

Peace through Aesthetics: The Social Politics of Art and Gender in Bastide's *La Petite*

Maison

Etien Santiago

“The eighteenth century is dominated by woman, given to enthusiasm, full of *esprit*, shallow, but with a spirit in the service of what is desirable, of the heart, libertine in the enjoyment of what is most spiritual, and undermines all authorities; intoxicated, cheerful, clear, humane, false before itself, much *canaille au fond*, sociable.” Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*¹

On the 15th of May, 1760, the French author and playwright Jean-François de Bastide offered the Swiss philosopher and social theorist Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a recent acquaintance he hoped to befriend, the sum of 200 *louis* for the right to publish the manuscript of *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*. Rousseau turned down Bastide's offer only to be approached by him again, sometime around December 1st, with the request of being allowed to publish *Émile, ou de l'Éducation*. Again Rousseau declined. As a consolation, he transmitted to Bastide on the 5th of December, via their mutual friend Charles Pinot Duclos, his manuscript for the *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle de M. l'Abbé de Saint-Pierre*.² Bastide proudly issued it the following year as a *hors-série* outside his more routine serial publication, *Le Monde*. In his letter to Bastide, included as a preface, Rousseau dispensed gracious words toward his new acquaintance while excusing himself for the modesty of his contribution. “I would have liked, Monsieur, to respond to the honesty of your solicitations by contributing more usefully to your enterprise; [...] I am sending you,” he stated, “the first of these excerpts as an inaugural subject for you who loves peace, and whose writings breathe it.”³ The Swiss author would later confess that he had in truth become exasperated by Bastide's obstinate efforts to serve as his editor, but nonetheless for a

brief moment their paths—intellectual and professional—intersected.⁴

At first glance, the oeuvre of Bastide and Rousseau might seem to share little else in common. Bastide produced mainly fictional works about gallantry; the amorous and comedic aspects of courtly romance pervaded most of his books. His writings garnered only limited attention during his lifetime, and were almost lost to posterity in the heap of minor 1700s literature dismissed as forms of amusement.⁵ Rousseau for his part became famous for his radical social and political theories, as well as wildly popular among eighteenth-century readers thanks to his epistolary novel *Héloïse* after it was published (by a different editor) in 1761. This work was marked by a much more tragic and somber take on love than that of Bastide's writings, and furthermore steeped in ideas about political philosophy. So why was Bastide intent on being the editor for this man of such different sensibilities? Michel Gilot conjectures that Bastide's precarious finances perhaps played a part, since the playwright may have hoped to buoy them with returns from a possible bestseller. Another reason may lie in his desire to frequent the circle of French enlightenment thinkers and participate in the nascent world of literary publishing, as evidenced by the numerous journals he launched (all of them unsuccessfully) throughout his career.⁶ Yet here I wish to argue that Bastide had other reasons to be interested in Rousseau.⁷ Though their writings occupied very different positions, this essay will reveal that Bastide actually shared many of Rousseau's concerns, notably involving the socio-political transformations of France in the pre-Revolutionary era.

While his insistence toward Rousseau was especially pronounced, Bastide edited texts by other authors around this time as well, many of them of a political nature. In 1761, the same year that *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle* came out, he also published Etienne de Choiseul's

Mémoire historique sur la négociation de la France & de l'Angleterre depuis le 26 mars 1761 jusqu'au 20 septembre de la même année. This book compiled diplomatic correspondence between France and England, which then were caught in the midst of the Seven Years' War, and particularly on the topic of defining the limits between Acadia and British Canada.⁸ Eight years later, Bastide served as publisher for *La Morale de l'Histoire* by Antoine Mopinot de la Chapotte, a grandiose manual of Western history for the instruction of young boys.⁹ These texts as well as others demonstrate Bastide's proximity as an editor to socio-political discussions.

Yet what tells us that this proximity was meaningful rather than coincidental? Might Bastide have merely edited such manuscripts while remaining indifferent to their political content? His foreword to *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle* suggests that this was not the case. After lauding Rousseau's talent in the opening lines, Bastide underscores the importance of rethinking the character of governance in the present day. He points to the design for the new monument honoring Louis XV in Reims, drawn up by the sculptor Jean Baptiste Pigalle, as evidence that opinions on this topic have shifted of late.¹⁰ Bastide had indeed chosen Charles-Nicholas Cochin's engraving of this work, which had not yet been built, as the frontispiece of Rousseau's book.¹¹ In this image, the statue of the king dressed as a Roman emperor towers above a cylindrical base, which is flanked by two dignified, symbolic figures, each one facing outward (Fig. 1). The design expresses, according to Bastide, a novel and more welcome kind of power based on reconciliation rather than conflict:

This artist wisely thought that the ordinary custom of placing slaves at the foot of these statues possesses the flaw of not distinguishing one reign from another and finds necessary to make us believe that we are still enough plunged in barbarism to



Figure 1: Frontispiece to Rousseau's Projet de Paix Perpétuelle, featuring an engraving by Cochin of a monument to Louis XV in Reims, designed by Pigalle

situate the glory of a King within the ambition of his conquests, rather than in that particular wisdom of government which constitutes the felicity of the people. This is what M. Pigalle obviated, by placing to one side a woman leaning on a rudder, who with her right hand guides a lion without any effort, holding him only by a few hairs of his mane. He is allegorically representing by this the mildness of government, the docility of the people, and their attachment to the sovereign.¹²

Although Bastide rarely wrote explicitly about political matters, these lines touch on the main axes of his views on politics. First, he believed that aesthetic works were closely ensconced with the realm of power and governance. Second, he realized that the systematic public exposure and discussion made possible by the printed press had altered the conditions for both artistic and governmental practices.¹³ Third, while this new publicity came with its risks, it nonetheless offered opportunities for reforming the current systems integral to both art and government. Art could now influence authority, and not simply be subject to it, by championing and eliciting support for improved forms of governance more appropriate for the present.¹⁴ Art would in turn also become transformed by its new publicness and political purpose. Fourth, Bastide valued a utopian spirit of reconciliation above all, in which entirely opposed groups and actors would come to esteem one another and join forces in a new union. As his reading of Pigalle's monument suggests, Bastide saw art as the ultimate synthesizing force: a realm in which aristocrats and commoners, monarchs and republicans, intellectuals and simple folk, moralists and libertines, as well as men and women could find agreement—and even a practical kind of love bent on political cohabitation.

It may seem preposterous to read so much into a few sentences that Bastide wrote about a statue. Yet one of his other texts, a somewhat scandalous and vapid-seeming novella titled *La Petite Maison* (published twice, a few years before and after the *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle*), echoes and expands on the implications latent in his description of Pigalle's sculpture. Instead of merely constituting a source of entertainment full of cheap thrills, Bastide's book lays out, in camouflaged form, his profound and poignant stance on politics in mid-eighteenth-century France.

