

## THE MIRROR IN THE 19<sup>th</sup> CENTURY: THE UNRELIABLE MIRROR AS A SYMBOL FOR SUBJECTIVE REPRESENTATION

**Maria Ioana OANCEA**<sup>1</sup>  
University of Bucharest

**Abstract:** *This article aims to explore the use of the mirror motif in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in both literature and visual art. The mirror gathers multiple and contradictory connotations: truth, illusion, seduction, the passage of time, self reflection, etc. There are, however, certain meanings more present in the thought of a certain time. The mirror has always been a symbol for artistic representation and we find this parallel particularly important in the shift between the objective and the subjective view that happens in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century: the reflection in the mirror differs significantly according to the angle of the viewer and the positioning of the object reflected. According to Walter Benjamin, this particular meaning of the mirror – both revealing and deforming, dynamic and comprising a multitude of angles – might have been influenced by the growing presence of mirrors in both private and public places in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As they became a part of décor, the presence of several large scale mirrors might have also resulted in a different way of looking – not into a looking glass to admire oneself, but a view in which perspective deformations played an important part creating the feeling of looking into a similar yet different world. But when did this dynamic and kaleidoscopic meaning of the mirror replace the realist claim of literature to be a mirror carried down a road and does it really contradict it? We will explore the connection between subjectivity in the artistic representation and the motif of unreliable mirrors and check the possibility of a turning-point – of an influence that might explain its similar use in both arts. We have chosen to analyze the role of the mirror in the literary works of Charles Baudelaire, Stéphane Mallarmé and Oscar Wilde, and in the paintings of Édouard Manet and Edgar Degas. We will base this argumentation on the following works: Charles Baudelaire, *La Beauté*, *Rêve parisien*, *Le Poison*, *L'homme et la mer*; Stéphane Mallarmé, *Hérodiade*; Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*; Edgar Degas, *Madame Jeantaud au miroir*; Édouard Manet, *Un bar aux Folies Bergère*.*

**Keywords:** *interferences, influence, mirror, motifs, subjectivity, mimesis, multiple angles, Decadence, Fin de siècle, literature and visual art.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The late 19<sup>th</sup> century abounds in representations of mirrors – mirrors working as both symbol and mere reflective surface. We find ourselves wondering whether art was suddenly preoccupied with its mimetic status or if the proliferation of mirrors in public places was for

---

<sup>1</sup> maria.i.oancea@gmail.com

the first time offering a completely different way of looking which inevitably influenced artistic representation. We thus ask ourselves: did the mirror work more as a symbol or as a particular type of surface?

It was Oscar Wilde who drew attention to this double status of mirrors and of art, subsequently: “All art is at once surface and symbol. Those who go beneath the surface do so at their peril. Those who read the symbol do so at their peril” (Wilde xxiii), confirming further his association between the two terms: “It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors” (Wilde xxiii).

The image (and mechanism) we find haunting almost all representations of mirrors of this period is the hall of mirrors. But what is a hall of mirrors? Someone living in the 19<sup>th</sup> century would surely never ask that. Mirrors were mass produced for the first time and suddenly halls of mirrors became a familiar sight, not the privilege of ballrooms in palaces but present even in *cafés* (and cabarets and brothels, of course). But what is the hall of mirrors symbolically other than an infinite space – several mirrors reflecting one another? And furthermore, a space of different angles subtly melting into one another. This particular kind of view seems to define late 19<sup>th</sup> century artistic productions in both literature and painting.

## 2. WOMEN

A particularly popular association present in both arts at this time (*Fin de siècle* subtly prolonging into *Belle Époque*) is that between the mirror and the woman. This particular take on the relationship between mirror and woman (for it was an association much older) diverges from *vanitas* and turns instead into what we can only identify as a dialogue, an encounter between two mirrors reflecting each other – between two gazes that is: an infinite act of mirroring creating through the double reflection a different if familiar and infinite space – the image of another world that is presented to the viewer and at once denied – a surface that is at once a window and a closed and guarded gate. It might be precisely that ideal world hinted at by Baudelaire in *La Beauté* that can only be glimpsed through beauty, which plays at the same time the part of an intermediary and that of a guardian to the ideal world (Baudelaire 34).

Why and when has the woman become a mirror, though? The answer is perhaps not as misogynistic as one might expect. It was Baudelaire who put the two in relation – but was that relation a simile? We find the woman to be simply the possessor of the other angle of view – just like the mirror – showing the poet or artist *the effects of what* is hidden to him.

