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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the popularization of the theme of the ‘hunt luncheon’ in the Rococo period, within the context of the châteaux renovations undertaken during the reign of Louis XV. In 1730s, the young king commissioned four paintings for newly conceived private dining rooms at Versailles and Fontainebleau. For the king’s new salle à manger at Versailles, the Bâtiments du Roi asked Jean-François de Troy (1679-1752) to paint Le déjeuner d’huitres and Nicolas Lancret (1690-1743) for Le déjeuner de jambon. At Fontainebleau, de Troy was asked to paint an outdoor scene entitled Le déjeuner de chasse, and Carle Van Loo (1705-1765) La halte de chasse for the same room. Not only was the theme of these commissions relatively new to French art, but the size of the works was remarkable for what might be called tableaux de modes and for their placement at these royal châteaux. Moreover, the salle à manger was a relatively new and fashionable room type, introduced into elite domestic architecture in the eighteenth century.
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INTRODUCTION

In the 1730s, the young king Louis XV (1710-1744), in his mid twenties – in an act displaying independence from his domineering former tutor, and first minister in all but name, Cardinal Fleury – commissioned four paintings for newly conceived private dining rooms at Versailles and Fontainebleau, the royal châteaux he most often visited. For the king’s new salle á manger, adjoining his private quarters on the second floor at Versailles, the Bâtiments du Roi asked Jean-François de Troy (1679-1752) to paint Le déjeuner d’huîtres and Nicolas Lancret (1690-1743) for Le déjeuner de jambon. De Troy and had recently painted a pair of mythological paintings for the hôtel du Grand Maître at Versailles, and Lancret was the newly named conseiller of the Académie. At Fontainebleau, de Troy was asked to paint an outdoor scene entitled Le déjeuner de chasse and Carle Van Loo (1705-1765), who had recently returned from Italy, La halte de chasse, for the same room.¹ Not only was the theme of these commissions relatively new to French art, but the size of the works was remarkable for what might be called tableaux de modes and for their placement at these royal châteaux.² Moreover, the salle à manger was a relatively new and fashionable room type, introduced into elite domestic architecture in the eighteenth century.

¹ Unlike the paintings done for Versailles, the paintings for Fontainebleau were not pendants. De Troy’s Le déjeuner de chasse had a pendant by the same artist, entitled Le cerf aux bois. See Christophe Léribault, Jean-François de Troy (1679-1752), (Paris: Association pour la diffusion de l’Histoire de l’Art, 2002), 354-355. While the pendant to Van Loo’s painting was done by Charles Parrocel, Halte de grenadiers. See Marie-Catherine Sahut, Carle Van Loo: Premier Peintre du Roi (Nice, 1705 - Paris 1765), (Nice, Clermont-Ferrand, Nancy, 1977), 42.

² The paintings by Carle Van Loo and Jean-François de Troy are not the first paintings of the hunt luncheon type. See Chapter 2 on Fontainebleau for a discussion on the earlier works of this convention as well as a discussion on the tableau de mode type most closely associated with de Troy.
With the paintings commissioned for the king’s châteaux, Louis popularized a new genre in rococo art, the hunt luncheon, long before his most famous mistress appeared at Versailles and amassed a very large collection of rococo art. Jeanne-Antoinette Poisson (1721-1764), from 1745 the Marquise de Pompadour, is known for her love of the rococo style, particularly the works of François Boucher (1703-1770) and, to a lesser extent, Van Loo. Art historians have stressed Mme de Pompadour’s patronage of works by these major rococo painters, but in fact, the Crown’s patronage began over a decade earlier.

While new scholarship has begun to explore French genre painting, these works have not been examined in any depth. Most studies are parts of monographs on these painters, and of those who have written about the hunt luncheons, the focus has dealt primarily on the “who, what, when and where” of these paintings, but not the why. Not only are these paintings significant as works of art, but they also seem to provide the viewer with a glance into social customs of the eighteenth century. No recent scholarship has explored these four paintings in the context of the culinary and architectural innovations of the century. Nor has any scholar assessed these four paintings as a group, perhaps because of a focus on the individual artistic monograph. I will argue that the innovations in domestic architecture and cuisine will help us to understand the “why” of this hunt-luncheon genre.

Mary Tavener Holmes has devoted her career to the study of Nicolas Lancret, building upon the seminal monograph by George Wildenstein. In her 1992 exhibition catalogue *Nicolas Lancret, 1690-1743*, she notes that the theme of the “hunt picnic” was practically invented by Nicolas Lancret. While Holmes briefly discusses half of the works I am concerned with, she does so in just a few paragraphs and only mentions these works as part of a larger genre. In *The Age of Watteau, Chardin, and Fragonard* as well as *French
Frances Gage has also addressed Lancret with respect to formulating the “hunt picnic”; however, her discussion is limited to the few pages allowed each catalogue entry. Marie-Catherine Sahut’s 1977 book about Carle Van Loo is a catalogue raisonné of the artist’s paintings, which accompanied an exhibition. While Sahut’s work offers a comprehensive look at Van Loo’s work, there is little room for discussion of the artist within the context of genre themes. Van Loo is long overdue a comprehensive study along the lines of Melissa Hyde’s recent publications on François Boucher. More has been written about Jean-François de Troy than Lancret and Van Loo. Christophe Léribault’s Jean-François de Troy (1679-1752) offers a comprehensive catalogue raisonné of the artist published in 2002. Most recently, Denise Amy Baxter’s 2003 doctoral dissertation Fashions of Sociability in Jean-François de Troy's tableaux de mode, 1725-1738 examines the artist’s tableaux de mode and the fashionable and societal conventions in the paintings. A refreshing break from a monographic work, Baxter’s examination of a few select works by de Troy is insightful and similar in approach to Melissa Hyde’s work on Boucher.

The French-ification of genre paintings, led by Antoine Watteau, focused on landscape and social scenes. The artist had a great impact on his fellow French artists with his new fêtes galantes. With his reception into the Académie Royale in 1717 with his famous Embarkation from Cythera, Watteau epitomized and invented a new genre, however short-lived, during the rococo period.

Along with genre painting and domestic architecture, the eighteenth century was also an era of culinary innovation. Changes were made in preparation and styles of food and dining, as well as dining practices. The advent of the dining room or salle à manger as an
actual room set aside for dining purposes gained momentum as the century wore on. The eighteenth century created the *mirepoix*: a trio of carrots, celery and onion, as well as mayonnaise, and the ‘mother sauces’ such as demi-glace.\(^3\) The culinary inventions of the eighteenth century are used by every chef to the present. Those innovations were intimately tied to the invention of a new genre in painting.

CHAPTER 1

VERSAILLES: THE GENESIS OF THE SALLE A MANGER AND DINING SCENES

The evolution of the dining room in the eighteenth century apparently inspired the development of elaborate dining scenes. These dining scenes, in turn, paved the road for the hunt luncheon genre, which combined the repast with the hunting party. Painters Nicolas Lancret, Jean-François de Troy, and Carle Van Loo helped to establish and popularize the French type of the hunt luncheon.