At the heart of *La Petite Maison* lies not a public kind of art like the statue of Louis XV in Reims, but rather a private one. This art comprises the lavish architecture, landscaping, and decorations of the suburban house mentioned in its title. Certainly *La Petite Maison* assumes, on the surface, the form of a libertine story. It begins with the classic formula for an eighteenth-century, *petit-maitre* libertine fiction. A nobleman, suspicious of love but keen on cultivating pleasure through sexual conquest, tries to sway a young woman into submitting to him despite her fear of a tarnished reputation as well as uncertainty about the true nature of his passion.¹⁵ He does this by inviting her to his country house, a sumptuous property laden with magnificent paintings, sculpture, architecture, and gardens, all of which are meticulously described in the book and attributed to real contemporary designers. The main character boasts to his prey that, once she experiences these works of art, she will no longer be able to resist his advances. The woman wagers that the estate will not have no such effect and accepts to test his offer in situ.

Some authors rescued Bastide's book from the dustbin of history by lauding it as a revealing testimonial of courtship practices and the shared imaginary of French eighteenth-century society. These authors, such as Michel Delon, find that the novel divulges its true value when placed in the context of libertine literature from that century. The prototypical *petite maison*—a well-appointed, often single-story house in a pastoral context just outside a city—was at the time widely perceived as a site of licentiousness.¹⁶ Delon accordingly edited a 1995 paperback book by Folio Classique which appends *La Petite Maison* to Vivant Denon's steamy fiction *Point de Lendemain*.¹⁷ Here the sexual charge of Bastide's story, and the particular flavor

of that charge (the “encounter of libertinage and luxury,” as Delon puts it) come to the fore.¹⁸ Scholars have built on this stance to explore how Bastide’s book elucidates eighteenth-century mores and artifacts revolving around this intersection; Kathryn Norberg’s essay “Goddesses of Taste: Courtesans and Their Furniture in Late-Eighteenth-Century Paris” and Ed Lilley’s “The Name of the Boudoir” both fall into this category.¹⁹

Other authors downplay the libidinous and interpersonal aspects of *La Petite Maison* to better stress its relevance for the history of architectural theory. Rodolphe El-Khoury, who translated Bastide’s tale into English, notes that two versions of it exist—one from 1758 which Bastide printed in his journal *Le nouveau spectateur*, and a different one with an altered ending released in 1763 as part of his compendium of writings (*Contes*).²⁰ In the latter, Bastide curtailed the emotional dimension of his story. As El-Khoury notes, “the original version of *La Petite Maison* devoted lengthier passages to the psychology of the characters and was abridged in the 1763 edition. The architectural descriptions, however, remained intact.”²¹ For observers such as El-Khoury, the essence of the story resides not in the interactions between the seducer and his female target, but rather in its engagement of eighteenth-century sensorialist philosophies and the theoretical questions involving their impact on architectural design.²² “Upon closer scrutiny,” he affirms, “*La Petite Maison* proves to be an echo chamber for a thriving architectural sensibility and not a mere fancy of libertine literature.”²³ El-Khoury acknowledges that Bastide’s novel fuses a romantic fiction with an educational component focused on art and architecture, but calls attention to the embedded conceptual questions rooted in its historical context, which he says critics have often overlooked by focusing on the voluptuous plot.²⁴

Certain observers start with the realization that *La Petite Maison* curiously merges an

architectural treatise with a sensual love story and argue that it is precisely this combination that endows it with philosophical importance. Anthony Vidler and Alberto Pérez-Gómez—although very dissimilar in their interpretations of eighteenth-century French architectural history—belong to this group. “Sexuality and space will always be an architectural affair,” proclaims Vidler at the end of his preface to El-Khoury’s translation.²⁵ Likewise, Pérez-Gómez portrays *La Petite Maison* as an early manifesto (following in the wake of the Renaissance era *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*) for a phenomenological ethos to architecture.²⁶ In his eyes, architectural design should be principally governed by matters of human feelings as well as bodily sensations, and Bastide’s tale implicitly asserts this by conflating the experience of art and architecture with romantic intrigue. Both Vidler and Pérez-Gómez believe that eroticism should not be viewed as tangential to the arts, but rather as integral to our relationship with them in any time period—whether as a designers or as spectators.

Most interpretations of *La Petite Maison* fall somewhere within the range of terms just discussed by classifying it somewhere between, at one end of the spectrum, an encapsulated commentary on sex and society, and, at the other, a treatise of architectural theory. Yet one close reading of Bastide’s text escapes the confines of this diagram. Paul Young’s chapter on *La Petite Maison* in his *Seducing the Eighteenth-Century French Reader* looks at Bastide’s novel through problems central to Enlightenment French writing practices. Young believes that *La Petite Maison* is “a complex reflection on the pleasures and dangers of reading,”²⁷ and that it testifies to Bastide’s critical assessment of the growing trend for a more immediate form of literature that connects authors more strongly with their publics. The problems of sincerity and insincerity, Young argues, permeate this story. He sees the main characters as constantly trying to decrypt

their true respective psychological interiors through their various outward expressions, and the decorations of the little house likewise alternately mask or reveal certain inner realities. By turning to the original ending of the 1758 version as well as other texts by Bastide, Young provides proof that the former actually meant to craft his story as a subtle critique of libertinage.²⁸ *La Petite Maison* accordingly avoids many of the tropes of eighteenth-century libertine fiction, notably via its emphasis on detailed descriptions of the ambient aesthetics rather than of the protagonists' traits or corporealities.²⁹ In Young's reading, this apparently hedonistic novel in fact harbored a moralizing purpose.

Young's argument would be difficult to sustain without evidence from Bastide's other writings. In a 1759 text titled *Réflexions*, the latter claims that all kinds of art, including literature, have the potential to transform readers into better people. Young latches on to this remark to demonstrate how the playwright infused such thoughts throughout the structure of *La Petite Maison*:

Through these comments, Bastide suggests that *La Petite Maison* offers much more than another frivolous tale of seduction. Indeed, I argue that Bastide's text, rather than placing itself within a libertine lineage, is offering a critique of the libertinage [that its central male character] appears to be feigning.³⁰

All of this leads us, says Young, to the question of whether a reading public should take authors' words at face value. Bastide realized that literature such as Rousseau's blockbuster *Héloïse* possessed the powerful ability to seduce numerous readers. This trend only grew as printed materials became more available throughout the course of the eighteenth century. Though bad books could hypothetically corrupt even more readers than before, misleading them with false

manifestations of candor, by the same token good books could also positively influence scores of readers. Flocks of readers were now increasingly at the mercy of duplicitous or well-meaning authors in the same way the heroine of *La Petite Maison* found herself at the mercy of its hero, struggling to decipher the true intentions beneath words.

