’influence du terroir, je sentais qu’il y avait en moi je ne sais quoi de local et de résistant que je ne transplanterais jamais qu’à demi, et si le désir de m’acclimater m’étais venu, les mille liens indéracinables des origines m’auraient averti par de continuelles et vaines souffrances que c’était peine inutile. Je vivais à Paris comme dans une hôtellerie où je pourrais demeurer longtemps, où je pourrais mourir, mais où je ne serais jamais que de passage. (463)

Votre pays vous ressemble, me disait-elle [Madeleine]. Je me serais doutée de ce qu'il était, rien qu'en vous voyant. Il est soucieux, paisible et d'une chaleur douce. La vie doit y être très calme et réfléchie. Et je m'explique maintenant beaucoup mieux certaines bizarreries de votre esprit, qui sont les vrais caractères de votre pays natal. (479)

First, the 'double horizon plat' of the text – literal and figurative horizons of *Les Trembles* (passages 1, 2, 4) and *Paris* (passage 3) – are inter-reflected in the text's various wide-angle, horizontal, flat landscape descriptions and gently oscillating sentence structures that harmonize, balance, flatten and merge contrasts, so that the eponymous *Dominique* is synonymous compositionally, as well as in Madeleine's view in quotation four, with the aptly named 'Les Trembles'. Second, the adjective 'plat' (and its cognates) reverberates for a Flaubertian with Bovarysme: it epitomizes the platitudes, clichés and provincial (as well as Parisian) mediocrity of received ideas as painted large in the description in *Dominique* of Saint-Pierre (chapter four) framing Madame Ceyszac's house in its repeated palette of sombre, dulling negatives and emotive hues. Third is Fromentin's surprisingly sparing use of simile when compared with the persistency of metaphor as Wright notes (2002, 61) in verbal constructions with repeated variations. For example 'changer de milieu', 'transplanter', 'acclimater' in quotation three are further compounded by their qualifying simile, 'comme dans une hôtellerie [...] de passage'. For a painter's text, reference to colour is then strangely absent except when sparingly used, like simile, for specific and striking visual detail, contrast, effect, counter-positioning and alternatively concentrating focus. For example, when Madeleine returns from her travels (with her father M. Orsel and sister Julie in chapter six), the first thing *Dominique* sees and notes from afar is 'le voile bleu de Madeleine, qui flottait à la portière de la voiture' (Fromentin 1984, 435).

Compositionally, the accumulative horizontal layering of observation and description throughout *Dominique* is further sedimented by qualifying tonal nuance, to prepare thick description in strategic set-piece *mises en abyme* concerning art and artworks in the text, for example in chapter sixteen. Its reflecting/refracting portraits are also portraits of the artist (Lethbridge 1979), despite *Dominique*'s seeming disingenuousness:

Il y avait une exposition de peinture moderne. Quoique très ignorant dans un art dont j'avais l'instinct sans nulle culture [...] j'allais quelquefois poursuivre, à propos de peinture, des examens qui m'apprenaient à bien juger mon époque, et chercher des comparaisons qui ne me réjouissaient guère. Un jour, je vis un petit nombre de gens qui devaient être des connaisseurs arrêtés devant un tableau et discourant. C'était un portrait coupé à mi-corps, conçu dans un style ancien, avec un fond sombre, un costume indécis, sans nul accessoire: deux mains splendides, une chevelure à demi perdue, la tête présentée de face, ferme de contours, gravée sur la toile avec la précision d'un émail, et modelée je ne sais dans quelle manière sobre, large et pourtant voilée, qui donnait à la physionomie des incertitudes extraordinaires, et faisait palpiter une âme émue dans la vigoureuse incision de ce trait aussi résolu que celui d'une médaille. Je restais anéanti devant cette effigie effrayante de réalité et de tristesse. La signature était d'un peintre illustre. Je recourus au livret: j'y trouvai les initiales de madame de Nièvres. [...] Madeleine était devant moi qui me regardait, mais avec quels yeux! dans quelle attitude! avec quelle pâleur et quelle mystérieuse expression d'attente et de déplaisir amer! (Fromentin 1984, 542–543)

Again, no colour distracts from the predominant dark tones and contrasting, sparing 'pâleurs'. Instead we find precision and impression in the portrait's hard delineations

and transience that make it at once ‘un émail’, ‘une médaille’, ‘une effigie’ as differently expressive of ‘incertitudes extraordinaires’. In exhibiting the talent of the artist as much as the particularities of the subject, this portrait shocks the reader in its concomitant attraction-repulsion-compulsion to look, and look again. We will discover an equivalent set-piece in *Salammbô* shortly. The space of resemblance in this ‘portrait’ is then in the emotive gap of its incompleteness, yet oneness of figure and ground, to merge and separate subjective objectivation – the viewer notes the sitter’s disembodied upper body, hands and ‘unfinished’ coiffure – and objective subjectification: ‘les initiales de madame de Nièvres’ transmute into ‘Madeleine’. The all-consuming male gaze (including of the ‘connaisseurs’) is challenged, however, in the eyes of the figured woman, because her full-face physiognomy is without other identificatory or prominent feature. These eyes powerfully signal to the viewer their ‘déplaisir amer’. In so doing, they prefigure both the end of Dominique’s fantasy relationship with Madeleine, and alternative view of the idyll in the final cameo of *Dominique* (to which we will return), his avowedly happy marriage to the no less diaphanous Madame de Bray. These eyes also challenge readers to see themselves, and to review the position of the artist.