In the eighteenth century, the salon emerged as the most important room in the elite house, whether it was a hôtel or château. In 1737 Jacques-François Blondel described it as a public room used for various purposes, into which tables and chairs could be brought when needed for dining on special occasions. These were the types of rooms in which lavish feasts might be held. Like his great-grandfather had done, Louis XV dined in his salon in the presence of the court at least twice a week, a ritual that faded in the later years of his reign.¹ The king himself sought a more private lifestyle than that of his great-grandfather, Louis XIV, who established a strategically public routine.²

By 1737, when Jacques-François Blondel published De La Distribution des Maisons de Plaisance, et de la Décoration des Édifices en Général, less formal dining was done in a separate room, an anti-chambre or salle à manger. In many elite homes, the anti-chambre

² Duindam, Vienna and Versailles, 180.
developed into an actual salle à manger, a room whose primary purpose was dining. The room was commonly paneled in wood or stone and was not hung with tapestries, which were thought to hold on to the odor of the food. It was during the eighteenth century that the dining room became a permanent feature in the aristocratic house, though it was not as well established in the bourgeois domestic sphere. Throughout the century, the salle à manger continued to grow both in size and in importance, until it, and the accompanying rooms, sometimes took up an entire wing of the hôtel.

In 1722, the Regent (Philippe, duc d’Orléans) moved the Court back to Versailles, in part so that the young king could ride, hunt, and enjoy the fresh air. Even at the early age of twelve the king preferred Versailles. The king initially began renovations at Versailles in 1728, but it was not until twelve years later that the petits appartements were reorganized on the second floor for Louis XV’s personal use and pleasure.

In 1735, this suite of rooms (fig. 1) was expanded to include a dining room in which the king and his companions could feast after their hunting expeditions. The room was

---


designed to seat about twenty guests. Both men and women were entertained in this new salle à manger, which was the most important room in Louis’ new petit appartement. This room was famous for its dinner parties and an invitation to join the king was not easy to obtain. Invitations to these informal dinners were so sought after that courtiers who did not get invited made up rumors about the hedonism and debauchery that was going on in the room. There is even one story of a courtier invited to the salle à manger half expecting to participate in an orgy, and well relieved when he realized that was not the case, as this was rumored to have occurred under the Regent during his soupers intimes.

Louis’ new salle à manger was a place of relaxation, free from the decorum of courtly life, though one did not forget one was in the company of the king. Around the table, guests sat in no particular order; there was no observance of rank or station. The chef would bring in the dishes, followed by a few servants who would serve each diner and then leave. Wine was placed on the table and guests were able to serve themselves. During the eighteenth century the dumb-waiter was invented to reduce the need for servants to be present in the salle à manger, as it was generally a small room which would become cramped with the presence of too many people. These meals with the king were more intimate than the previous banquets and they were more refined. The “French style” of dining was invented in the eighteenth century. As the century unfolded, it became customary to have food passed

10 Marie, Versailles au temps de Louis XV, 235-236.

11 Barbara Ketcham Wheaton, Savoring the Past, The French Kitchen and Table from 1300 to 1789 (New York: Touchstone, 1983), 156.

12 Levron, Daily Life at Versailles, 158.

around the table rather than each person being served; these were often four-course dinners with many options for each course.  

Louis also had a salle à manger installed under the roof of Versailles (fig. 2), which was often used in the summer when the king and his companions would dine on the roof and take leisurely strolls around the roof top terraces. From this vantage point one would have a panoramic view of the gardens and parks of Versailles. Louis’ new dining rooms were serviced by a suite of kitchens, offices, and sculleries on the same story; unfortunately, they have all disappeared.

Since this was an age of culinary innovation, Louis employed all of the best chefs; indeed, these were the first “celebrity chefs” of their age. These chefs even had their own personal quarters next to the kitchen on the roof level. Louis was not only a fan of fine food and wines; he also enjoyed cooking himself, as did his uncle the Regent, who had done so at the Palais-Royal. Louis liked to prepare omelets, lark pâtés, chicken with basil, and eggs en chemise à la fanatique. In the petits cabinets du roi, he had a kitchen installed for his own personal use; in fact, Louis was given cooking lessons by one of his chefs.

By the eighteenth century, not only had the dining room been established as its own place within the elite house, but French epicurean sensibility had also taken hold. The manners and customs of the elite diner were also changing. Dinner times were drastically

15 Levron, Daily Life at Versailles, 126.
16 Marie, Versailles au temps de Louis XV, 236.
17 Revel, Culture & Cuisine, 171.
18 Verlet, Le château de Versailles, 475-476.
pushed back. ‘Dinner’ was eaten around six in the evening while ‘supper’ was taken at about eleven at night.\(^{19}\) Therefore, it is with ‘dinner’ that I am primarily concerned, as it was after Louis’ mid-day hunting expeditions that the room was most often utilized.\(^{20}\)

In 1735, the twenty-five year old Louis XV commissioned two paintings for the dining room of his newly renovated petits cabinets at Versailles. *Le déjeuner d’huitres*, by Jean-François de Troy (fig. 3), and *Le déjeuner de jambon*, by Nicolas Lancret (fig. 4), were entirely in keeping with “culinary revolution” and the epicurean innovations of the early eighteenth century. Previous scholars have often admired these paintings, but few have fully explored the qualities of the works which depict evolving social conventions.

De Troy’s *Le déjeuner d’huitres* (fig. 3) was originally installed in the *salle à manger* of Louis XV’s petits appartements at Versailles.\(^{21}\) Compositionally, de Troy divided his painting in half, with the foreground occupied by the dining party and the upper half of the painting depicting an elaborately bedecked architectural space. The artist also chose to use a muted palette, giving further emphasis to the color of the gentlemen’s jackets and the bright gilding throughout the room. Details are rendered with tight brushwork and immaculate definition.

In *Le déjeuner d’huitres* de Troy depicts a brightly lit room, with high ceilings, where putti intertwine with decorative vegetation flanking an oval-framed painting. It depicts a

\(^{19}\) Flandrin and Montanari, *Food, A Culinary History*, 369.


scene of Roman myth, that of Zephyr and Flora, a story that de Troy treated on at least six different occasions (fig. 5). Zephyr, the god of the spring winds, with his wife Flora, the goddess of flowers and everything that blooms, together signified rebirth. They were fitting deities to preside over a dinner of oysters which were (and still are) thought to be an aphrodisiac.

A table surrounded by men is laden with an abundance of oysters. A statue of Venus presides over the men and their feast of the ocean’s bounty from her perch above their heads. The room, filled with the lively men, is just as richly decorated as they are magnificently dressed. The most prominent feature of the room is the balconied alcove in front of which the men sit as they partake of their feast of bivalves. This arched alcove draws the viewer’s eyes into the back of the painting, adding depth and some mystery about its purpose. The viewer is left to speculate about what is concealed by its rounded corner. On the left side of the alcove, screened by the balustrade, there is an allusion to a door; the golden swags that frame it are similar to those on the large greenish-blue double doors to the left of the alcove, separated from it only by a gray and a blue-toned marble Ionic column and a pilaster which is topped with a golden capitol.

Inside the arched niche, a pair of pilasters, similar to those seen on the main door, flank a smaller door on the left side. This mysteriously separate space is blocked off from the men by a sculpted balustrade, whose spindles seem to mirror the shape of the Venus statue to

the right. Venus stands in her own niche, a shell behind her head, as though to remind the viewer of her origins from the sea. The shell further relates to the feast of bi-valves and is akin to the one that bore her to dry land. She stands there on the head of a dolphin, which spouts water into a basin below. The gilded basin of the fountain, barely visible below, resembles a shell. The convex form of Venus’ pedestal contrasts with the concave niche cordoned off by the balustrade.