I am convinced by Young's assertion that *La Petite Maison* should not be viewed as a celebration of libertinage, or just part of an eighteenth-century, libertine kind of "pulp fiction." However, I think that much more remains to be discovered based on his insights. Young limited his discussion to the realm of French literature, since it comprised the focus of his book. Yet if Bastide's story suggests, as Young contends, that artworks can be read much in the same manner that novels are, then what does this tell us about political artworks such as Pigalle's monument to Louis XV? Furthermore, what is the implication of Bastide's belief in the transformational power of art (as well as writing) with respect to texts that combine literature and politics, such as Rousseau's *Héloïse*? Such questions might hypothetically have remained outside the scope of Bastide's concerns, but, if we delve into the text of *La Petite Maison*, we will see that this was not the case.

According to on my reading, Bastide's story takes a stance on the tension pitting Enlightenment authors against state authority, while advocating that aesthetic practices should play an essential role in mediating this conflict. Contrary to the view accepted by most historians, *La Petite Maison* can neither be boiled down to a libertine novella nor construed as a story primarily concerned with architecture, nor cast as a manifesto whose particularity lies in fusing these two realms. Bastide's fiction in fact harbors a veiled discourse on the relationship of knowledge and art to power in eighteenth-century France, and more specifically on the role of

public writing in society at that time. In the wake of such a rumination, art can no longer be understood as merely an ingredient or minor topic of Bastide's book. A close examination of *La Petite Maison* will reveal that Bastide in fact elevated art to a position of ideological importance, beyond the immediate purposes of his story, by envisioning it as capable of reconciling social and political antagonists in French society.

Let us begin our close reading of *La Petite Maison* by noting that the aesthetic realm plays an important role from the very beginning of the narrative, since Bastide distinguishes his two protagonists by contrasting their respective positions toward it. In the first pages, we are informed that the young woman, called Méliete, devotes her time to “instruction, acquiring true taste and knowledge” about the arts, and thus is able to “recognize the works of the best artists at a glance.”³¹ Her seducer, the Marquis de Trémicour, is for his part described as a gentleman of “wit and taste, [...] magnificent and generous.”³² Each one masters art, but in a significantly different way. Méliete marvels as a spectator and connoisseur at the aesthetic beauty of fine art, whereas Trémicour is more interested in what art does—in other words, using art to his advantage. Throughout the tale, she is repeatedly associated with prudence and reason (“a reasonable woman”)³³ while he is more impulsive (“It is true that I am impatient”).³⁴ Whereas Méliete is morally dutiful and pure in her appreciation of artists (“she looked on their masterpieces with respect and awe”),³⁵ Trémicour is opportunistic, having hired them as a way to trick women into surrendering to him. These two very distinct approaches toward aesthetics

come to a head right from the start of Méliete's visit to the little house: "Already, Méliete's somewhat excessive curiosity had begun to annoy the Marquis."³⁶ Clearly, she enters into this tale as the pensive connoisseur who is not interested in action and change, but rather desires to "linger at every turn,"³⁷ methodically bringing every aspect of the work of art under the lens of examination. Rather than moving forward to the next subject, a critic such as she persists in going "back to examine once more what she had seen already."³⁸ Trémicour, by contrast, plays the role of the art patron or lord who yields influence, constantly yearning to move from one aesthetic creation to the next (just as he had previously consummated one affair after another), only to better serve his calculating purposes. For him, art is but a tool for domination. Therefore the figures of the connoisseur and the patron face off against one another, each with very different methods and priorities. We can posit that, in Bastide's story, Méliete symbolizes intellect, critique, caution, and reason, while the Marquis de Trémicour symbolizes force, desire, impetuosity, and authority.

During the first half of the novel, Méliete employs the tactic of repeated, careful examination in order to frustrate the plans of the Marquis to win her over. Yet it is crucial that she accomplishes this not only through a cyclical process of repeated close inspections, but also through words. Méliete prolongs the operation of seduction, delaying Trémicour's attempt to reel her in by talking at length about the various architectural, landscape, and decorative designs that she comes across. Her "stubborn chattering,"³⁹ while motivated by the beauty of these works, nonetheless keeps their affective power at bay—as well as, at the same time, the risk of submitting to the amorous drives of the Marquis. Words erect themselves before the unmediated sensuality of objects as well as testosterone-driven men. As a result, these words shield the

protagonist from the inner forces of the objects that she is precisely admiring. Bastide's use of adjectives convey an implicit condemnation of the erudite critic who schematizes and speaks without end all the while postponing practical action. The deduction to be made here is that Bastide views such tacks as no more than a ploy to uphold certain theoretical convictions in an effort to remain unmoved and unchanged by the brute energy of the world. Even when the critic speaks positively of a work, her words are portrayed as superfluous: "Trémicour accepted Mélite's continuing flood of tiresome compliments." ⁴⁰ Like a true art critic, she verbalizes even the smallest details: "Mélite praised the light chisel of the ingenious Pineau, who had created the sculptures. She admired the talents of Dandrillon, who had applied his skills to convey the most imperceptible refinement in the carvings of the woodwork." ⁴¹ While the critic is exhaustively analytical, breaking wholes down into smaller elements to lay each of these bare with words, the patron is coldly instrumental, appropriating works of art to direct their appreciation toward his own persona. Bastide displays no favoritism for the latter, but his depiction of Mélite's attitude and "airy talk" ⁴² divulges a clear disapproval of her irresolute verbosity.

We must recall that Bastide himself was a writer eager to obtain public recognition, thirsting for a noteworthy role in the realm of publishing. Moving within cultured circles, he was acquainted not only with Rousseau but also other famous *philosophes* such as Jean le Rond D'Alembert, and he corresponded with Voltaire. The character of Mélite, according to my interpretation, stands for all of these thinkers in eighteenth-century France: intellectuals, rationalists, and writers. Voltaire in particular supplies us with an instructive real-life parallel to Mélite, since he was repeatedly both courted and persecuted by various European monarchs who strove to domesticate his brilliant mind, but seethed at his liberal ideas and satiric irreverence.

Clearly Bastide admired the *philosophes*. Yet he also believed that these writers and orators were missing something important, as evidenced by the fact that, in *La Petite Maison*, Mélite's wordiness and rhetoric games are unsuccessful at disarming the Marquis (in addition to being described with disdain by the author), to the point that they eventually begin to break down.

Now let us return to our story, in which Mélite can be seen to represent the smart, cautious, flirtatious, and rational Enlightenment critic while Trémicour stands for the irascible, obstinate, and fiery sovereign power. The opposition between her words and his actions takes a new turn, as does the relationship of Mélite to Trémicour, when her feelings for the works of art begin to impede her voicing of these feelings. "Mélite no longer dared praise anything; she had begun to fear her own emotions. Thus, she hardly spoke." An "appreciative silence" ensues.⁴³ The more language recedes, the better the artworks can exert their raw power: "her tongue was mute, but her heart could not be silenced."⁴⁴ Unable to restrain the gush of sensory pressure, Mélite regresses to the point of emitting primal noises, as "for a quarter of an hour she uttered nothing but cries of admiration."⁴⁵ Mélite even implores the Marquis, when she senses that defeat is near, to describe a room to her instead of taking her inside of it, once again attempting to erect words against the onslaught of emotions.⁴⁶ For Bastide, the intellect and all of its ruses are progressively forced to retreat before the sheer primacy of gut feelings. Even the best Enlightenment critics, he implies, are unable to fully explain or dismiss the raw power of great artwork. Here Bastide suggests here that, just as contemporary art critics of the analytic kind fail to adequately harness the beauty of art, obsessed as they are with churning out caustic, defensive streams of prose, so does rational political criticism ultimately fail at defusing despotic powers.