But the painterly negotiation here of frame, portrait, subject and viewer in this composite artwork description also depicts modern art (including Salon exhibition and critical consumption) in relation to its older forms. In directly negotiating (dual) viewer positioning to render particular-individual yet universal-general time and space, this portrait exemplifies perspective as the second major feature of *Dominique* shared with *Salammbô*. Chapter sixteen, importantly, opens with insights into Dominique’s ‘maturity and modernity’ (MacKenzie 2007), because it also investigates Fromentin’s as author/artist in *Dominique* thanks to another rare and hence striking simile:

Je ne mis plus les pieds dans le monde [...] Je ne m’enfermai pas trop à l’étroit, j’y serais mort d’étouffement; mais je me circonscrivis dans un cercle d’esprits actifs studieux, spéciaux, absorbés, ennemis des chimères, qui faisaient de la science, de l’érudition ou de l’art, comme ce Florentin ingénu qui créait la perspective, et la nuit réveillait sa femme pour lui dire: ‘Quelle douce chose que la perspective!’ Je me défiais des écarts de l’imagination: j’y mis bon ordre. (Fromentin 1984, 537)

As Wright notes (2002, 55), the painter in question is the early Renaissance artist Paolo Uccello (1397–1475). That he was also a geometer further illuminates Dominique’s mention of Uccello’s wife in this account as important interlocutor in his trigonometrical ‘eureka moment’. This artist simile thus refigures Dominique’s earlier interpretation of the painting of ‘Madeleine’ in its delineations of her multiple absence paradoxically empowering her presence. The significance of shadowy female ‘Echos’ is therefore not only as reflectors and guarantors of self-absorbed Narcissus figures in the text (Segal 1988). These moments of self-revelation also determine the renewed assertion of the dominant male gaze by the Narcissus-main narrator, Dominique. His perspective is thus to control what is unseen, located in circumscribed presence – ‘je me circonscrivis’ – in the absence of his others as the frame safeguarding against ‘des écarts de l’imagination’. The Uccello reference here, without an identifying proper name (yet exemplary of the ‘Old Master’, to prefigure Fromentin’s *Les Maîtres d’autrefois* of 1876 discussed by Robert Lethbridge in this Special Issue), nonetheless pinpoints the ultimate logic of composition using predominantly horizontal perspectives. Whether accreted, sedimented

or elongated, these will reveal their compositional vanishing point where they meet, a question in geometry that absorbed Uccello. Space does not permit investigation of the subconscious reverberations of Uccello (Italian for bird) for Fromentin in *Dominique* in that birds as a shared subject feature everywhere at significant moments in the text's hunts, scenes of spring (the arrival of storks) and in cages. To the point here are key scenes in *Dominique* depicting various 'Echos' and their absences in pivotal moments of male self-revelation and self-deception, and hence 'vanishing point'. It is consistently located and incorporated by the text's doubly peripheral female figures – the nameless wives of Uccello and Augustin, in Madame de Bray and Madeleine's sister, Julie – in their varying degrees of literal and figurative anonymity and ethereality. Julie's fainting brought on in part by the starkly contrasting verticality and vertigo of the famous lighthouse scene (chapter 11) prefigures and reflects her controlled self-abnegation and proneness, the better to magnify her powerful returning gaze on the eponymous Dominique's dominant patriarchal perspectives in a further pictorial passage (in chapter seventeen) redolent of Dutch genre paintings (as well as prefiguring Manet's 'Olympia' of 1865, discussed in Therese Dolan's and Michael Tilby's articles):

Quand il me fut permis [...] d'entrer dans sa chambre, je trouvai la malade étendue sur un long canapé, dans un ample peignoir qui dissimulait l'exiguïté de ses formes et lui donnait des airs de femme. Elle était très changée [...] [U]n petit épagneul dormait à ses pieds, la tête appuyée sur le bout de ses pantoufles. Il y avait à portée de sa main, sur un guéridon garni d'arbustes et de plantes en fleur, des oiseaux en cage qu'elle élevait [...] Je regardai ce mince visage, miné par la fièvre, amaigri et bleui autour des tempes, ces yeux creusés, plus ouverts et plus noirs que jamais, où flambait dans l'obscurité des prunelles un feu sombre, mais inextinguible. (Fromentin 1984, 547–548)

Dominique's failure to recognize that he is the direct cause of Julie's state of burning fever and inextinguishable passion means that he can burn the books of his poetic efforts (issuing from this past). He can faint himself shortly after this scene, provoking Madeleine's wild horse riding and its aftermath, when he finds himself again at her bedroom door – 'J'avais perdu connaissance, tout en me maintenant encore debout' (555). He can also ride away from both sisters to remake life after his own self-image in Les Trembles (as Madeleine noted in passage three of the opening sequence of four above), unaware of the unlimited damage that his lack of 'connaissance' causes to Madeleine as well as to Julie, because determined by his inability to 'se connaître'. For the perspicacious reader, however, both women clearly wear before him the distinctive touches of blue (his bruising of them) about their temples.

Dominique's unawareness of his problem is already clear, however, at the beginning of chapter 5, in his unwitting simile of (non-)self-recognition upon identifying his own worst enemy in himself: 'le jour où le collège se rouvrit, j'y ramenai [...] un être agité, malheureux, une sorte d'esprit plié en deux, comme un fakir attristé qui s'examine' (421). This unique oriental simile in *Dominique* confirms Fromentin's artistic vision in the text. Its many affective horizons – Leroyer de Chantepie's term is 'poésie' – connect with his earlier travels and their painterly description. After he has completed *Salammbô*, Flaubert's intensive reading response to *Dominique* above clearly affirms the (mesmerizing) importance of its affect. For Fromentin, the artistry of his own work – encapsulated in the portrait above – equally stares him in the face in his response to Flaubert after reading *Salammbô*: 'De nouveaux horizons plus vastes, une mise en scène

prodigieuse ont permis à votre manière de *se mettre au large*; et votre exécution *déjà si ferme a pris une âpreté et un relief* qui font de vous un praticien consommé. Je parle ici seulement du métier (Fromentin 1995, 1273, my emphasis). Let us now turn to Flaubert's seemingly opposite strategies for achieving the same affect, his dispassionate distancing techniques, strangely disembodied narrative perspective and chilling vanishing points, all best epitomized in *Salammbô*'s famous ending: 'Ainsi mourut la fille d'Hamilcar pour avoir touché au manteau de Tanit' (Flaubert 1964, 797).