We find the depiction of a woman in front of a mirror to be a popular motif in both literature and visual arts towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. We can only wonder if they all bear a similar signification and whether that is really relevant since this association itself already outlines a common preoccupation.

If we chose to look at all and particularly at certain representations of women before mirrors as a game of illusions, we will undoubtedly find them to have greater depth. But certain representations already call for that further interpretation by disrupting or preventing a normal reading through the discrepancy between the expectation of similitude and the difference: the mirror reflects something else.

The mirror either refuses or betrays the correspondence with the model – choosing instead to depict or even sometimes just to hint at the existence of a different angle on the same scene that has the virtuality of overthrowing and inverting the image presented to us from the main angle.

### 3. EYES

The woman is seen as a mirror because she is “the other” but also because she is a possessor of eyes that function at once as a desirable object to look at, a means of seeing, and a reflective or mirror-like surface. We cannot help but wonder how these three attributes influence one another.

The frequent use of the same signifier for all three meanings inevitably casts a great deal of ambiguity on all representations of eyes. What is more, their association with the mirror motif highlights a particular meaning: doubling one of the meanings of a polysemous signifier suggests a particular reading, without however completely rejecting the others – the symbol continues to carry all of its meanings even if in a latent state and these tend to interact at least on a subliminal level, thus subtly bearing their mark on the interpretation of the motif in the text or image.

What inevitably draws our attention (and which is perhaps even meant to do so) is the double if not triple status of the act of looking: seeing, being seen and reflecting another’s gaze. We find ourselves confronted with the famous tension between seeing and being seen that Starobinski tackles in his *L’oeil vivant*. Doesn’t the mirror represent the possibility of seeing oneself: suggesting at once self awareness, the reflexive character of the artistic work and the consciousness of the actual act of looking at oneself? This process implies the double status as subject and object at once in the form of the most interesting case: the subject viewing oneself as an object. And who could be prone to such a reflexive use of the mirror? The poet – who tends to be presented as a reflexive and pensive creature, the dandy – who willingly seeks to objectify himself and – we must suspect – the woman. In Baudelaire’s works a very frequent female presence is that of the prostitute, which comes as no surprise for she represents the woman who consciously casts herself as an object of desire and thus inevitably of viewing.

In this case, lining one’s eyes with crayon kohl seems to strengthen their reflexive properties. We must ask ourselves whether accentuating the eyes as an object to look at makes them see better – that is makes them see deeper into another’s soul – and why. On the one hand, drawing attention to the eyes as an object makes eye contact more likely – thus actually enabling them to see into the other’s eyes. On the other hand, what is the very gesture of lining one’s eyes with kohl but a confirmation of one’s awareness of being looked at? Is it more likely that a less innocent gaze will better reflect the viewer? This might be why Baudelaire found the prostitute’s gaze to be the most reflective of female gazes: by knowing she is looked at and by willing to be looked at, the prostitute resembles the poet - this making her more likely to be able to better and more fully and complexly mirror him since she shares the same divided and contradictory character – the same status of both viewing subject and viewed object along with the conscience of it.

Of all desirable feminine attributes, a woman's gaze has always been an *object* of fascination. Furthermore, we find it almost obsessively present in Baudelaire's poems as well as in later 19<sup>th</sup> century works of both literature and visual art. The woman's gaze is fascinating precisely because it carries a threat to the viewer – that of being himself objectified: a possible reversal of roles. This places the gaze at the center of a power-play (between active and passive roles, between knowledge and ignorance, between self-awareness and innocence) – where everyone fears and is attracted by their own image in the other's eyes.

The very existence of a different and inaccessible angle destabilizes the view presented by rendering it relative and highlighting its subjectivity, and also making the spectator question its reliability – and here by spectator we mean not only the public's view of a work of art but the individual's trust in their own perception.

This kaleidoscopic way of forming images comes to replace the traditional representation straining for objectivity and trying to present the public with a coherent image. This is perhaps the shift in perspective that dominates the whole artistic world of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The mirror and most of all the image of several mirrors looking at each other becomes a symbol of the interaction and usually incompatibility between subjective gazes – the importance as well as the difficulty of inter-subjectivity – of accessing the other's view.