Although he disapproved of Mélite's defensive loquaciousness, Bastide was certainly not

insensitive to the plight of his female heroine or to that of the *philosophes* she represents. He too was a victim of the autocratic power structure that Louis XIV bequeathed to eighteenth-century France. Bastide was imprisoned at least once in his life and, like other contemporary *hommes de lettres*, intermittently forced to flee various countries after having displeased their authorities. Desperate to find a protector and patron under whose wing he could reliably work, he unsuccessfully petitioned one after another (including the government minister Malesherbes). Many of Bastide's journal projects accordingly floundered or collapsed in large part because state authorities wished to protect the supremacy of the official cultural periodical, *Le Mercure de France*.⁴⁷ In this regard, he could have commiserated with another fellow writer of his time, the priest Marc-Antoine Laugier, whose plan to launch the first serial publication dedicated to art and architectural criticism was also struck down by the state.⁴⁸ Fears about the potential damage to the reputations of established and officially-sanctioned artists prevailed over Laugier's innovative idea. Five years before *La Petite Maison* appeared, the priest had anonymously published a book that had caused quite a stir by criticizing dominant habits of French architectural design.⁴⁹ Although his stylistic preferences were largely opposed to the rococo effervescence characterizing Bastide's *petite maison* (since Laugier argued for a return to the stern and stoic principles of early, and especially Greek, architectural origins), the two writers shared an interest in publicly emitting views on aesthetic matters and both were stymied by the reigning order. We must remember that, even within permitted outlets for publication, censorship by the authorities strictly limited what could be said at the time. This is why so many texts from this period cloaked their messages in well-veiled metaphors, and thus, we can presume, also why Bastide draped his views about the dance between *philosophes* and the monarchy in the guise of

a trivial story about seduction.⁵⁰ In short, Bastide was no stranger to political persecution. He was acutely aware that art, including the art of writing, was caught in a political system that did not favor its full blooming. He hoped, as will become evident, not so much to topple this system but to propose a way in which it could be amended. What he found problematic was precisely the confrontational relation between the critics and the authorities. Rousseau had been correct to point out in his letter that Bastide loved peace: not just peace between nations, but, as evidenced by the latter's reading of the monument by Pigalle, peace between rulers and their subjects.

Back in *La Petite Maison*, the tension between Méliste and Trémicour subsides only after she puts aside her caustic games and he drops his impetuosity, patiently waiting much longer to win her over than he would have for a mere flirt. Méliste is overwhelmed by the beauty of the little house and ultimately gives in to the wishes of the Marquis. However, we also get a sense that he too has changed in the process, since his ruthless cunning was confronted with an unprecedented bastion of virtue and intelligent scrutiny. Bastide finds the necessary resolution to the opposition between all-too-measured knowledge and all-too-unmeasured ambition in the love that, by the end of the tale, unites the two characters. Although it is true that Trémicour's final intentions are ambiguous (since we are no longer sure if he is a true libertine at heart, or if he will abandon this mantle now that he has found love in a worthy woman), and Bastide offers no unequivocal hints about how this fictional story might continue, the author nonetheless concluded both published versions of the tale with the two characters expressing newfound respect for one another.⁵¹ He appears to have yearned for a resolution between the polar opposites whose battles were defining his social, political, and cultural context: the *philosophes* versus the monarchs, theorists versus practitioners, the human intellect versus the passions.

In order to resolve these kinds of dichotomies, Bastide subtly lobbied for the use of a non-violent, gentle kind of force which he believed to be more effective than authoritarianism. He alluded to this political strategy throughout the narrative of *La Petite Maison*, and especially in scenes where Trémicour evaluates how to best make Mélite conform to his wishes. As she enters a bathroom and is smitten by its charming decor, “Trémicour could have taken advantage of her ecstasy to close the door without her noticing and force her to listen to his words of love, but he would rather that his victory progress at the pace of pleasure.”⁵² The best way to achieve a desired outcome, Bastide insinuates, is not to precipitate it but rather to coax it into being. Upon Mélite’s sudden request to exit the house to visit the gardens, “Trémicour obeyed again. His docility was no sacrifice [...]”⁵³ When she senses that her defeat is at hand and asks to leave, “Trémicour understood that she should not be challenged, but he did not doubt his power to deceive her; he had succeeded a hundred times by yielding.”⁵⁴ Or, in a different situation, “he thought it best not to insist [...]”⁵⁵ Although this same idea is manifested in dozens of other passages throughout the book, let us only mention one more:

Mélite had been courted before, hundreds of times, but when a suitor is not particularly liked, his cares and attentions can hardly be mistaken for love. Nevertheless, such cares and attentions tend to disguise ulterior motives, and a reasonable woman learns to be wary of them early on. What seduced Mélite here was Trémicour’s inaction in expressing such tenderness. *Nothing alarmed her defenses, for she was not being attacked.* She was being adored, and adored silently.⁵⁶

Bastide’s hidden message to rulers is this: it is better to acquiesce to the requests of your subjects

than to impose unwanted rules upon them, for only thus will you truly achieve what you want. In his eyes, if the state were to give in a little to critics, then this would greatly assist the process of bringing the two back together into a productive relationship.

Not only does “The Little House” advocate for such a political resolution, but it does so by arguing that artistic activity should play a fundamental role in it. Indeed, Trémicour’s judicious patronage of the best artists reveals the true goodness within him, and Méliete’s sensory experience and appreciation of the artworks causes this goodness to rise to the surface. Thanks to the sublime achievement of the artistic *gesamtkunstwerk*, Méliete casts aside her sardonic, analytic rationalism, while Trémicour, in the face of her transformation, in turn casts aside his tactics of tyrannical manipulation. Through the catalyst of aesthetic beauty, both the realms of liberated knowledge and that of restrictive force can be reconciled. Their synthesis leaves neither unchanged. Art allows this project of reform to occur without recourse to violent confrontation, which Bastide found harmful for both parties. Indeed, art pushes forward a cause in a way that is indirect, allusive, and gentle—exactly the kind of peaceful application of force that was being advocated in the quotes above.