Techniques of Contiguity as Artistic Practice 2. The Stereoscope of *Salammbô*

The reader's alienation and disorientation in *Salammbô*'s barrage of foreignizing word, image and plethora of archaeological detail deriving from recent book knowledge (Strong 1975; Houssais 1996) come nevertheless by aesthetically compelling means. As Adrienne Tooke has so convincingly shown (2000, 177), despite allocating to 'Carthage' only a 'Postscript', Flaubert was as highly informed about and sensitive to the pictorial arts as Fromentin (2000, 18). While critics of *Salammbô* note among its intersecting pictorial dimensions its 'tableaux (vivants)' (Jullien 2013), 'illustrations' (Houssais 1996) and 'panoramas' of Antiquity (Arweiler and Westerwelle 2021), I want to return to what *moves* its compositional subject and ground, guiding visual perspectives and hence location of aesthetic and ethnographical vanishing point(s), by looking again at the text in the light of Fromentin's *Dominique*. I do so through connecting two unrelated, yet altogether prescient observations by Tooke (because she interestingly footnotes Fromentin in each case):

Sometimes, the landscape seems to come alive and move; or successive changes of viewpoint make 'le même tableau' open out to become three-dimensional (this is the art of the 'stéréoscope' to which Flaubert's writing was often compared by contemporaries). (Tooke 2000, 158).

The grand landscape, the great set-piece, begins to yield, also, to the more approachable *image d'Épinal*. [...] It is the *Voyage en Orient* [of 1851], however, that is the real test of Flaubert's pictorialist techniques. Flaubert was confronted with exactly the same difficulties as painters of his time: how to find a form to accommodate the landscapes of the Near East and could they even be called 'landscapes' as such? Colours and light seemed absolutely new; and notions of the picturesque were quite out of place in the desert. (159)

The key landscapes (with or without Tooke's quotation marks) and set pieces in *Salammbô* that most test Flaubert's 'pictorialist techniques' are the opening ('Le Festin', part I), the immolation of Carthage's children ('Moloch', part XIII) and 'Mathô' (Part XV) as finale/ mirror scene to the first. The ritual sacrifice of the Barbarian leader-hero – to whom the eponymous heroine had given the marriage cup at 'le Festin' – is an essential part of *Salammbô*'s political wedding to Narr'Havas closing the text. All three intensify the novel's affect as 'terrible' (Leroyer de Chantepie). Moreover, as set-piece theatres of cultural ritual – 'spectacle' is Fromentin's term above – they provide inter-reflecting compositional and interpretative force. The ritual sacrifice of Mâtho the Barbarian leader-hero, to whom the eponymous heroine had given the marriage cup at 'le Festin', is an essential part of *Salammbô*'s political wedding to Narr'Havas closing the text. There

she is also indubitably the ‘child’ of Carthage that her father, Hamilcar, sacrifices to its political future. If all three scenes merge subject and ground, their compositional perspective is all, to ensure that we the reader are rivetted by the (unfolding) excesses and horrors. This same ‘attraction-repulsion-compulsion to look, and look again’ that we discovered in the portrait (of Madeleine) above ensures that readers also cannot escape from being moved. Excerpts from these three scenes from *Salammbô* in their running order highlight their main positioning perspectives (and hence identify where literal and figurative vanishing points are located):

Le palais s’éclaira d’un seul coup à sa plus haute terrasse, la porte au milieu s’ouvrit, et une femme, la fille d’Hamilcar elle-même, couverte de vêtements noirs, apparut sur le seuil. *Elle descendit le premier escalier qui longeait obliquement le premier étage, puis le second, le troisième, et elle s’arrêta sur la dernière terrasse, au haut de l’escalier des galères.* Immobile et la tête basse, elle regardait les soldats. [...] Mâtho le Libyen se penchait vers elle. Involontairement elle s’en approcha, et, poussée par la reconnaissance de son orgueil, *elle lui versa dans une coupe d’or un long jet de vin pour se réconcilier avec l’armée.* [...] Cependant l’immobilité de Mâtho étonnait Spendius [...] Il [Mâtho] suivait quelque chose à l’horizon [...] *Un point d’or tournait au loin dans la poussière sur la route d’Utique; c’était le moyeu d’un char atelé de deux mulets.* [...] il y avait dans le char deux femmes assises [...] Spendius les reconnut; il retint un cri. Un grand voile, par derrière, flottait au vent. (‘le Festin’, Flaubert 1964, 697–700, my emphasis)

La statue d’airain continuait à s’avancer vers la place de Khamon. [...] Enfin le Baal arriva juste au milieu de la place. *Ses pontifes, avec les treillages, disposèrent une enceinte pour écarter la multitude, et ils restèrent à ses pieds, autour de lui.* [...] *Les hiérodoules, avec un long crochet, ouvrirent les sept compartiments étagés sur le corps du Baal. Dans le plus haut, on introduit de la farine; dans le second, deux tourterelles; [...] La septième case restait béante.* [...] Avant de rien entreprendre, il était bon d’essayer les bras du Dieu. [...] Enfin un homme qui chancelait, un homme pâle et hideux de terreur, poussa un enfant; *puis on aperçut entre les mains du colosse une petite masse noire; elle s’enfonça dans l’ouverture ténébreuse.* [...] Les bras d’airain allaient plus vite. Ils ne s’arrêtaient plus. [...] *Cela dura longtemps, indéfiniment, jusqu’au soir.* [...] *Ce grand bruit et cette grande lumière avaient attiré les Barbares au pied des murs; se cramponnant pour mieux voir sur les débris de l’hélepole, ils regardaient béants d’horreur* (‘Moloch’, Flaubert 1964, 779–781, my emphasis)

L’escalier de l’Acropole avait soixante marches. *Il [Mâtho] descendit comme s’il eût roulé dans un torrent, du haut d’une montagne [...]* Dès le premier pas qu’il avait fait, [Salammbô] s’était levée; puis, involontairement, à mesure qu’il se rapprochait, elle s’était avancée peu à peu jusqu’au bord de la terrasse; et bientôt toutes les choses extérieures s’effaçant, elle n’avait aperçu que Mâtho. [...]