Venus stands on the dolphin-head fountain, while being flanked on either side by a gilded term whose muscular shoulders seem to support the molding above her head. Their powerfully built torsos lead to legs that twist around each other to give an almost fin-like effect, as though they were mermen who helped carry Venus ashore on her clam shell. Following the gaze of the goddess, one finds a small cherub intertwined with a golden candelabrum, perched to the side of a very large mirror framed with gold, in a niche of its own. In front of this mirror are a delicate glass and bottles, similar to those in the ice chest in the forefront of the picture.

The ice chest sits in the center foreground of the painting; two bottles peek up through the ice in the top, while the shelves are visibly stocked with silver dishes akin to the large platter that lies on white linen on the floor to the left. The large platter on the floor and the one to its left, sitting on top of a woven basket, will be used to serve the gentlemen after the oysters have been shucked by the kneeling servant in dark blue. Unshucked oysters and the remnant shells of those already eaten, lay strewn about the floor around the table servant, as do a few empty champagne bottles that lay on their sides. On the floor, the upturned pearly white insides of the opened oyster shells and the dark grayish black of the whole oysters echo
the black and white of the floor tiles. The tile pattern confirms that the room being utilized is, in fact, either oval or rounded, at least at the end that the men occupy.

A large group of men occupy the central ground of the painting, and at least five of these men can be identified as servants. The servant in blue kneeling to the left of the painting is in the process of shucking oysters; the platter next to him contains some that have already been opened. The man at his shoulder gives him directions as he gestures towards the oysters that lay scattered about on the floor. He is obviously a gentleman, and possibly the host of this lavish feast; his red coat is brocaded with gold stitching and hides his ruffled white shirt, with only his collar and puffy sleeves on display. The red of his coat is echoed in the red of his leggings and the red heels of his shoes, which identify him as noble and as a person who has been presented at court to the king.²³

Along the left side of the table, behind this seated man in red, is a figure who wears a gold coat and raises an empty glass. Over his shoulder, a standing man dressed in white looks off to the right at the servant dressed in pale blue, who is presenting the guests with a platter of oysters on the half shell. That servant is distracted by a cork which has recently taken flight and is barely visible against the bluish-green of the column. The white circular table on which the servant prepares to set the platter of oysters is covered with a large white linen table cloth. Both oyster shells and small loaves of bread lay spread across the table, apparently forgotten by the participants of this sumptuous gathering.

Also standing in the doorway is a man in a coat of a dark blue with gold detail, apparently embroiled in conversation with his seated companion, the seated man in a gold coat. To the right is another seated figure, fashionably dressed in a grayish-tan coat, his left hand holding a bottle on the table; he too gazes at the cork that has taken flight from the bottle he just opened with a knife. Also following the flight of the cork is a servant in black, opening oysters for the man in a red jacket who stands to his right. The man dressed in red has an oyster in hand, about to raise it to his mouth and slurp it down. Between their heads, we see another man with an oyster shell in hand, ready to dispose of its delectable contents.

The servant dressed in blue, who is placing the tray of oysters on the table, neatly divides the large number of men into two smaller groupings. A man in a dark brown coat with gold embroidery obscures his face with his arm as he raises a bottle to refill his glass. Another man, in black, holds a champagne glass by its long dainty stem, as he daubs his mouth with his large white napkin. His gaze is directed at a seated gentleman in an ochre-colored coat, who gestures across the table as he converses with two men seated near him. He apparently addresses the man dressed in gray, whom we see from head to toe. Between them, and partially hidden, is a man dressed in dark blue who raises his glass and peers at its contents, as his right hand rests on the back of the chair that the gray-garbed man occupies. The seated man in gray pours champagne from a distance, producing an abundance of bubbles in his glass. Given his prominence, the gray-garbed man of this group might be the host or the guest of honor. His outstretched leg mirrors that of the man across the table from him in the red jacket, and his red heel is barely visible to the viewer. Standing behind him and his companions is another man in a red jacket; he has his glass raised to his lips and is in the process of emptying its contents.
Behind the caned back chair of the seated gentleman in gray, a servant is kneeling, his white apron spread across his lap. The servant holds a basket on its side in his left hand, and is possibly in the process of picking up the empty oyster shells scattered across the floor. Completing the composition to the far right foreground are two standing men; a gentleman in red heels and light gray jacket is devouring oysters that the servant is opening for him. The servant, dressed in tan, stands with his foot propped on an overturned basket and is in the process of opening oysters for the gentleman.

The room depicted in *Le déjeuner d’huîtres* was, in fact, an imaginary version of the *salle à manger*, which was taking root in the eighteenth century. A number of elements help to identify this room as a *salle à manger*. The dolphin fountain on which the Venus statue stands was found only in dining rooms. Michel Gallet has pointed out that these fountains were typically decorated with motifs of gods, dolphins, fish and shells. The room is decorated with sculptures, marbles, bronzes, and gilding. Such features were described by architectural theorists as appropriate for decorating this new room type. Earlier, Louis Herpin published a design for a *salle à manger* at the *Hôtel de Soubise* (fig. 6).

The flooring depicted in the painting gives the viewer another clue to the identification of the room being used. First *antichambres*, located just off of the vestibules, were commonly paved with black and white square tiles. The dining room emerged from

---

24 Gallet, *Stately Mansions*, 86.


the *antichambre*; it was often paved in the same way. The shape of the space, revealed by the pattern of the tiles on the floor, also gives clues about the room’s identity, as it is known through floor plans that some *salles à manger* had rounded ends. Both the *Hôtel du Châtelet* (fig. 7) and the *Hôtel Amelot de Gournay* (fig. 8) are examples of round ended *salles à manger*.

In dining rooms, paintings sometimes depicted Roman gods, akin to those who appear in the oval painting in *Le déjeuner d’huitres*. Watteau, for example, had depicted Zephyr and Flora as Spring in a series of four seasons done for the *financier* Pierre Crozat’s dining room.27 The gods, specifically Bacchus, the god of wine, and Flora, the goddess of fruit bearing plants, were commonly depicted in the *salles à manger*.28

The small wooden table so prominently depicted in *Le déjeuner d’huitres* was most likely a *table servante* or a small mobile table with shelves, compartments, and bottle coolers; it was coming into fashion in dining rooms at precisely this time (fig. 9). It is known that the king utilized these *tables servantes* during his *petits soupers* to lessen the need for servants to be present.29

The artist’s choice to depict oysters has another meaning beyond their association as an aphrodisiac. Oysters had a long history in France that goes back to the 1500s; in 1545 Francis I gave Cancale, a small town along the coast in Brittany, exclusive rights for


providing oysters to the royal court. Louis XIV is said to have had oysters delivered to the palace every day. While oysters were plentiful in the seventeenth century, during the latter half of the eighteenth century they became scarce. In the early half of the century oysters were continually fished from natural beds; however, around 1760 the supply became so low that restrictions were placed on fishing oysters. By the date of Jean-François de Troy’s *Le déjeuner d’huitres*, the available oyster supply was beginning to diminish, but one could presume that the king would still be able to obtain as many as he pleased.

Furthermore, oysters have a long history of being depicted in northern genre paintings. It is known that French artists of the rococo period were inspired by such paintings, and Jean-François de Troy certainly saw still-lifes with oysters painted by Northern artists. Dutch and Flemish masters were superbly skilled at representing the opalescence of the inner oyster shells. However, it is a motif very rarely depicted in French art, despite the nation being the leading consumer and producer of this particular shellfish.