Bastide was far from indifferent about the role of art in this reconciliation, for he himself, as a playwright and a poet, produced aesthetic works whose purpose was to have an wide impact. In the 1774 *L’Homme du Monde Éclairé par les Arts*, co-written with the architect Jacques-François Blondel (who is suspected by several historians of having assisted Bastide in establishing the architectural content of *La Petite Maison*),⁵⁷ Bastide waxes on the capacity of writing to enlighten its readers. “We could never like reading less; we would even like to enlighten ourselves by reading,” he states. “But books have all of the imperfections, and all the

bizarreness of minds.”⁵⁸ He goes on to spell out the tragedy inherent to contemporary writing: a loss of high standards for literary excellence, the inability on the part of readers to render what is due to authors, the fickleness of taste, and the harshness of critique against the enthusiasm of well-intentioned writers. So should we give up on writing, Bastide asks, and by extension also the possibility for others to learn through texts? Certainly not, he proclaims. To restore our hope in the useful, constructive art of writing, Bastide presents us with *L’Homme du Monde*, an epistolary novel in which a man and two women of high social standing write letters to one another about the fine arts, instructing each other in the process. He describes the protagonists as speaking truthfully and justly, attributing either praise or critique where each is due. The man is an expert on art and architecture, who, through his romantic letters to the two women, inculcates in them a love for trying their hand at aesthetic criticism. The reader meanwhile reaps the benefits of the discussions, which notably evaluate the merits of various contemporaneous architectural designs.

La Petite Maison also harbored a pedagogical purpose. As the visit of Trémicour’s villa unfolds, Bastide conscientiously identifies all of the real artists who are imagined to have produced every aspect of its design, educating the reader with footnotes that summarize the achievements of these creators. While Méliette broadens her knowledge of the best French artists in her time, so does the reader. Would a purely libertine novel have troubled itself with such details? Bastide, however, views them as essential to the mission of his text. Furthermore, through ekphrasis, he offers an immediate and practical demonstration of how an aesthetic creation can elevate the reader to forge a consensual synthesis. His descriptions of the little house effectively couple the rationalizing, stultifying nature of language with the passionate, overly-

vigorous force of raw affect to produce something wholly new.⁵⁹ In addition to embedding his message in the content of the story itself, Bastide wished to prove it via its medium as well. Bastide's novel, in sort, asserted in a variety of ways the power and importance of poetic writing over analytic writing in satisfactorily addressing the political struggles of his epoch.

Bastide's idea of representing the French nation as a courtly, romantic liaison was not incongruous with his those of his contemporaries. As Lynn Hunt describes in *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, anxieties about the family permeated the collective imaginary of the Gallic nation throughout the late eighteenth century. Hunt demonstrates how this communal unconscious persistently reverted to analogies between public political figures and an inept, dysfunctional married couple.⁶⁰ If the troubles of such a marriage can be seen to have shaped the cultural atmosphere of the 1780s and 90s, then Bastide's *La Petite Maison* could be retroactively labeled as a 1760s fantasy concerning the courtship phase prior to the wedding. While such a gross generalization leaves out the more complex realities of this history, the coming battle between royalists (inspired by the monarchy) and republicans (inspired by the *philosophes*) can be viewed as having its seeds in the cultural work of the first half of the eighteenth-century.

More central to our purposes here is one particular idea that Hunt's book brings to our attention: not only were female roles up for discussion in this rapidly shifting political and cultural environment, but moreover, the process of rethinking female roles was also vital for

constructing valid kinds of (allegedly) masculine roles as well. Bastide did not address these questions head on, but his work certainly charted a course through this shared terrain of inquiry. He seems to have been especially preoccupied with the role of women in artistic discussions, since he not only cast Méliete as the critic in *La Petite Maison* but also structured, with Blondel, the form of *L'Homme du Monde Éclairé par les Arts* around a conversation between the two genders. With our reading of *La Petite Maison* now in hand, we will conclude by turning to the implications of this interpretation for ideas concerning the relation of femininity, intellectualism, aesthetic practices, and the public sphere in eighteenth-century France.

Although the crushing majority of artists in pre-Revolutionary France were men, the realm of artistic contemplation and discussion was particularly associated with the female sex. This can be chiefly attributed to the influence of the *salons*: exclusive social events, hosted by well-mannered women at their homes, during which current events and artistic works were discussed and appraised. Certain *salons* staged poetic, musical, and theatrical performances for the enjoyment of their guests. *Salons* rose to prominence in the seventeenth century and lost glamour only after the French Revolution. At their height, the most important *salons* could make or break a reputation, since their members' opinions (especially those of the most powerful hostesses) spread far beyond their doors.⁶¹ The *salon*, as Joan Landes notes in *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, constituted “an alternative sphere of cultural production inside absolutism [...] set apart from all the others by its pronounced feminine character.”⁶² This paradigmatic social custom would establish an ambiguous relationship with the conservative milieu from which it emerged:

To some extent, the *salon* was merely an extension of the institutionalized court, which already accorded royal women positions of leadership in matters of taste and pleasure. But it also allowed for the extension of the culture of polite society to an ever-widening group of persons, persons often outside the traditional nobility [...].⁶³

Because *salons* relied on the presence of interesting guests—especially talented artists and fashionable men of letters—to foster exclusivity and desirable exchanges of conversation, they encouraged mixing between people from a wide range of castes.⁶⁴ Furthermore, the aristocratic *salonnières* (*salon* hostesses) spawned copycats of less noble birth, who in some cases rivaled the former in both selectivity and popularity due to their ability to craft a noteworthy program. Throughout the 1700s, *salons* wielded a large amount of cultural force and placed women at the center of collective dialogue on the arts.

Certain historians have compared the *salon* to the modern-day periodical press by describing both as a “vast engine of power, an organ of public opinion.”⁶⁵ While this comparison has its merits, we must keep in mind that *salons*, like the first periodicals were not accessible to most of the French population. The *salons* moreover primarily cultivated light banter and entertainment rather than talk about economics or politics. According to Landes, the rise of a mass media press would eventually displace the *salons* as a forum for the debate of ideas, while also noticeably replacing the kinds of topics being discussed. Nevertheless, the early and mid-eighteenth century comprised a moment when both *salons* and the early press cohabited—the first at its pinnacle and the second in its infancy—and shared much in common. At the time, the two were closely bound by their overlapping publics. In the same way that the best *salons* were

difficult to get invited to, art criticism such as that found in the serial *Correspondance Littéraire* was also, due to strict censorship policies, mostly limited to a “small, international circle of subscribers” of the most distinguished type.⁶⁶ Such newsletters were not like the open-subscriber journals that we are familiar with today, but rather confidential and semi-private forms of correspondence between a select group of people.