What we do see is in fact not really the other's view but rather the effects of what the other sees, which seems to be the focus of Mallarmé's search considering his statement in a letter of 1864 regarding the very process of writing *Hérodiade*: "To paint not the thing but the effect it produces" (Mallarmé in Lenson 573).

Following the previous parallel, if Baudelaire considers the woman to be devoid of a clear separation between soul and body that can only correspond to the fluid border between the image in the mirror and the model with only a subtle difference between the two instead of a completely different image (as we often find in previous representations of mirrors) – thus contributing to the uncanny feeling when viewing a model and its reflected image together.

#### 4. CIRCULARITY AND MOVEMENT

But seeing both the model and the reflected image at once induces a circular movement of the gaze between the two. As Kate Etheridge states:

The moving stillness suggested by this synthesis of poetry with visual art is replicated in the evocation of the mirror and its infinite reflections. The seemingly passive mirror is an agent of motion, since the spectator's gaze bounces back towards him. [...] even a still figure looking at a mirror can suggest movement, as the gaze focuses on a distant object and comes back towards itself, repetitively moving and yet making no physical advance (Etheridge 45).

This phenomenon must certainly make use of and perhaps justify the presence of subtle differences between the two images facing each other. Similar to the mirror and often accompanied by it, in Baudelaire's works the woman becomes a symbol of "elusiveness and multiplicity", "capable of representing both an idea and its opposite, becoming a site of

multiple contradictions. Furthermore she resembles a mirror in her reflectivity, her ceaseless movement, her unreality and her capacity for revelation and illusion” (Etheridge 70). This is undoubtedly reflected in the unusual depiction of the woman in Baudelaire’s works using a series of unstable metaphors. Baudelaire repeatedly suggests that only a moving surface can reflect the soul of the poet/viewer or subject: “La mer est ton miroir; tu contemples ton âme dans le déroulement infini de sa lame” (Baudelaire, *L’homme et la mer* 31). Connected to his view of women as moving and ever fluctuating, this undoubtedly contributes to his attributing them the role of mirrors and perhaps also explains their very frequent association with water in his poems. It might be that when both model and reflection are presented in the same image, every time the gaze returns, shifting between the two, it discovers something new, ignored so far, thus not only stimulating a movement of the gaze between two points but also creating the illusion of moving, images that constantly transform and somehow escape the full grasp of the viewer.

According to Kate Etheridge, “repeated emphasis on the shifting reversal of familiar images demonstrates how fantasy worlds, dominated by reflective surfaces and depicted in the mirror of the poetic persona’s imagination can disrupt our usual mode of seeing” (Etheridge 43). This can only result in the uncanny feeling of fantasy worlds that use and invert familiar images or tropes, in similar way to a mirror, showing a recognizable yet slightly different image, which “corresponds but not precisely imitates” (Etheridge 46), producing strange inversions. This inevitably points at the close relation between the mirror motif and the baroque trope of “le monde à l’envers”.

As Kate Etheridge (2016: 49) explains, “connections established by the act of mirroring are fraught with contradictions”. Baudelaire himself, faithful to his parallel between mirror and art, states that a truly valuable mirror should never perfectly replicate the model – thus criticizing in his writings on art certain artists who only represented what they saw without adding their own contribution to it – without, that is, showing what was inaccessible to the inexpert or innocent gaze through a straightforward gaze. According to Baudelaire, the artistic representation should not try to copy reality but rather to decompose it and reorganize it.

We find ourselves in front of what is in fact the “Dichotomy between familiarity and strangeness that lies at the heart of the mirror image” (Etheridge 50). The unnerving discrepancies between the two images might in fact suggest the partial correspondence between what is inside and what is outside – the inevitable (even if slight) disjunction between what one chooses to share and what one prefers to hide – and how one looks from different angles.

This uneasy tension between similitude and difference takes a particularly interesting form in Degas’s *Madame Jeantaud au miroir* where the correspondence is obvious and loyal from a perspective point of view, and yet the expression and gesture of the woman as well as the brushstrokes and colors differ greatly.