Il n’avait plus, sauf les yeux, d’apparence humaine; c’était une longue forme complètement rouge; [...] sa bouche restait grande ouverte; de ses orbites sortaient deux flammes qui avaient l’air de monter jusqu’à ses cheveux; et le misérable marchait toujours!

Il arriva juste au pied de la terrasse [...] elle ne voulait pas qu’il mourût! A ce moment-là, Mâtho eut un grand tressaillement; elle allait crier. Il s’abattit à la renverse et ne bougea plus. [...] Un homme s’élança sur le cadavre. [...] D’un seul coup, il fendit la poitrine de Mâtho, puis en arracha le cœur, le posa sur la cuiller, et Schahabarim, levant son bras, l’offrit au soleil. [...] Salammbô se leva comme son époux, avec une coupe à la main, afin de boire aussi. Elle retomba, la tête en arrière, par-dessus le dossier du trône, blême, raidie, les lèvres ouvertes, et ses cheveux dénoués pendaient jusqu’à la terre.

Ainsi mourut la fille d’Hamilcar pour avoir touché au manteau de Tanit. (‘Mathô’, Flaubert 1964, 796–797, my emphasis)

Fromentin's horizontal thick descriptions are in Flaubert's hand verticals of different intensities, apprized from above and/or from below depending on perspective (insider Carthaginian top down, external 'Barbare' looking up), until Mâtho in excerpt three replays Salammbô's initial entry (in excerpt one), to collapse any last opposition of Carthaginian and 'Barbare' (as the constant message of the novel's earlier tableaux) that signals her ultimate sacrifice upon his. The inescapable relentlessness choreographed in these three scenes in so many 'steps' (or apertures in the brazen statue) is magnified in each scene as initial wide-angle views 'zoom in' on key exchanges central to them. The scenes need no metaphor or accumulation of detail for maximum effect: a point of optimum reflection suffices to connote the whole, whether the glint of light on the hub of the carriage wheel (excerpt one), the 'petite masse noire' of the first child sacrifice (excerpt two), or the 'longue forme rouge' that is Mâtho (in excerpt three). Their vanishing points are the repeated spaces of the seen-unseen each collocates. Even more crucial for their effects (of horror) is the repetition of the same gaping gaps (holes) in the 'varifocal' adjustment and vacillation between near and far, up and down and (revolving) fixed point to comprehend movement and stasis, to ensure that the reader misses no interpretative detail for the larger whole. These scintillation/stereoscope effects in Flaubert's *Salammbô*, however, are not in the places of vertigo, or invaded intimacy (as in *Dominique* discussed above), but in the capturing of depth within the very public cityscapes of Carthage exemplified above, its many reflecting surfaces glittering and drenched in unshaded sun. The horror of the empty seventh chamber awaiting the first child is also compositionally centre of a 'tableau' depending for its focus on the iterations of 'béant' for this compartment reverberating in the open mouths of the 'Barbares' (as its supreme judges) at scene end, but only after the reader has been directly guided towards it visually and aurally in the verb 'ouvrirent' reinforced by 'ouverture (ténébreuse)'.

But there is more here than 'painterly' composition in word and image to ensure that the reader cannot miss the pictorial perspective that is depth, to return to the similar point of the Uccello allusion in *Dominique*. Flaubert also creates in words the artifices of the stereoscope developing its precursor, the *veduta* (noted by Wright 2002, 54), to guide or hide the novel's vanishing points and ultimately affective 'message'. The triumphant killing of the children and of Mâtho and the theatrical demise of Salammbô clinch in this spectacle of continuing world domination of Carthaginian civilization what is 'felt' by the reader amid such national celebration: the (anti-climactic) aftershock of its final line is the irreversible truth of history viewed with both foresight and hindsight. Carthage's later fall to Rome not only undermines the 'triumphalism' of the 'Moloch' and 'Mâtho' episodes. Repeatedly, the composition of the text has also negotiated not so much the (unfinished) blanks of history, but the gaping (w)holes in history's repeated ritual-cultural and aesthetic self-representations. Do the endings of both *Salammbô* and *Dominique* then inter-reflectively demonstrate the emptiness of France's socio-cultural and national-triumphalist self-representations in 1862? Do these endings also reflect back the positioning of Flaubert and Fromentin as 'historical' painters?

'Nous sommes tous nés nomades'? Re-Orienting the Critical Vanishing Points of Flaubert's and Fromentin's Pictorial Poetics

Fromentin's immediate reaction to *Salammbô* in 1862 in his assessment of Flaubert as 'un grand peintre', qualified by 'mieux que cela, un grand visionnaire' calls for further

reflection, both to question the distinction between these terms (and the arts associated with them), and his own self-reflection upon them. The Littré definition (of 1873) for ‘visionnaire’ specifies the person ‘[q]ui croit avoir des visions, des révélations; [q]ui a des idées folles, extravagantes, chimériques’. Fromentin’s reading of *Salammbô*’s battle episodes, including the Barbarians’ defeat in the ‘Défilé de la Hache’, might then presuppose his casting of Flaubert the visionary ‘painter’ more in the manner of a Delacroix, Goya or Ingres (all of whom he admired) than of a Blake or even a Gustave Moreau. Well-documented is Flaubert’s hostility to illustrations for his works, because coextensive with his repugnance of all forms of ‘copy’. For Tooke (2000, 4), Flaubert’s known experiences of epilepsy and hallucination explain the ‘arabesque which informs [...] the whole of Flaubert’s writing life’, including his ‘style cannibale’ (Tooke 2000, 13), her term especially applicable to *Salammbô*. It exemplifies the all-consuming verbal-visual incorporations in set piece scenes (‘le Festin’, but also literal cannibalism in the ‘Défilé de la Hache’) for the reader. His art thus befits Fromentin’s visionary qualification of the ‘peintre’ as one who shows (‘faire voir’), rather than tells.