Besides oysters, *Le déjeuner d’hui tres* depicts another delicacy: champagne. Eighteenth-century scholar Nicole Garnier-Pelle states that De Troy’s painting is the first to depict champagne, which had just been invented at the end of the previous century. Champagne was purportedly invented by Dom Pérignon, a monk from the Benedictine order at the Abbey of Hautvillers on the Marne River. Champagne became the beverage of choice

---

30 Drew Smith, *Oysters: A World History* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: The History Press, 2010), 120.


33 Smith, *Oysters: A World History*, 121.

for the Duc d’Orléans during his time as the Regent, and later by Louis XV. 

Champagne had also become a traditional accompaniment to oysters.

Jean- François de Troy composed a sketch in preparation for his final painting (fig. 10). The painting, which is in a private collection, is little studied, not widely published and even less exhibited. On the back of the sketch are the words “bon à exécuter” which was apparently a note from the Bâtiments du Roi.  

After analyzing the painting done for Versailles, one might deduce that the king appreciated the work for its depiction of leisure-time activities, which he was known to have enjoyed. The painting gives art historians valuable insight in to social customs, as well as attire. For example, this painting documents the French tradition of champagne as a complement to oysters. Furthermore, Le déjeuner d’huitres gives insight into the duties of servants during such a flurry of activity.

Nicolas Lancret’s painting Le déjeuner de jambon (fig. 4) was commissioned as the pendant to de Troy’s Le déjeuner d’huitres. Set outside, it contains many of the elements of Le déjeuner d’huitres, but it is far more informal. Despite the informal setting, Lancret was as meticulous in his attention to detail as de Troy. Lancret’s palette also echoes that of its pendant; the artist used largely muted colors to accent the brighter color of the sky and the colors of the party’s wardrobe. Also similar is the composition of Lancret’s painting, with the

participants taking up the bottom half of the painting. However, since Lancret depicted an outdoor scene, the top half of the painting is occupied by sky and foliage. The artist’s tight brushwork and careful delineation of the figures is carried through even to the flora.

This rambunctious scene takes place in an idyllic park setting, the revelers surrounded by lush green foliage of the trees. Again the men depicted are seated around a table spread with a large white linen. A statue Bacchus, the god of wine, appears instead of Venus, but the god’s presence is just as prominent. Bacchus reinforces the drunken debauchery of the revelers below. The god’s relation to the scene unfolding below is similar to that of Venus presiding over the feast of bivalves while standing on a shell similar to the one that bore her to dry land.

The servants are gathered to one side of the painting, instead of intruding on the scene, and a lone female figure is present in Le déjeuner de jambon. Lancret’s single woman stands amid a group of seated men. She is dressed in pale blue; pink ribbons at her breast and at her elbow adorn her white bell-shaped sleeve. Her gray curly hair frames her round face, her complexion slightly ruddy. She gazes to the right as she reaches to caress the face of the man seated in front of her. The woman’s ruddy complexion, a result of her inebriation, is a sign of the informality of this luncheon party. Her presence at the party as the sole woman also serves as an indication of her lowly status; she is quite possibly a mistress of the seated man.

38 Lancret’s choice of setting for his raucous scenes is reminiscent of Dutch genre paintings such as Party in a Garden (fig.24) by Esaias Van de Velde. Van de Velde’s painting, dated 1619, depicts fashionably clad men and women seated at a table laden with peacock pie along with other rare dishes. Watteau is known to have borrowed from northern painters and Lancret surely did so too. See the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Masters of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Genre Painting (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), chapter 2.
The corpulent man whose head the woman coddles, sits with his shirt unbuttoned, face ruddier than the woman’s, and gazes in the same direction. His tan coat is thrown open and a white cap sits on his head, where his wig once was. Another man in a blue coat, seated to his right, gets ready to pour himself a drink. He rests one arm on the table while holding his glass, his large white napkin draping from the table and across one leg. He, too, has replaced his wig with a white cap.

The central figure of the group has adorned his white cap with laurels and stands on his chair with one foot on the white linen table cloth, his large napkin is still draped on one knee and tucked into his shirt as he pours wine into his glass. His sweeping gesture and raised arm echo the arm of the statue to his right. His stance brings focus to the wine bottle and glass he is holding, which is the central motif of the painting. On the table in front of this central figure is a large ham. Plates, knives, and wine coolers are scattered about the table. A loaf of bread sits to the left, with smaller pieces broken off the loaf dotting the table.

A man wearing a brown coat and standing behind and partially hidden by the man with laurels in his cap talks to another standing man dressed in pale blue; they too wear simple white caps. Between them is a seated man wearing a red coat, with one hand on the table and the other on his chest holding his napkin as he watches the central figure pouring wine into his glass. At the end of the table sits a man dressed in a rose colored coat. His legs are splayed, a napkin covers his entire lap and chest, and he seems to be chuckling to himself about the scene unfolding. These figures, their fashionable wigs discarded, are not interested in proper social etiquette at the moment. Their servants to the left are not even visibly shocked at the scene in front of them; in fact, they are more composed than their masters.
Five servants stand to the left of the painting, grouped closely together. While most of them are composed and uninterested in the scene at hand, the servant closest to the group points and whispers; the listener holds a small platter of food and gazes upon the scene at hand. The servant in blue in front of him holds another platter and also watches the revelry as does a slightly bent-over African wearing a turban. The final servant stands behind the turbaned man and holds an empty silver platter to his chest. None is surprised at the boisterousness of the gentlemen.

The party of drunken men is surrounded by the remnants of their jovial enjoyments; on either end of the table sit wine chillers, one empty, one containing only a single bottle. A large white linen draping off the front of the table belongs to one of the standing men, who stood up with enough force to knock his chair onto the ground. The chair still lies where it fell, a napkin still draped over the back. Broken wine bottles and dishes give the viewer insight into the scene and explain the ruddy features of all in attendance. A copper wash basin and a smaller bucket stand to the left of the scene, both empty; possibly they had been full of the empty, broken, and discarded bottles that litter the ground. A small tan and white dog gazes upon the scene hoping to get some remnant scraps of ham thrown to him. Another small dog sits in front of a broken plate eating what little scraps are left, and a black cat hisses and arches its back at the black dog, though the dog pays no attention to it.

The statue of Bacchus eating grapes presides from atop a pedestal over this scene of inebriation; the god of wine is accompanied by a panther, one of his attributes. On the right, partly obscured behind a tree, is a green gazebo, the sky visible through its mesh construction. The clouds echo the tablecloth, napkins and white shirts of the men; they start
as thick billows behind the central figure and dwindle to wispy trails interrupted by the bright blue of the sky overhead.