More importantly for us, distinguished women such as Madame Geoffrin, who ran one of the most influential salons in 1750s Paris, were key readers of missives such as the *Correspondance*. A regular of Madame Geoffrin’s *salon*, the Abbé Raynal, launched this serial before handing it over to her friend Friedrich Melchior (also known as the Baron von Grimm) two years later. It was in clandestine journals such as these, rather than in the official *Mercure de France*, that the first true art criticism appeared.⁶⁷ Thus, by extension, the *salons* served as a space where the critical thoughts of these semi-private publications were voiced, debated, and further promulgated. “*Salonnières* began to act as promoters and managers of the literary mens’ careers; it is said of Mme de Tencin, for example, that ‘it was her influence that gave its first impulse to the success of Montesquieu’s *Esprits des lois*, of which she personally bought and distributed many copies.’”⁶⁸

Given this context, it should come as no surprise that, in *The Little House*, Bastide represents the critic and Enlightenment thinker as a woman. Grimm allegedly spent hours every day on his appearance with the toiletry accessories of a lady, “decidedly not lacking in a tact or finesse that were scarcely masculine attributes.”⁶⁹ An eventual subscriber to Grimm’s journal, King Frederick II of Prussia was, during his youth, tormented by his father who found his son’s interest in philosophy and poetry too effeminate.⁷⁰ Likewise, it was precisely around this period

that certain French *philosophes* countered the traditional idolatry of virility, which they correlated with the unfairness of absolutist power.⁷¹ Thus, the act of rethinking the position of women in society went hand-in-hand with rethinking a more just social system for all. An alternative appears to have emerged in the course of the 1700s, and it was steeped in the sphere of femininity. One could almost imagine that, for a brief moment, aesthetic criticism, women's rights, liberal ideas, and intellectual writing all intersected in the *salons*.

However, this overly simplistic summary does not hold water. *Salons* belonged to the old *Ancien régime*, not the coming modern republicanism. Furthermore, the *philosophes* did not generally propose that women should be permitted to have the same responsibilities as men; on the contrary, they tended to hold tight to the notion of masculine superiority. Landes surveys Rousseau's particular stance on this topic to demonstrate that, despite his otherwise progressive views, he wished to restrict women to very discreet, maternal roles outside of the public eye.⁷² In a sense, the *salonnières* had helped foster the dawn of a free intellectual and critical environment, but, as the years went by, they and their world came to stand for all that the *philosophes* objected to. "It is striking that in this much celebrated Age of Woman so many of the men who associated with women and benefited tangibly from their society exercised a license to criticize 'the sex,'" writes Landes.⁷³ As Jürgen Habermas argues, the main actors of the public sphere (all men, of course) would come to naturalize a particular social condition that corresponded to what they thought rational society and discourse should look like. Thus they would abandon, and ultimately betray, the political ideal for total equality originally promised by the rise of the public sphere.

Landes unfolds what this meant for the place of women, given that the fair sex had played such an important role in the early stages of modern aesthetic discourse. During the

second half of the eighteenth century, the female sex became associated with much of what was wrong with monarchal society. Madame de Pompadour and Marie Antoinette were ridiculed for their superficial lives bathed in shocking extremes of luxury. Certain artists and critics eventually shunned the intricate, overloaded rococo style that such feminine gentry typically embraced (and which was especially linked to Madame de Pompadour) due to its *Ancien régime* connotations.⁷⁴ Stylistic choices were political in nature and not a minor matter. Similarly, many of the *philosophes* discerned in the female world stereotypical aspects that they found inhibitive to the creation of a more just and rational society. They contrasted the supposedly feminine traits of “pleasure, play, eroticism, artifice, style, politesse, refined facades, and particularity” with an allegedly more masculine utilitarianism, transparency, and sobriety that they viewed as integral to universal reason.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, as artistic and social criticism evolved outside of the *salon*, many of its professionals mandated themselves with the task of “revers[ing] the spoiled civilization of *le monde* in which stylish women held sway [...]”⁷⁶ Although the powerful and revolutionary presence of women in public life, especially when it came to aesthetic matters, had broken new ground, after 1750 “public women were a convenient metonym for the worst sides of absolutist life.”⁷⁷ The reversal was acute.

A similar kind of ambiguity with respect to the feminization of the public sphere can be perceived in Bastide’s *La Petite Maison*.⁷⁸ As has been made clear, Bastide was skeptical of the acerbic, relentlessly prolific criticism that he associated with women as well as scholarly critics who filled pages of text with analytical descriptions. However, at the same time he saw (along with Blondel) the need to educate all members of society, including women, and even include women in discussions involving artistic matters.⁷⁹ Although Bastide filled *La Petite Maison* with

descriptions of rococo artwork and decorations that were clearly linked to the world of feminine *salons* and rooms, he implicitly condemned the kind of banter and verbal flourishes typical of such environments and which Mélite exhibited at the start of the tale. We get the sense that, like many men of his generation, Bastide felt uncertain about to what degree the intellectual and public liberalization of women should be allowed. The ending of *La Petite Maison* confirms his desire not for female autonomy but rather for both of the sexes to mutually rely on one another. Thus he too circumscribed the role of women in the public realm. Mélite's brash haughtiness at the beginning of the tale is overcome by the time we reach the end; she ends up needing the Marquis just as much as he needs her. Bastide's gendered role-play standing for collective aesthetic discourse wrestled with the contours of female influence in the public realm. His resolution of the story implies that he believed this issue was tied to the establishment of a broader socio-political consensus between authorities and their critics.

Most discussions about the nascent artistic public sphere in France—as well as discussions about *The Little House*—make no mention of the role of women in society. I believe that this is an oversight belied by the fact that Bastide's story boldly fused a tale about romantic attraction with a didactic overview of art and contemporary politics. Too many scholars get away with the notion that, simply because artists, public intellectuals, and representatives of the state and the academies were almost all men at the time, it is fair to leave women mostly out of the picture. In doing so, such writers overlook the strong links that bound *salon* life (principally governed by women) to public dialogues about art. Women may not have been the headliners, but they and the feminine realm at first played an essential role in the emerging and rapidly shifting realm of art in the public domain. Attempts to categorize *The Little House* as no more

than a libidinous novel, purportedly concerned essentially with the awakening of the senses by a domestic setting, fail to see the importance of this book when it comes to reconsidering what we take to be the public role of art in eighteenth-century France.

Just as the rise of the bourgeois public sphere failed to live up to its promise of generating true equality and openness, so did the French Revolution not engender the enlightened nation that some of its intellectual supporters had longed for. In fact, the revolution constituted precisely the kind of event that Bastide thought artistic culture could help avoid, and for which he provided an alternative in his fictional reconciliation between the critic and the crown. In the wake of the bloody aftermath of the French Revolution, another writer, this time in Germany, would explicitly craft an argument along similar lines. The philosopher Friedrich Schiller formalized the ethos that, about thirty years earlier, had already permeated Bastide's work, this time with the aim of explaining where both the historical march toward the liberation of human reason as well as the Immanuel Kant's philosophies had gone awry.⁸⁰ Schiller expressed this system in his 1794 *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, arguing that "the realm of aesthetic experience and creativity constituted the crucial mediating, unifying link between the polarities of reason and inclination, morals and nature, ... freedom and necessity."⁸¹ Only through beauty could antagonistic forces be brought together into a better whole.