The relentless, dominant point of view in both 1862 works noted above is what moves the reader alert to perspective (and its power dynamics) to see in their different subject matter and internal composition surprising depictions of contemporary (Second Empire) metropolitan modernity. These are collocated in *Dominique* through provincial contrast and its seeming idyll of Les Trembles, and in *Salammbô* through cultural allegory (Green 1982). Their common underpinning aesthetic interest here, however, is in the clearly-perceived hollowness of the endings of both works. Their literal vanishing point conclusions are (failed) marriage plots that conserve triumphant patriarchal order by means of concomitant sacrifice and sublimation of female agency and sexuality. Such vanishing points are therefore also figurative in their uneasy non-negotiation of closure (an ever after), yet foreclosure of nostalgia for imaginary pasts – whether pastoral, romantic, personal in *Dominique*, or exotic and archaeological in *Salammbô* – because both endings are circular in looking back and forward at once. These works of 1862 both shun positivist, historiographical approaches to time and its constructions of modern (post-Revolutionary) history, to redirect reader attention instead to (past and present) configurations and self-representations of (national) space. The ‘visionnaire’ is then the ‘painter’ of perspectives, who *artfully* connects the various ‘écarts de l’imagination’ (so eschewed in the Uccello simile in *Dominique* above), to point out where such an interpretative position lies. What Flaubert had already understood in his *Voyage en Orient* (of 1851) he had again to establish through a further journey to North Africa before he could complete *Salammbô*, namely *in situ* envisioning of (the ruins of) Carthage, to determine the novel’s affect for contemporary (1862, future) eyes. His letter of August 29, 1862 to Leroyer de Chantepie therefore crucially inflects *Salammbô*’s imaginary (including his altogether fictional *Salammbô*) with contemporary ‘visionary’ view: ‘Nous sommes tous nés nomades’ connects via (the compasses of) ‘[o]n the manque point à ses origines’ and ‘[i]l n’y a pas longtemps que nous étions des Barbares!’ to recent French archaeological endeavour in the late 1850s in Second Empire France including Algeria (Orr 2021), to identify a common migratory (pre)history and (pre-)civilization. But Flaubert’s larger interest is aesthetic (the medium) almost more than ethnographical-ideological (the message). To return to my reading of the masculine underpinning *Salammbô*, the novel challenges

notions of cultural superiority and civilization within the heritage of Occidentalism [...]. The same [...] social structures in Carthage, and between Carthage and her neighbours remain essentially unchanged in patriarchal nation-states like Flaubert's France. The basic principle is power: who has it and how it is maintained. (Orr 2000, 54–55)

We can now better identify the medium conveying and displaying it in *Salammbô* in the (mapmaker's) 'roving', birds-eye, controlling narrative point of view, and Flaubert's painterly capturing of it (as a 'peintre visionnaire' of history in Fromentin's response). Indeed, the same nomadic perspective (identified thanks to Flaubert) predominates in the differently personal but no less visionary history painter-narrator of Fromentin's Algerian travel writing in the late 1850s, to which we now turn, because this same perspective informs the culminating vanishing points of his eponymous *Dominique*.

The persistent painterly vocabulary, and comparative references to indicative (Western) painters such as Rembrandt, Raphael, Poussin and Delacroix in *Un été dans le Sahara* (Fromentin 1874, for example 40–41, 44, 80, 99, 200, 205, 212) are further magnified – after the narrator has encountered Vandell, his interlocutor and French traveller-*géographe* double – in several set-piece expositions of the history of (non-Oriental) art in *Une année dans le Sahel* (Fromentin 1859, for example 159, 177, 251–254 on Poussin, Leonardo, Raphaël, André del Sarte, Titien). These expositions preface the larger personal debate at stake for Fromentin, spearheaded by Vandell's questioning of his motives for travel and relation with Algeria (Fromentin 1859, 249). The reply articulates Fromentin's important negotiations of the distinctiveness of Orientalist painting (and its three different sub-genres as exemplified by recent painters):

En un mot, il y a deux hommes qu'il ne faut pas confondre; il y a le voyageur qui peint, et puis il y a le peintre qui voyage [...] Et le jour où je saurai positivement si je suis l'un ou l'autre, je vous dirai exactement ce que je prétends faire dans ce pays. (Fromentin 1859, 255)

In the simple aesthetic and ethnographical example of (Arab) children at play in the sun before them is the difference between two artistic perspectives; a portrait with background illustration, or a landscape with accessory figures: '[N]ous y voyons l'individuel caractère d'un tableau d'Orient [...], ce difficile équilibre des vraisemblances qui oblige à demeurer vrai sans être exact, à peindre et non pas à décrire' (Fromentin 1859, 261). The Scylla of abstraction ('combinaisons d'atelier') and the Charybdis of ethnography ('tableaux composés comme un inventaire') pivot on the self-effacement of the painter (through hiding all evidence of preparatory studies), to leave only their ('nomadic') result (Fromentin 1859, 261–265). In Vandell the traveller-geographer is a 'voyageur qui peint', through producing 'petits dessins fort curieux [...] démonstratif[s] comme une figure de géométrie' (Fromentin 1859, 248). In lauding the 'paysagiste' as the first-mentioned of the three types of major Oriental painter (the painter of 'du paysage et du genre' and of 'genre et de la grande peinture' being the two others), Fromentin interestingly conceals the names of French Oriental painter contemporaries (in the manner of Uccello in *Dominique*). More strikingly, he racializes them in a hierarchy that also constitutes the compositional 'frame perspective', moving the contrasts and variations of the geographical spaces and places that his connected travelogues encounter. For Fromentin, 'le paysagiste [...] était né peintre d'Orient car on dit qu'il ressemble lui-même à un Arabe. Le peintre de genre a le goût des pays turcs [...] le peintre d'histoire est un Vénitien [...] Il est donc le plus traditionnel et le moins oriental des trois (Fromentin 1859, 268–