Unlike de Troy, Lancret chose not to depict the red heels signifying nobility, which would have been out-of-place in this informal setting. It has been suggested that this is a scene before or after a hunting party, however the picture offers no evidence of that other than the presence of the dogs. Nor does the scene offer any evidence of what happened to the fashionable and expensive wigs the men would have been wearing. Men still wore wigs during Louis XV’s reign, and a number of styles prevailed.39

Both Jean-François de Troy and Nicolas Lancret chose to depict statues that were related to the themes of their paintings. The artists most likely learned to incorporate statuary into paintings in that manner Watteau, who famously used statues as symbolic motifs.40 Nicolas Lancret’s choice of Bacchus to preside over his scene is more than just a decorative addition. As the god of wine, Bacchus towering over the jovial scene reiterates the intoxicating power of the drink being consumed. Echoing Bacchus is the central man wearing laurels on his head, raising his wine glass in his boisterousness; he could just as easily be found in a Bacchanal procession. The god’s attribute of the panther relates to the scene as Bacchus was often depicted in a chariot drawn by panthers; the men of this party would have been driven to the remote locale in carriages drawn by horses, their modern mode of transport. De Troy’s choice of statuary was just as important. Venus accentuates the feast of


oysters; her position as the goddess of love reiterates the thought that oysters are an aphrodisiac. Also relevant is the bivalve’s relation to the sea, as she is said to have sprung from the foam of the sea and was carried to land on a giant clam, kin to oysters.

It was apparently not the settings of *Le déjeuner d’huîtres* and *Le déjeuner de jambon* that were of great importance to the king, although the settings lend themselves to the events depicted. It was the lifestyle that the artists chose to depict that is of great importance, as it amused the king. This was this type of lifestyle that Louis probably wanted to be living inside his new *salle à manger* in the *petits cabinets du roi*.

In the realm of dining scenes, Louis XV set the standards of popular taste, and therefore it was not unusual to find commissioned copies of paintings, or paintings with the same theme as those done for the king and queen. Most of these would have been commissioned by aristocrats, recently ennobled financiers, or the rising middle class patron, since they could afford to commission a copy or variation of a painting from the same artist.

The version of *Le déjeuner de jambon* by Lancret now in The Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (fig. 11) is a slightly different version of the painting that he did for Louis XV’s *petit appartement* in Versailles. Given the similarities of the paintings, one may assume that it was commissioned by a patron who had seen the original hanging at the king’s residence. This version of the painting was later in the collection of Ange-Laurent de La Live de Jully, who stated that this version was done after the original.41

The biggest difference between the version of *Le déjeuner de jambon* commissioned by Louis XV and the version in the Boston collection is the dining table. The table covered with white linen is depicted as square in the Boston picture, while it is round in the painting installed in the king’s *salle à manger* in the *petit appartement* at Versailles.

The sole woman in the painting stands in the same position in both paintings; however, in the Boston version, she makes the sign of a “cuckold” above the head of the man whose chin she coddles. The statue of Bacchus has been turned into a simple urn that sits atop a large stone pedestal along with a wall to the left side. On the right, slightly obscured behind a tree, is a gazebo painted green, the sky visible through its mesh construction. The clouds of the sky are wispy and dissipate into a pale blue sky above the central figure. Like the foliage of the trees, the sky in the Boston version is not painted with the same fullness and depth that it is in the version that was painted for the king.

The two versions of Lancret’s *Le dejeuner de jambon* apparently offer the viewer a glimpse of an informal scene of everyday life. Regardless of the social status of the participants, the scene seems like a rare peek into a lifestyle depicted by few rococo artists. The paintings display the drunken carousal which would mostly occur behind closed doors or in an isolated location with very few witnesses.

Without the innovations in the cuisine and dining habits of the eighteenth century, *Le déjeuner d’huîtres*, and *Le déjeuner de jambon* would most likely not have been commissioned by Louis XV. Lacking the refinement in private architecture and social

practice, such dining scenes would not have been conceptualized and brought to fruition by either the artist or his patron. Therefore, the inspiration for these paintings lies in the beginning of the *salle à manger* being considered or recognized as a specific room set aside for the primary purpose of dining.
CHAPTER 2

FONTAINEBLEAU: COMBINING DINING SCENES WITH THE THEME OF THE HUNT

Since the Middle Ages, hunting had been an activity reserved for royalty and the nobility; it was less about bagging the game than it was about the signifying social ritual that accompanied it – processions, picnics, and parties...¹

Dining-rooms were often decorated with hunting scenes as an allusion to the edible bounty of the hunting expeditions of the elite social class.² Hunting scenes were perfectly suited to decorate the salle à manger of the king, because Louis was a passionate huntsman.³ It has been sometimes said that Louis XV cared more about his hunting expeditions than his governmental duties.⁴

Throughout the eighteenth century the refinement of dining practices merged with the ever popular theme of the hunt, which had its own rich history in genre painting, both in England and in France. The combination of the two themes may be seen in a painting by Lancret shown in Salon of 1725, entitled Le déjeuner dans le forêt (fig.12 & 13).⁵ Lancret’s

⁴ Ibid, 91.
⁵ Georges Wildenstein, Le Salon de 1725 (Paris, 1924), 46. Excerpt from the Mercure de France, 1725 Salon exhibition: “M. Nicolas Lancret...Retour de Chasse, de 4. Pieds de large sur 3. où l’on voit divers Cavaliers & des Dames en Amazones qui font collation.” In his monograph on Lancret, Georges Wildenstein notes that the mention in the Mercure de France could relate to either Le Déjeuner dans la Fôret or Repas au Retour de la Chasse. However, the Louvre offers 1738 as the date of Repas au Retour de la Chasse. Two paintings entitled f
painting is apparently the earliest work to show the combination of a dining scene with the hunt genre; however, it was not until Louis XV commissioned paintings for Versailles and Fontainebleau that the hunt luncheon theme took root in the rococo repertoire and gained popularity as a genre of its own.

Despite the early date of Lancret’s *Le déjeuner dans le forêt*, the artist did not depict either a hunting or a dining scene for ten years. In 1735 Lancret received the commission for his dining scene, *Le déjeuner de jambon*, in the *petits appartements* at Versailles. However, the artist did not depict a hunting scene again until 1738, when he was hired to paint for the king’s suite at Fontainebleau. Another early rococo painting on the hunting theme is Lancret’s work *La fin de la chasse*, although the painting has not been dated by scholars (fig. 14). Clearly, however, the most significant merging of the two distinct themes into one are the paintings commissioned by Louis XV for his two favorite hunting châteaux.

The Château du Fontainebleau was well known for its immense forests that provided abundant game, the perfect setting for royal hunts.⁶ It was on these hunting grounds that Louis XV spent much of his time, as hunting was his great passion. Fontainebleau, like Versailles, was renovated for the king. In 1737, architect Jacques V Gabriel and his son Ange-Jacques reshaped the space, of the *premier cabinet du roi* into a number of new rooms; the location of the *premier cabinet*, which overlooked the Jardin de Diane, appears in the first floor plan published by Yves Bottineau (fig. 15). The remodeled suite of rooms included a

---

salle à manger and an office, which could also be used as a petit salle à manger, as noted on the floor plan (fig. 16). A section reveals the prominent position of the salle à manger within the premier cabinet (fig. 17). The salle à manger was strictly intended for the use of the king and his companions.

At Versailles, Louis XV’s salle à manger had been decorated with two dining scenes, one that occurred indoors and one that occurred outdoors. At Fontainebleau, however, both were outdoor scenes; these paintings were less about the act of the hunt, than the societal conventions that accompanied the ritual.