"Architecture or revolution," wrote the Swiss architect Le Corbusier about a hundred and fifty years later in a very different context.⁸² With these words he nonetheless recycled the

notion, in the vein of Bastide's theories, that the aesthetic and creative realms possess the climacteric ability to synthesize opposing forces and resolve fundamental conflicts in a society. Artistic designs could operate on a breach that had so far only been explored by philosophy: the traumatic modern experience of a living in a universe that seems fundamentally problematic and contains a seemingly intractable set of unresolvable contradictions and oppositions. According to both Bastide and Le Corbusier, art can help us escape this trap. Thus, carried into the social realm, art could instigate the ultimate form of historical synthesis. This vision echoed a particular strain of thought, fueled by the Enlightenment, which foresaw a final resolution to the past chain of human suffering and blindness: from Kant, via Hegel, and eventually to Marx. Of course, each member of this group championed a different view on how the conclusive end of all political struggles should come about. In the context of mid-eighteenth-century France, Bastide viewed the arts as essential to ushering in a peaceful solution, so it is quite fitting that Rousseau asked him to publish the *Extrait du projet de paix perpétuelle*. History, however, chose revolution.

¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), 59.

² "Jean François de Bastide (1724-1798)," accessed December 13, 2013, <http://dictionnaire-journalistes.gazettes18e.fr/journaliste/040-jean-francois-de-bastide>.

³ "J'aurais voulu, Monsieur, pouvoir répondre à l'honnêteté de vos sollicitations, en concourant plus utilement à votre entreprise ; mais vous savez ma résolution, et faute de mieux je suis réduit pour vous complaire à tirer de mes anciens barbouillages le morceau ci-joint, comme le moins indigne des regards du public. [...] Je vous envoie, Monsieur, le premier de ces extraits, comme un sujet inaugural pour vous qui aimez la paix, et dont les écrits la respirent." Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Lettre de M. Rousseau à M. de Bastide, Auteur du *Monde*," in *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle de M. l'Abbé de Saint-Pierre* (Paris, 1761), v. Available online at gallica.bnf.fr.

⁴ "Jean François de Bastide (1724-1798)."

⁵ Rodolphe El-Khoury, "Introduction," in *The Little House* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 42.

⁶ “Durant toute l’année 1760, Bastide prolonge la vie de ses *Spectateurs*, passant du *Nouveau Spectateur* au *Monde comme il est* (mars 1760), puis au *Monde* en décembre. Mme Riccoboni, qui attendait depuis 1758 de faire paraître une revue comparable sous le nom de *L’Abeille*, se déclare exaspérée par cette obstination de B[astide] à occuper le terrain.” “Jean François de Bastide (1724-1798).”

⁷ Paul Young keenly establishes a link between Bastide and Rousseau toward the end of his analysis of Bastide’s *La Petite Maison*: “In the *Réflexions*, Bastide demonstrates an affinity with the thought of another contemporary writer, that ‘cityoien de Genève,’ with whom in the following year (1760) he would collaborate on an edition of *Projet de Paix Perpétuelle* [...]. In Bastide’s *Réflexions*, the influence of Rousseau’s writings is already apparent, as Bastide presents man as being indisputably good, asking his readers: ‘Does there exist a man without a heart? If he exists, let him show himself; one can repair this betrayal of nature. If he knows that this failing needs to be repaired, it already has been’ (574).” Paul Young, “Looking Inside,” in *Seducing the Eighteenth-Century French Reader: Reading, Writing, and the Question of Pleasure* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 78. I find this correlation between Bastide and Rousseau insightful, but wish to demonstrate in the present essay that their mutual concerns were not limited to the inherent goodness of man.

⁸ Etienne de Choiseul, *Mémoire historique sur la négociation de la France & de l’Angleterre depuis le 26 mars 1761 jusqu’au 20 septembre de la même année : avec les pièces justificatives* (London : Chez D. Wilson, T. Becket & P.A. De Hondt, 1761). Available online at https://archive.org/details/cihm_32788.

⁹ “Jean François de Bastide (1724-1798).”

¹⁰ Jean-François de Bastide, “Avant-Propos,” in *Extrait du Projet de Paix Perpétuelle de M. l’Abbé de Saint-Pierre* (Paris, 1761), vi-viii. Available online at gallica.bnf.fr.

¹¹ See http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=1625885&partId=1&people=116770&peoA=116770-1-7&page=1.

¹² “Cet Artiste a sagement pensé que l’usage ordinaire de mettre des Esclaves au pied de ces statues, a le défaut de ne point caractériser un règne plus qu’un autre, et semble devoir faire croire que nous sommes encore assez plongés dans la barbarie pour placer la gloire d’un Roi dans l’ambition des conquêtes, plus que dans cette sagesse de gouvernement qui fait la félicité des peuples. C’est à quoi M. Pigalle a obvié, en mettant d’un côté une femme appuyée sur un gouvernail, qui de la main droite conduit un lion sans effort, en le tenant seulement par quelques poils de sa crinière. Il représente par-là allégoriquement la douceur du gouvernement, la docilité des peuples, et leur attachement pour le Souverain.” Bastide, “Avant-Propos,” viii-x. Erika Naginski discusses the critical reactions to this monument as well as to an engraving of it by Moitte in her *Sculpture and Enlightenment*: Erika Naginski, *Sculpture and Enlightenment* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2009), 257-264.

¹³ As Jürgen Habermas describes, the emergence of a public sphere in the West following the end of the Renaissance both posed a challenge to traditional lineages of authority while also stemming from some their practices and, once formed, was often co-opted by groups in power. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1991).

¹⁴ For more on how the French sculpture and monuments of this time grappled with engaging the public with notions about a waning monarchy and the rise of ideals cherishing reason and justice, see Erika Naginski’s *Sculpture and Enlightenment*.

¹⁵ See Michel Fehrer, ed. *The Libertine Reader: Eroticism and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century France* (New York: Zone Books, 1997), 14-22.

¹⁶ Paul Young, “Looking Inside,” 57.

¹⁷ Michel Delon, ed., *Point de Lendemain* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995). “Both narratives draw a sinuous, capricious line that leads the reader in an exploration of space that comprises the analysis of a conscience,” says Delon. Michel Delon, *Le Savoir-Vivre Libertin* (Paris: Hachette, 2000), 124.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 100.

¹⁹ See Kathryn Norberg, “Goddesses of Taste: Courtesans and Their Furniture in Late-Eighteenth-Century Paris,” in *Furnishing the Eighteenth Century: What Furniture Can Tell Us About the European and American Past* (New York: Routledge, 2007) and Ed Lilley, “The Name of the Boudoir,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians Vol. 53 No. 2* (1994): 193-8.

²⁰ Rodolphe El-Khoury, “Introduction,” in *The Little House* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 42.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 44-5.