272). The nomadic (horseman) ‘Arab’ encapsulates the energy, freedom and virility that Fromentin ‘paints’ in the final set-piece description of the *fantasia*, ‘le galop d’un cheval bien monté’ (Fromentin 1859, 327, the horse compared to the work of Rubens, 330). The sedentary, effeminate ‘Turk’ articulates the Oriental genre painter, whom Fromentin illustrates upon first visiting Haoûa (‘la Kabyle’, ‘ma Mauresque’) through direct comparison of her living quarters with Delacroix’s ‘Les Femmes d’Algers’ (of 1834): ‘c’est tout semblable [...] [L]a noire servante fit exactement le geste que tu peux voir dans le tableau de Delacroix, pour écarter le rideau de mousseline à fleurs’ (Fromentin 1859, 176–177). The words of *Une année dans le Sahel*, however, overpaint this very scene from Delacroix most disconcertingly. In further visits to Haoûa with Vandell, the ‘narghilé à trois branches’ that interconnects and focalizes the women in Delacroix’s work is shared in their threesome: ‘chacun de nous peut ainsi disposer d’un tuyau’ (Fromentin 1859, 199). The same discomfiture of power relations is repeated in the later description of the specifically gynocentric ‘fête de fèves’, which is a virtuoso poetic and painterly study in reds: ‘ce rouge inimitable dont la violence eût effrayé Rubens, le seul homme du monde à qui le rouge quel qu’il fut n’ait jamais fait peur’ (Fromentin 1859, 220). The vanishing points of the local men in this scene, also located in the ‘nomadic gaze’ of Vandell and the narrator, prepare and disclose the finale, which strikingly mirrors that of *Salammbô*. The closing study is in white, ‘quelque chose de blanc qui roula, puis resta couché’ (Fromentin 1859, 336). This is the ‘honour killing’ of Haoûa, hit by Ben Arif during the *fantasia* with his horse so as to disfigure and kill her. If this scene echoes paintings by and after Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps (1803–60) (Fromentin 1859, 89), in for example the latter’s ‘Albanian Duel’ of 1828, and ‘la Morte’ by Charles Joshua Chaplin (1825–91) in the final description of the dead Haoûa (Fromentin 1859, 340), the scene in white discloses the same vanishing points as in the ‘study in red’: the principal men – Ben-Arif, Vandell and the narrator – disperse from the centre (the women) of these frieze-frames. But this scene also returns in French guise in chapter thirteen of *Dominique*.

Two significant travel tales unfold and cross-connect upon Dominique’s confession of his love to Madeleine. Her reaction, which takes the form of an ‘image offensée et si pleine d’angoisse’ (Fromentin 1984, 505), is etched in his memory for the reader (as captured later in the ‘expression’ of her portrait discussed above). But her larger action is her departure from Paris for an unnamed spa town in Germany, to leave Dominique in a (self-created) limbo marked only by her occasional letters. When she finally indicates her return to include her reception of Dominique, this is mediated through her husband’s presence except for the moment when Dominique can announce to her his (retaliatory) intentions also to travel and to maintain continuing correspondence with her. Madeleine, however, quashes all possibility of contact because it imposes upon her a Dominique ‘au hasard’ (Fromentin 1984, 508). Dominique lasts only a few weeks rather than the planned months away, however, as recorded in a two-paragraph ‘récit de voyage’ that is a model of clichéd Romantic travel writing and landscape painting:

Je ne vous dirai rien de ce voyage, le plus magnifique et le moins profitable que j’aie jamais fait. Il y a des lieux dans ce monde où je suis comme humilié d’avoir promené des chagrins si ordinaires et versé des larmes si peu viriles. [...] J’étais seul, les pieds dans le sable, assis sur des roches vives où l’on voyait des boucles d’airain qui jadis avaient attaché des navires. Il n’y avait personne, ni sur cette plage abandonnée par l’histoire, ni en mer, où pas une voile ne

passait. Un oiseau blanc volait entre le ciel et l'eau, dessinant sa grêle envergure sur le ciel immuablement bleu et la reproduisant dans la mer calme. [...] Je jetai au vent le nom de Madeleine [...] pour qu'il se répâtât à l'infini dans les rochers sonores du rivage; [...] et je me demandai, la confusion dans le cœur, si les hommes d'il y a deux mille ans, si intrépides, si grands et si forts, avaient aimé autant que nous! (Fromentin 1984, 508–509)

In its empty remake of Narcissus gazing lovingly at his own image, however, the 'nomad' in this frame – also distorting the earlier 'fakir' simile above – meshes with the ending of *Dominique*. At this juncture, however, the narrator's view of Dominique, 'dont la plus réelle originalité était d'avoir strictement suivi la maxime ancienne de se connaître soi-même' (564), is confounded in the anti-mirror of the arrival of Augustin (his former tutor):

[P]etit, nerveux, avec tout l'extérieur, la physionomie, l'assiette et la précision d'un homme peu ordinaire et préoccupé d'affaires graves, même en voyage; parfaitement mis d'ailleurs, et là encore on pouvait définir des habitudes élevées de situation, de monde et de rang. (564)

Vandell of *Une année dans le Sahel* now shows up in Augustin here, once the equivalent 'death of Haoûa' in those of Madeleine and Juliette also secures the nomadic Dominique in *Les Trembles* as circumscribed in his own self-image (with Madame de Bray and their children in the background) in the text's finale. The problematic (Second Empire) masculinities of Dominique/ *Dominique* – Wright hinted at the character's androgyny and fear of the feminine (2002, 41 and 69) – now reveal their homosocial and 'Arab' faces in the worlds of its frame. If Madeleine's 'voile bleu' and (dangerous) mobility are also reflected in Haoûa and Salammbô, these women's judgements are on behalf of all who defy the hollowness of marriage through their challenging look directed back at the reader. Madeleine's 'dépense amer', like Haoûa's terrible headwound and Salammbô's (self-)immolation, figure more than can a thousand words in moving the viewer to look, and look again.