The theme of the hunt is one which has a rich tradition in the decoration of châteaux, and at Fontainebleau dining scenes were combined with it, and then gained popularity as a whole new type. This new genre combined the out-of-doors forest-like settings of Watteau’s fêtes galantes, with the fashionable society of the tableau de mode popularized by Jean-François de Troy. Defining the genre of the fête galante is not an easy task, but in short it may be seen as a small-scale painting depicting the outdoors, with ethereal lighting and a vibrant color palette. The occupants of a fête galante are often engaged in conversation and often in courtship. Defining tableaux de mode is a bit simpler as they depict social trends and leisure time. This combination of modes formed the motif of the hunt luncheon. It is the idea of the picnics and the parties during the hunt with which I am concerned.

---
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Antoine Watteau had depicted the rest of a hunting party as early as 1718 (fig. 18), a genre he may have learned from Philips Wouwerman’s paintings, such as *A Stag Hunt*, in the collection of Pierre Crozat (fig. 19). It seems likely that Watteau borrowed the hunting theme from a painter widely admired for his depiction of horses and cavaliers. Oliver T. Banks has shown that Watteau borrowed not only themes from other painters, but also figure groupings, which the artist then altered to fit his own style.  

The same year renovations began at Fontainebleau, Jean-François de Troy and Carle Van Loo both received commissions for paintings that were to be hung in Louis XV’s new *grande salle à manger* in the *petits appartements du Roi* of the château. De Troy’s painting, *Le déjeuner de chasse* (fig. 20), and Van Loo’s painting, *La Halte de Chasse* (fig. 21) are both hunt luncheon scenes that depict elegantly clad men and women seated in forest-like settings. These paintings were just two of numerous hunting scenes commissioned for the king’s renovation of the royal château. However, these two paintings are different from the rest in that they do not depict actual hunting scenes; instead, each depicts a tranquil moment during the hunt, when the male participants are relaxing and joined by female companions.

10 Francis Gage notes in her catalogue entry on *Le déjeuner de jambon* in *The Age of Watteau, Chardin and Fragonard* that some scholars have used the term “hunt picnic” to describe the painting, however the painting done for Versailles depicts only a few of the motifs of a hunt luncheon, especially the hounds in the foreground and the architectural setting. There is no evidence that this painting was meant to depict a scene before, during or after a hunting expedition. Bailey, et al., *The age of Watteau, Chardin, and Fragonard*, 146.


In preparation for their commissions, both artists executed preliminary sketches of their paintings; de Troy’s painting has only slight differences from the sketch in composition, but Van Loo’s painting was dramatically altered from the initial sketch. However, both artists’ final paintings contain elements that are significant in defining them as hunt luncheons. Important to this new type is the presence of horses and hounds, as the gentleman participating in the hunt could not do so without them. Other significant motifs present are the horn, also used during the hunt, and a château, from which the hunting party emerged. Like some of Watteau’s fêtes galantes, a large number of people are present in the scenes depicted, but most importantly, Watteau’s scenes could not be called ‘luncheons’.

Carle Van Loo’s preliminary sketch for La halte de chasse (fig. 22) bears little resemblance to the final version that was installed at Fontainebleau (fig. 21)\textsuperscript{14}. While the paintings are compositionally similar, the sketch is more populated and the entire painting is much more crowded and not as gracefully tranquil as the final version. The loose brushwork, along with the compression of space, makes for an almost unsettlingly busy work. In his final version, the artist added space on the right side, giving the final painting an airy, less compact feeling. Perhaps Van Loo retooled his final version to be a better match to de Troy’s serenely elegant Le déjeuner de chasse.

Van Loo’s painting depicts a hunting party in a clearing, rendered in lush color with abundant foliage. The forest screens the upper two-thirds of the sky from left to right. Van Loo’s lush forest allows the viewer only the faintest glimpse of blue sky, between the brown

---

\textsuperscript{14}Marie-Catherine Sahut notes that the size of the painting has been altered and previously was rounded on the top. Sahut, \textit{Carle Van Loo}, pg. 42.
limbs covered with rich green leaves, slightly tinged with yellow and orange. The sky that is visible is depicted with fairly dense cloud coverage, which seems to settle on the forested mountain landscape in the distance.

The main focus of Van Loo’s sketch and final work (fig. 21 & 22) is the white linen which has been spread out on the ground; in each it is laden with white platters holding meat and bottles filled with wine. In both versions dogs appear in the foreground. While both feature a hunting horn, it is given slightly more prominence in the final version than the sketch. In the earlier work the horn is barely discernable in the middle ground of the painting; a rapidly painted huntsman sitting atop his horse can be seen blowing the horn behind the main party. In the final version the horn sits more prominently perched on a broken branch of a tree in the left foreground.

There are other more significant differences in Van Loo’s finished work that are a part of the type of the hunt luncheon. A château can be faintly seen in the distance at the center of the Fontainebleau painting but not in the preliminary sketch. Van Loo would presumably not have portrayed the château if it did not have significance for this scene and its participants. Partially blocking the view of the buildings are the rumps of three horses, which are likely the mounts of the female companions that rode out to meet the party; these horses replaced a carriage that the artist depicted in the sketch. The newly painted horses stand in a group separated from the other horses in the painting by a fair expanse of green grass.

Just behind the women’s horses to the right of the painting, the ground slopes down slightly and the remainder of the hunting party is visible on horseback, either just joining
those already picnicking or turning their horses around to continue on with the hunt. These horses and the mounted men in the background are original to Van Loo’s final composition.

Also original to the final version are the horses in the right foreground of the painting: a white horse’s head and mane are visible, with a brown horse’s head barely seen behind him. In the front stands a horse wearing opulent armor and a gilded plumed headdress. Some horses were depicted in the sketch, but they are more numerous and prominent in the finished painting. Two hunting dogs also appear.

De Troy depicts a hunting party taking a break from the pursuit to eat, amuse and be amused; and both paintings contain the important elements of the conventions of the hunt luncheon type. Once again, a small party of ladies has ridden out to meet the men in an outdoor setting bordered by trees and dense foliage. And again the main focus of the painting is a white linen. In de Troy’s painting, however, the linen covers a table, not the ground. The château off in the distance has been replaced by a rustic stone building in the right middle ground of the painting.

Like Van Loo, de Troy also executed a preliminary sketch for his commission for Fontainebleau (fig. 23). De Troy’s final version is closer to his initial sketch than Van Loo’s paintings.

De Troy chose to depict his hunt luncheon next to a small rustic structure, part of a château or a village inn. The latter would then explain the depiction of the carriage, used to bring the ladies. The artist uses trees dense with leaves and the blue cloudy sky to cut the painting diagonally from left middle ground to the right upper corner of the canvas. With the exception of a small sliver of sky in the upper right of the painting and the sliver of empty sky at the left side of the painting, the upper third of the painting is screened with abundant
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foliage. The diagonals of the tree and sky are echoed in the diagonals of the buildings that screen the right side of the painting and serve as a backdrop to the festivities.

Slight differences also appear in de Troy’s final version (fig. 20) that distinguish it from the sketch (fig. 23). The final version has more people and more depth of articulation, though the composition is the same as the sketch. In the final version, the table in the center is round, replacing a square table in the sketch. In both versions the man in the red brocaded jacket stands at the table serving the guests from a large silver platter laden with food.