²² *Ibid.*, 38-41. The reception of the book in Bastide’s time also appears to have been mitigated at least in part due to its emphasis on architectural didacticism at the expense of immersive story-telling: “Following the publication of *La Petite Maison* in 1758 (in the second volume of *Le Nouveau Spectateur*), Grimm offered a fairly scathing critique of this story in the *Correspondance Littéraire*, arguing that Bastide ‘ha[d] no talent,’ and suggesting that the story was written simply as a forum in which the author could parade ‘the names of the artists who are most frequently employed for interior decoration in Paris.’ Moreover, Grimm notes that the attention paid to the descriptions of the *petite maison* leaves little room for anything else, to the detriment of the text’s two characters: ‘Thu the two heroes of *La Petite Maison*, Mélite and Trémicour, are precisely the characters who interest the reader the least.’” Paul Young, “Looking Inside,” 56.

²³ Rodolphe El-Khoury, “Introduction,” 46.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

²⁵ Anthony Vidler, “Preface,” in *The Little House* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 18.

²⁶ Alberto Pérez-Gómez, *Built Upon Love* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006), 38 and 62.

Michel Delon paved the way for such an interpretation by pointing out the correspondence between Bastide’s novel and Nicolas le Camus de Mézière’s *Le Génie de l’Architecture, ou l’Analogie de cet Art avec nos Sensations*, published about twenty years later in 1780. Denon, *Point de Lendemain*, 24.

²⁷ Young, “Looking Inside,” 80.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 72-9. Young points to the commonalities between Bastide and Rousseau, and particularly their shared belief in the original, natural goodness of man, as further proof for his argument. (See note 6.) However, Young finds that Bastide went further and traced his own path by believing that “man may be returned to this state of goodness (or at least reminded of it), through the representation of examples (or acts) of virtue.” *Ibid.*, 78.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 68-9.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 79.

³¹ Jean-François de Bastide, *The Little House*, trans. Rodolphe El-Khoury (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), 70-3.

³² *Ibid.*, 57.

³³ *Ibid.*, 85.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 66.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 72.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 65.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 57.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 76-8.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁴⁷ “Jean François de Bastide (1724-1798).”

⁴⁸ “His main interest, however, centered around the arts, architecture in particular. By 1759 he had worked out a detailed scheme for a journal devoted exclusively to the discussion of every aspect of the arts, of architecture, painting and sculpture as well as of the applied arts, giving information on artists and reviewing books dealing with the arts. Laugier quite rightly felt that such a novel and ambitious undertaking needed official backing and submitted a plan for the journal, to be called *L'état des arts en France*, to the Marquis de Marigny who as *Directeur des Bâtiments* was in fact responsible for the organization of all the arts. Unfortunately, nothing came of it, mainly due to the hostile attitude of the artists, who were alarmed about the trend toward complete emancipation of art criticism. Thus, Laugier was prevented from pioneering what would have become the first art periodical in history.” Wolfgang Hermann, “Laugier’s *Essay on Architecture*,” in *An Essay on Architecture* (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977), xv-xvi. Also see Thomas Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 6 and 9.

⁴⁹ Marc-Antoine Laugier, *An Essay on Architecture*, trans. Wolfgang and Anni Hermann (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977).

⁵⁰ See Leo Strauss, "Persecution and the Art of Writing," in *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 22-37.

⁵¹ Bastide does supply us with some clues that Trémicour's declaration of love for Méliete is honest: "He responded distractedly to her compliments on his good taste, and for the first time, the house meant less to him than the object he had brought to it." Bastide, *The Little House*, 59. Yet, as Paul Young points out, the rest of the book makes clear that the nobleman possesses a masterful ability mask his true emotions. Young, "Looking Inside," 63-5.

⁵² Bastide, *The Little House*, 80.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 102-3. My emphasis.

⁵⁷ Richard Cleary, "Romancing the Tome; or an Academician's Pursuit of a Popular Audience in 18th-Century France," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* Vol. 48, No. 2 (1989), 144, and Anthony Vidler, "Preface," 9.

⁵⁸ "Jamais on n'aima tant à lire ; on a même quelqu'envie de s'éclairer en lisant : mais les livres ont toute l'imperfection, et toute la bizarrerie des esprits." Bastide, "Préface," in Jacques-François Blondel, *L'Homme du Monde Éclairé par les Arts* (Paris, 1774), ix. Available online at gallica.bnf.fr.

⁵⁹ Bastide's ekphrasis also plays an important role in Young's study of how the book relates to literary issues important in the eighteenth century. Young, "Looking Inside," 68-70.

⁶⁰ See Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

⁶¹ Michel Fehrer, *The Libertine Reader* (New York: Zone Books, 1997), 15. For a discussion of the *salons*, also see Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 33-4. Also see Margaret Hunt, *Women in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2010).

⁶² Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 40.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Amelia Gere Mason, *The Women of the French Salons* (New York: Century, 1891), 124, as quoted in Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere*, 23.

⁶⁶ Thomas Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 9.

⁶⁷ Diderot notably published reviews of the Parisian biannual art salon in Grimm's *Correspondance Littéraire*. Ibid. See also Janet Aldis, *Madame Geoffrin: Her Salon and Her Times: 1750-1777* (London: Methuen & Co., 1905), 182-3.

⁶⁸ Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere*, 54. "Mme du Deffand, Mlle de Lespinasse, and Mme Geoffrin were noted for their influence over publication and over the academic careers of talented men." Ibid.

⁶⁹ Aldis, *Madame Geoffrin*, 182.

⁷⁰ "Frederick the Great," accessed December 11 2013, http://philosopedia.org/index.php/Frederick_the_Great.

⁷¹ See Georges Vigarello et al., *L'invention de la virilité: de l'Antiquité aux Lumières* (Paris: Seuil, 2011).

⁷² Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere*, 66-89.

⁷³ Ibid., 45.

⁷⁴ Crow, *Painters and Public Life*, 110.

⁷⁵ Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere*, 46.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 48.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 49.

⁷⁸ In *L'Homme du Monde*, the dual stereotypes of femininity (one pointing back to the *Ancien Régime* and one pointed forward to a liberated state) are reified in the two female protagonists, "the passionate Marquise de Galeas, who lives by instinct, and the cool, intellectual Comtesse de Vaujau, who is the voice of reason." Cleary, "Romancing the Tome," 145.

⁷⁹ Speaking of Blondel's *L'Homme du Monde*, Bastide lists the following ambitions for the book: "Rendre sensible ce qui doit être estimé, réduire à sa réalité ce qui a pu usurper l'estime ; exciter l'indulgence des gens du monde, en leur offrant les avantages de l'instruction, sans exiger les peines de l'étude ; fournir aux femmes le prétexte d'une application, en paraissant leur offrir un amusement ; les mettre à la portée de s'acquitter envers les Beaux-Arts, en leur faisant faire connaissance avec eux ; les engager à donner un exemple utile en autorisant les hommes à leur apporter le fruit de leurs réflexions. Tel est le but qu'on se propose." Bastide, "Préface," in Jacques-François Blondel, *L'Homme du Monde*, xiii-xiv.

⁸⁰ John Toews, *Hegelianism: The Path Toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805-1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 31-5.

⁸¹ Ibid., 38-9.

⁸² Le Corbusier, *Toward an Architecture* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2007), 89.