Conclusions

By 'only connecting' the contiguous *Dominique* and *Salammbô* of 1862 we have shown the renewing critical interest of these texts to be in their interreflections of a shared aesthetic concern that is also revelatory of reorienting points of view. As mature works inflecting their authors' travel writing and its outsider-insider perspectives on Second Empire France, both *Dominique* and *Salammbô* refigure the nomadic (male) gaze that empowers them, to disclose its blind spots and vanishing points. The set-piece 'portraits', 'landscapes' and 'inscapes' of these texts of the French Second Empire also review its (self-)representations in the unrelenting perspectives of their author 'painters'. The gaping hollowness of both texts in their endings then also shows up the overarching and imperializing nomadic view for what it is: vainglory in *Salammbô* is an *amour propre* in *Dominique*. Its Janus face prides itself in 'success' that fails to acknowledge its collateral damage (in Haoûa-Juliette, in *Salammbô*). These 1862 works as *études* recollect their authors' earlier formative and nomadic travel writing, to prepare its further returns in Flaubert's and Fromentin's mature texts of 1874, respectively the *Tentation de saint Antoine* and *Préface* to the re-edition of *Un été dans le Sahara* and *Une année dans le Sahel. Journal d'un absent*. Critics of Fromentin and Flaubert alert to their

intensities of connected word and image can now do well to investigate further what are mere starting points in this article. Many Orientalist painterly and poetic debates and allusions are inflected in these 1862 novels. For example, I was intrigued by Decamps's painting, 'Les Experts' (of 1837), with its 'singerie' of art critics around a Poussin landscape painting, potentially inspiring the 'connaisseurs', and narrator, in *Dominique* finding in its pivotal portrait of an amputated woman more than they had bargained for.

But the terrible stasis of its sitter when we also see Madeleine as a free-spirited (horse-riding and travelling) 'nomade' now returns us to our point of departure and return. Flaubert's words of August 1862 to Leroyer de Chantepie speak to the agonies of her circumscribed life as an unmarried woman in Angers. Clearly the 'nous' in 'nous sommes tous nés nomades' includes her possibilities of empowering change of scene and view, yet further pinpoints the greater material limitations constraining her world as a female traveller, let alone as an *artiste (voyageuse)*. At the same time, however, Leroyer de Chantepie attests firmly to the bibliotherapeutic powers of works that move. Her stay in Tours demolished dead fantasies of 'love' in her refusal to be a mere Echo – she flings the bouquet of jasmine finally into the river in her letter of September 8, 1862 – so that her action also extends her new (self-)critical reach. After the critical turn of the later twentieth century and the decolonizing turn of the twenty-first it is worth returning to Leroyer de Chantepie's critical emphasis on 'cœur' (also reiterated in *Dominique*'s 'confusion dans le coeur' in his travel *récit* above). It identifies the necessary articulation of affect in visual and verbal works of art as the marker of their aesthetic and moral qualities. It also gives her courage to engage her compasses, to connect media and texts which then offer her freedoms as a critic 'nomade' to explore very different cultural productions crossing her path. In that Leroyer de Chantepie looked for so much more than the lines of character, plot, frame, composition and narrative viewpoint to the place where some works move, and continue to move (such as *Lélia* for her), whereas others may dazzle without having greater depth, her lessons also renew reappraisal of contiguous nineteenth-century works in different media. Their immediate reception is an important coordinate if we are to map the reach of such a work today (still) to move. It is indeed in 'only connecting' with informed critical understanding that *dix-neuviémistes* can best take up Wright's legacies of critical wisdom. 'To connect to' is a first point of comparison from which to launch more nomadic text and image research that is inspired 'to connect with'. It is the latter that requires all critics following Wright's critical example to look more connectedly, and to look again.

Acknowledgements

My special thanks go to the British Academy for its support for the research and completion of this article, when it was not part of the project for which it had awarded me the 2021–2022 Donald Winch Fund Senior Research Fellowship in Intellectual History. I am also most grateful to my co-editors, Therese Dolan, Maria Scott and Claire Moran, for their perceptive responses to earlier drafts.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Mary Orr is the Buchanan Chair of French at the University of St Andrews and the holder in 2021–22 of the British Academy Donald Winch Fund Senior Research Fellowship in Intellectual History, to complete *Sarah Bowdich (Lee) 1791–1856: Pioneering Perspectives in French Natural History* (Anthem Press forthcoming). A specialist of nineteenth-century French literature and science, her publications in 2022 include “‘In from the Periphery’? Re-framing the Reach of the Nineteenth-Century French Literary-Scientific Imagination” (*Dix-Neuf* 25 (3–4): 280–299) and ‘Catalysts, Compilers and Expositors: Rethinking Women’s Pivotal Contributions to Nineteenth-Century “Physical Sciences”’ (in *The Palgrave Handbook of Women and Science since 1660*, edited by Claire G. Jones, Alison E. Martin, and Alexis Wolf, 505–528. Cham: Springer/ Palgrave Macmillan).