The female companion in the right foreground appears in both the sketch and the final version. Her rosy cheeks and small red mouth are visible in the final version, but they lack the same definition and elegance in the sketch. She and her female companions all wear a small piece of lace adorning their heads, which was the vogue in women’s headwear at the time.15

The building is composed of two towers in the background connected with an arch to the building with its small wooden balcony and stairway in the middle ground. The building section furthest from the party consists of a circular tower, which can be identified as a dovecote with its roof made of woven reeds.16 The square turret is screened by the trees, and from its window a lone female figure wearing a red dress, white cap and an apron is leaning out. Two servant women stand on the balcony just behind the hunting party, one in red leaning on the railing, another in tan holding a swaddled infant. The figure in the doorway is


16 Stephen D. Borys, *The Splendor of Ruins in French Landscape Painting, 1630-1800* (Oberlin College, Ohio: The Allen Memorial Art Museum, 2005), 66. Dovecotes were typical buildings found in the countryside; they were used in rural areas to house pigeons to keep them from scavenging crops and as a food supply.
a male servant holding a tray. The stairs in the final version are full of commotion as a female servant hands a man a chair.

De Troy introduced important differences in his final painting for Fontainebleau, *Le déjeuner de chasse* that do not appear in the initial sketch. Like Van Loo, he moved the hunting horn to a more prominent spot, perched on the back of the chair behind the man in the red and gold brocaded jacket. The presence of the dogs in the foreground of the scene is also significant; a brown dog peaks his head out from under the table cloth. In the right corner of the foreground, a black and white dog has found a scrap to gnaw on, his white teeth and red gums visible to the viewer.

The horses around the tree behind the party have been pushed back, at a further distance from the commotion in the finished painting. The empty sky on both the left and right sides of the painting have been enlarged. To the left it lights a small clearing in which three huntsmen atop their mounts can be seen in the distance.

Just as Lancret’s *Le déjeuner de jambon* (fig. 4) echoes aspects of seventeenth-century Netherlandish paintings such as Easias Van de Velde’s *Party in a Garden* (fig. 24), Jean-François de Troy’s *Le déjeuner de chasse* (fig. 20) is reminiscent of Van de Velde’s *Banquet in the Park of a Country House* (fig. 25). This painting by Van de Velde apparently depicts the woods south of Haarlem, which were said to have been a refuge, and a great place to eat, drink and be merry,¹⁷ exactly the leisure time activity that De Troy’s painting depicts.

---

One thing that Van Loo incorporates into his painting for Fontainebleau that de Troy does not is the type of hat that some of the men from the hunting party wear. This hat, called a *lampon* was a tri-cornered hat which was popular at the time. Both men depict popular wigs worn during the time of Louis XV and both artists depict the *ailes de pigeon*, or the curls around the front of the face which hide the ears. Van Loo depicts the gentlemen wearing *catogans*, braids tied with black bows. De Troy chooses to depict his gentlemen wearing bag wigs, wigs which had small taffeta bags containing the back hair. This was the same wig that de Troy depicted the men wearing in *Le dîner d’huîtres*.

In both Van Loo’s *La Halte de chasse* and de Troy’s *Le dîner de chasse*, the artists depict a hunting horn, another motif integral to the convention of the hunt luncheon. The horn in Van Loo’s painting can be identified as a *cor à plusiers tours*, or a horn of many turns. The horn depicted on the back of the chair in de Troy’s painting is most likely a *cor de chasse* or a *trompe de chasse*, as it seems to have only one turn. The purpose of the hunting horn was to direct the party and keep a large group of people organized. The prominent presence of the horns in both paintings, along with the presence of the horses and the dogs in the final versions, helps to identify them as hunting scenes.

In their paintings for Louis XV *salle à manger* at Fontainebleau, Van Loo and De Troy both depict the same red coat brocaded with gold. It is a coat similar to the one that de Troy painted in the earlier Versailles painting *Le dîner d’huîtres* (fig. 3); however the gentleman wearing the jacket in the earlier painting is also wearing red heels, a sign of his

---


19 Red was a color that was worn by the king and his court. Scott, *The Rococo Interior*, 97.
nobility (fig. 26). The red coat that de Troy and Van Loo depict in their Fontainebleau paintings is worn by a man serving the guests. This ornately dressed man must be a livered servant, and the coat he wears is the uniform of the house and indicative of the rank and wealth of his master.\(^{20}\) The coat worn by the servant is identifiable as a livery by the braided knot on the shoulder of the jacket and the presence of the ornamental braiding on the sleeves.\(^{21}\)

Commissioned two years after Le déjeuner d’huitres (fig. 3), Le déjeuner de chasse (fig. 20) is very similar in many respects to the earlier painting, and it displays de Troy’s ability to imbue his characters with elegance and refinement. Compositionally, de Troy’s Le déjeuner de chasse is nearly a mirror image of Le déjeuner d’huitres. The dining tables take up most of the middle ground, and the grouping of men is similar in both paintings. Instead of the indoor setting of the Versailles painting, de Troy chose an outdoor setting; however the Fontainebleau painting does display architecture, in the form of the rustic exterior of a building instead of the lavishly decorated interior.

The evolution of the dining scene into a hunt luncheon was a progression inspired by Louis XV’s love of the courtly pastime. Without the king’s undertaking of various château renovations, and the subsequent commissions from the artists, it is possible that the new genre would not have gained the popularity it did. Similar to Le déjeuner d’huitres and Le déjeuner de jambon, the paintings commissioned by Louis XV for Fontainebleau apparently


depict a lifestyle that the king enjoyed; it seems that it was the routine that he was enjoying at his favorite châteaux.
CHAPTER 3

THE INFLUENCE OF THE KING; IMITATION OF ROYAL TASTE

The young Louis XV apparently set new trends in popular taste with *Le déjeuner de chasse* and *La halte de chasse*. The new type of the hunt luncheon proliferated. Not only did Lancret paint two more hunt luncheons, *Le repas au retour de chasse* and *Le repas de chasse*, after his earlier painting entitled *Le déjeuner dans le forêt*, artists including François Boucher also embraced the new type. Boucher painted *Le déjeuner de chasse* (1735-1739) and *Le pique nique* (1745-1747). François Le Moyne painted two versions of his *Le déjeuner de chasse*, one in Munich (1730) and one in São Paulo (1723). While these paintings may not contain all of the motifs of the hunt luncheon, they do fulfill most of the “requirements” of the convention.

Le Moyne scholar Jean-Luc Bordeaux has argued that the São Paulo version of Le Moyne’s *Le déjeuner de chasse* (fig. 27) was the original, contradicting Jacques Wilhelm’s earlier claim that the Munich (fig. 28) version (c. 1730) was the first. Bordeaux also claims that the painting dates to 1723, only three years after Watteau’s *Halte de chasse* (fig. 18), and before Lancret’s 1725 salon mention (fig. 12 & 13). It is also known that Le Moyne was a friend of Lancret, so it is quite possible that Le Moyne also depicted a hunt luncheon as early as his friend’s 1725 painting. However, there is speculation that this painting was altered at a later date, possibly to include the party dining in the foreground of the painting. These works therefore occupy an ambiguous place within the theme of hunt luncheon paintings.
There are only minute differences between the two versions. The coloring of the paintings is the most noticeable difference. The Munich painting is more condensed than the São Paulo version and the buildings on the left of the scene have been left out; leaving only the watermill on the right of the scene which occurs in both versions. Both scenes depict a trail leading to a small enclave of buildings with an open expanse of land in the central foreground. Le Moyne depicted horses and dogs, as well as numerous participants. The ladies are finely dressed and one is seen being helped off a horse.¹ Wine is being passed around and a small table cloth has been laid on the ground and bread lay on top. The only motif missing to classify these paintings as a hunt luncheon is the presence of the horn. However, the paintings do depict something unique: dead game is depicted in the central foreground lying next to a seated woman. Lancret depicted the fruits of the hunt in his early La Fin de La Chasse, which was purely a hunting scene. Boucher also depicted dead game in his version of the hunt luncheon, Le déjeuner de chasse.

Of Boucher’s two paintings, only one should actually be considered a hunt luncheon. In Le déjeuner de chasse (fig. 29), Boucher includes the architectural setting, the guns, horses, food, dogs and numerous figures needed to be characterized as a hunt luncheon. Scholars have dated this painting from 1735-1739, since Boucher worked on various royal commissions at Versailles while de Troy and Lancret were working on their own commissions it seems likely that Boucher was inspired by Lancret’s Le déjeuner de jambon (fig. 4) and painted his own ribald interpretation of the theme.

¹ Banks, Watteau and the North, 47-75. This same figure grouping is seen in Watteau’s work Le Halte de chasse and scholar Oliver Bernier has proved that Watteau borrowed the man, woman and horse from another artist. Francois Le Moyne borrowed the grouping from Antoine-Jean Watteau, who had in turn, borrowed the same grouping from an earlier artist.
In Boucher’s *Le déjeuner de chasse*, the foreground is occupied by a group of men lounging around a white linen laid on the ground; scattered bottles and dead game lay in front of the men. Three rambunctious men raise their glasses and look to be completely inebriated. A fourth member of the party lays at the left with his hand on his head as though he has dozed off. One man stoops to lay a platter on the linen and a turbaned African servant stands holding a tray. The setting of this licentious scene is outdoors with a small triangular roofed building behind a small grove of trees. Horses and dogs are both present in the painting, however there are no women depicted. A three-cornered *lampion* hat hangs from a tree and another is still donned by the standing man pouring wine to the men with the outstretched goblets. The one convention of the hunt luncheon that is missing from Boucher’s version is the hunting horn.

At first sight Boucher’s *Le pique nique* (fig. 30) seems as though it could be characterized as a hunt luncheon, but it lacks many of the motifs typifying a hunt luncheon. While it does depict the outdoor setting, multiple people, horses and food, it does not contain any dogs, horns or have an architectural setting. It lacks the key elements indicative of a hunting scene, the dogs and the horn. It is therefore more in line with Lancret’s outdoor dining scene of *Le déjeuner de jambon* (fig. 4) than with Boucher’s own hunt luncheon, *Le déjeuner de chasse* (fig. 29).

2 Similar to Boucher’s *Le pique nique* is the Jean-Baptiste Pater painting *Le Gouter* (at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City), however Pater’s painting does not depict any actual food, only a gold footed dish with lid, a gold long-necked ewer and a two tall glass cruets on a serving tray. More in line with Boucher’s *Le pique nique* is Pater’s *La Collation* (in a Private Collection). See Musée des Beaux-Arts de Valenciennes, *Watteau et la fête galante.* (Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 2004), 244-245.
King Frederick II of Prussia was a huge collector of rococo art. In his collection was the earlier mentioned hunting picnic by Nicolas Lancret entitled *Le déjeuner dans le forêt*. Like Le Moyne, Lancret painted two versions of *Le déjeuner dans le forêt*, one in Detroit (fig. 12) and the other in the Château at Sans-Souci (fig. 13). The version in Sans-Souci is presumably the one from Frederick’s collection. However, little scholarship exists on these two paintings so it is unclear if one painting predates the other. Only slight variations exist between the two paintings, and further scholarship is needed. Both paintings contain all of the motifs of a hunt luncheon with the exception of an architectural setting.

Lancret’s *Le repas de chasse* (fig. 31) was also owned by King Frederick; it contains almost all of the motifs of a hunt luncheon. The party in the foreground depicts a number of men and two women who have joined the party; the numerous participants of this scene sit upon a small hill with a grove of trees at their backs. Horses flank the group on either side, and a basket can be seen atop the horse on the left side of the painting. A man opening a bottle is depicted on the left, and another presents the seated party with a basket of peaches. While not as elaborate a dining scene as some of the other paintings, *Le repas de chasse* still depicts food and beverages. Tethered dogs are being handled by a man in the right foreground and building can be seen in the far distance in the right middle ground. The only thing the painting lacks is a horn.


Another hunt luncheon by Lancret was owned by the Marquis de Beringhen, the king’s premier écuyer, or stable master. Beringhen’s painting was entitled *Le repas au retour de chasse* (fig. 32). Compositionally similar to *Le repas de chasse*, this time the artist has placed the grove of trees on the left of the painting behind a laden table and a grouping of horses. A fountain occupies the central middle ground of the painting, giving the scene an architectural detail. Two dogs are visible in the left foreground. Again the party seems to occupy a spot atop a small hill giving them a prominence over the landscape below. While the scene depicted also lacks a horn, the white table cloth on the ground echoes the work of Carle Van Loo. In *Le repas de chasse* and *Le repas au retour de chasse* Lancret depicts the participants either male or female wearing the three-cornered *lampion* hat.

Similar to Carle Van Loo and Jean-François de Troy, these paintings done by Le Moyne, Lancret, and Boucher, with the exception of Boucher’s *Le pique nique*, display the key conventions of a hunt luncheon scene. All of the paintings depict food, horses and dogs as well as the populated outdoor scene of a fête galante. While not all of the paintings depict a hunting horn or architectural details they contain enough of the conventions of a hunt luncheon to be considered as such.
CONCLUSION

With the king’s renovation of the petits appartements at Versailles came the royal commission of two paintings, Le déjeuner d’huitres by Jean-François de Troy and Le déjeuner de jambon by Nicolas Lancret. These paintings both represent dining scenes that apparently epitomized the leisure time spent in the very room for which were commissioned. De Troy’s Le déjeuner d’huitres also displayed the advances in domestic architecture, though in an artificial setting, and the classification of the salle à manger as a distinct room in a château or hôtel.

At Fontainebleau the commission of two paintings for the renovation of the king’s salle à manger, de Troy's Le déjeuner de chasse and Carle Van Loo's La halte de chasse, helped to popularize the hunt luncheon as a new theme within rococo art. The hunt luncheon’s genesis lay within the rococo period itself, during which painters turned to a variety of Northern genre paintings including hunting and dining scenes.

Following the popularization of the hunt luncheons, numerous paintings by various artists depicted the new theme. Even Lancret, whose 1725 Salon entry and 1735 commission helped to conceive the new genre, painted a number of hunt luncheons. While Lancret was definitely the artist who exemplified the new genre, other artists such as François Boucher and François Le Moyne contributed to its popularization. These imitations of royal taste indicate the influence that Louis XV had in the commissioning of art.

Louis’ popularization of the new hunt luncheon genre occurred almost ten years before his relationship with Madame de Pompadour. She is well known as an important patron of the arts and commissioned many paintings, including several by Van Loo;
although, Boucher was apparently her favorite. It is quite interesting, therefore, that Louis
had a hand in the popularization of a new convention within the rococo period, as opposed to
his mistress.

Architectural innovations, a king who treasured privacy – evident in his renovation of
the *petits appartements* at Versailles and Fontainebleau – changes in cuisine, the trend
towards more informal dining, and the talents of brilliant rococo artists all came together in
the formation of a new genre, the hunt luncheon.
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