References

- Arweiler, Alexander, and Karin Westerwelle, eds. 2021. *Flauberts Salammbô: der Tod der schönen Antike*. Paderborn: Brill.
- Brizemur, Daniel. 1960. “Une correspondante de Flaubert: Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie.” *Les Amis de Flaubert* 16: 3.
- Felski, Rita. 2015. *The Limits of Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flaubert, Gustave. 1964. *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. 1. Edited by Bernard Masson. 2 vols. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Flaubert, Gustave. 1991. *Correspondance*. Vol. 3. Edited by Jean Bruneau. 5 vols. Paris: Gallimard, Pléiade, 1973–2007.
- Fromentin, Eugène. 1859. *Une année dans le Sahel*. Paris: Michel Levy Frères.
- Fromentin, Eugène. 1874. *Un été dans le Sahara*. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre.
- Fromentin, Eugène. 1984. *Œuvres complètes*. Edited by Guy Sagnes. Paris: NRF Gallimard, Pléiade.
- Fromentin, Eugène. 1995. *Correspondance d'Eugène Fromentin*. Vol. 2. Edited by Barbara Wright. 2 vols. Paris: CNRS-Editions: Universitas.
- Goellner, Sage. 2018. *French Orientalist Literature in Algeria, 1845–1882: Colonial Hauntings*. Lanham, Boulder, New York & London: Lexington Books.
- Grant, Richard B., and Nelly H. Severin. 1973. “Weaving Imagery in Fromentin’s ‘Dominique.’” *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 1 (3): 155–161.
- Green, Anne. 1982. *Flaubert and the Historical Novel: Salammbô Reassessed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, Anne. 2011. *Changing France: Literature and Culture in the Second Empire*. London & New York: Anthem Press.
- Houssais, Laurent. 1996. “Archéologie, littérature, illustration: Salammbô vu par G.-A. Rochegrosse.” *Histoire de l'art* 33–34: 43–54. doi:10.3406/hista.1996.2715
- Jouannaud, Laurent. 2003. “Dominique d'Eugène Fromentin, ou le bourgeois romantique.” *Littératures* 48–49: 65–80. doi:10.3406/litts.2003.2213
- Jullien, Dominique. 2013. “‘‘Quelque chose de rouge’: On the Aesthetics of *tableaux vivants* in *Salammbô*.” *MLN* 128 (4): 761–784. doi:10.1353/mln.2013.0069
- Kabbani, Rana. 2008. *Imperial Fictions: Europe’s Myths of Orient*. London: Saqi.
- Kraume, Anne. 2013. “Abwesenheiten: Eugène Fromintins literarische Ästhetik des Raumes.” In *Die (Neu-) Vermessung romantischer Räume: Raumkonzepte der französischen Romantik vor dem Hintergrund des Spatial Turn*, edited by Marina Ortrud, M. Hertrampf, and Dagmar Schmelzer, 23–46. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Lethbridge, Robert. 1979. “Fromentin’s ‘Dominique’ and the Art of Reflection.” *Essays in French Literature* 16: 43–61.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1991. *Critical Terrains*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- MacKenzie, Robin. 2007. “Maturity and Modernity in Fromentin’s ‘Dominique.’” *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 35 (2): 352–366. doi:10.1353/ncf.2007.0019

- Mickel, Emanuel J. Jr. 1994–95. “Orientalist Painters and Writers at the Crossroads of Realism.” *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 23 (1–2): 1–34.
- Moussa, Sarga, ed. 2003. *L’Idée de “race” dans les sciences humaines et littératures (XVIII^e–XIX^e siècles)*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- Moussa, Sarga. 2004. *Le Voyage en Égypte: Anthologie de voyageurs européens de Bonaparte à l’occupation anglaise*. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Oliver, Hermia. 1982. “Nouveaux Aperçus sur Marie-Sophie Leroyer de Chantepie.” *Les Amis de Flaubert* 61: 4.
- Orr, Mary. 2000. *Flaubert: Writing the Masculine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orr, Mary. 2021. “The Grotte du Renne, Leroi-Gourhan and Flaubert’s *La Légende de Saint Julien L’Hospitalier* (1877): The Question of ‘Préhistoire(s)’ to Delimit the Human.” *Paragraph* 44 (3): 334–348. doi:10.3366/para.2021.0374
- Peltre, Christine. 2004. *Orientalisme*. Paris: Terrail.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Segal, Naomi. 1988. “Sylvie and Dominique.” In *Narcissus and Echo: Women in the French Récit*, 121–159. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Stone, Lawrence. 1971. “Prosopography.” *Daedalus* 100 (1): 46–79.
- Strong, Isabelle. 1975. “Flaubert’s Controversy with Froehner: The Manuscript Tradition.” *Romance Notes* 16 (2): 283–299.
- Thompson, Christopher W. 2012. *French Romantic Travel Writing: Chateaubriand to Nerval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tooke, Adrienne. 2000. *Flaubert and the Pictorial Arts: From Image to Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Barbara. 2000. *Eugène Fromentin: A Life in Art and Letters*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Wright, Barbara. 2002. *Eugène Fromentin: Dominique*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow French and German Texts.
- Wright, Barbara. 2010. “‘Only Connect ...’.” In *From Information to Knowledge; from Knowledge to Wisdom*, edited by Erik de Core, and Jens Erik Fenstad, 141–146. London: Portland Press.
- Yee, Jennifer. 2016. *The Colonial Comedy: Imperialism in the French Realist Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zielonka, Anthony. 2012. “Flaubert and the Centrality of Literature: An Analysis of the Correspondence with Mademoiselle Leroyer de Chantepie.” *Romance Quarterly* 59 (3): 177–188. doi:10.1080/08831157.2012.681261

Appendix: Points of Connection between Flaubert’s *Salammô* and Fromentin’s *Dominique*.

In no particular order these works compare in their

- reconstruction of the past – societal in *Salammô*, individual in *Dominique* – in the present of narration;
- epic structure, accommodating inexplicable gaps in the spatiotemporal logic of the text (and hence in characterization, action, motivation etc.);
- omnipresent and hence ‘contemporary’ narrators at arm’s length from the main textual action;
- pivotal set-piece scenes circumscribing (i) place-as-synonym-of-main-(male)-character (the opening of *Salammô*; *Les Trembles*), (ii) the hero’s uninvited, non-consensual invasion(s) of the heroine’s boudoir (*Salammô* chapter five, *Dominique* chapter six) as central to the onward plot dynamics, (iii) the extraordinary agency, sexuality and mobility of the heroine (*Salammô* chapter nine, *Dominique* chapter six) at key junctures in the plot, and in defiance of passive female social (and religious) *mores* and decorum, and (iv) seeming return to an immovable (patriarchal) status quo in endings encapsulated in non-marriage of the hero and heroine;
- two-dimensional secondary characters/foils for the problematic hero(es);

- concerted structural, thematic and symbolic use of clear hierarchies, binary oppositions and polarizations (of location, milieu, gender and other norms);
- extensive (obsessive) attention to 'local' colour and telling detail in dress and *mores*;
- alignments (beyond pathetic fallacy or extended metaphor) of weather, seasonal and climatic events with the highs and lows of human passions, emotions and responses to circumstance (individual and collective);
- predominant themes of possession and obsession – personal and political – and exploration of destructive passions other than but including love, to identify relational and (inter-)cultural power dynamics in the affinities of conflict: love, voyeurism: insight, sadism: masochism.