What we find to be a very common variation between the model and the reflected image in many representations of this age is the hair. The hair may look lighter and more loosely done in the mirror. This is the case of Manet’s *Un bar aux Folies Bergère*, also paired

with a more familiar relaxed and friendly pose of the back – creating together undoubtedly a much more approachable character than the one actually facing the viewer who seems distant and detached. On the other hand, the hair can also look darker in the mirror – as in Degas’s painting: the actual model, presented from the side profile, is depicted in a loyal and realistic way: with almost imperceptible brushstrokes, details and soft passages between colors and the multiple nuances. Furthermore, while keeping the same pose as that of the reflected image, she looks benevolent, obliging, modest and very young. The reflected image however, without clearly breaking the connection, mimics her pose while making it seem much more rigid and somehow we are led to presume much more independent – for one thing, the decor we see does not appear in the reflection. The contrasts between light and darkness are much more brutal and what perhaps catches the eye the most is the hair which is much darker and also pinned much more tightly.

The hair seems to bear a similar signification in the poems of both Baudelaire and Mallarmé. The act of brushing one’s hair is particularly relevant since it becomes here not only a symbol of seduction and of life but signifies circular movement through the actual form of the hair and the motion of brushing it: “Aide-moi, puisqu'ainsi tu n'oses plus me voir, A me peigner nonchalamment dans un miroir” (Mallarmé 44). Here Mallarmé’s coupling of the two motifs – the hair and the mirror – is particularly eloquent, suggesting the doubling of the circular movement of brushing long hair and that of the reflective process. The process is also mirrored in the very form and sound of the verses which are long and repeat and multiply the same sound resembling the style of an incantation – a term which is actually used earlier in the poem.

What also strikes us in Degas’s *Madame Jeantaud au miroir* are the gesture and angle of the reflected woman’s hand which doesn’t exactly contradict the one of the model (since it is the hand least visible and since in the reflection it is perhaps the most loosely treated element) but the gesture we see is definitely a different one, most importantly describing a different attitude. On one side of the mirror we see a young woman departing, holding her hat, who will at some point put it back on her head but who seems in no rush, her loose, relaxed gesture seems to suggest she might have been delayed mid-action and perhaps forgotten she was leaving, absent-mindedly turning to look at herself in the mirror – while the mirror shows a much more decisive woman and a much more decisive and imminent gesture – we actually feel the woman is about to put on her hat. What actually strikes us most and what makes this probably the most intriguing depiction of a mirror by Degas is the subtlety of the passage between the two images, since no clear rule is broken, and yet the two images are so very different.

## 5. DISJUNCTION

These disparities are often characteristics of irony and thus somehow linked to it (whether it is the case or not) – for what could be a better definition of irony than the “discrepancy between expectations and reality, the disjunction between art and life, between past and present, and between the mirror image and the real self” (Etheridge 51). Starobinsky focuses on this definition of irony in *Reflexion de la reflexion, La melancolie au miroir*,

stating irony's status as a double reflection – which “evokes a hall of mirrors in which the speaker becomes trapped” (Etheridge 51).

An unanimous interpretation of the artwork in this case becomes impossible since it is ambiguity who makes it mirror rather the spectator than the model as Oscar Wilde states “It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors” (Wilde xxiii). The impossibility of a single and valid interpretation however, far from undermining an artwork's quality, actually comes to prove its complex nature and its authenticity as a true work of art: “Diversity of opinion about a work of art shows that the work is new, complex, and vital” (Wilde xxiv).

Since we have so far relied greatly on Oscar Wilde's reflections on the subject of mirrors and artistic representation, we must consider his own use of mirrors in his works. Wilde wrote about visual art contemporary to him undoubtedly tackling its mimetic qualities. Furthermore his very famous novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* actually has the very problem of this mirroring relation – correspondence between the work of art and life/reality as its central theme. Dorian contemplates his own image and each time he looks he begins to notice certain differences – so imperceptible he thinks at first he is merely imagining it. Most importantly, the difference that strikes him is one of expression: “Surely his wish had not been fulfilled? Such things were impossible. It seemed monstrous even to think of them. And, yet, there was the picture before him, with the touch of cruelty in the mouth.” (Wilde 74) – which is exactly what we find to be the most potent and intriguing difference in the visual representations of mirrors and models in the same image.

## 6. STRUCTURE

What is perhaps most interesting and constitutes the true modernity of late 19<sup>th</sup> century artistic production is the mimicking or perhaps “mirroring” of the represented motif or content in the actual structure of the works – a mechanism we find/ encounter in both arts. It is a phenomenon amply explored by Jacques Derrida in the *Dissemination*. Derrida explains how the text can not only express its content but also simulate it through its form, rhythm and sonority, employing here as an example precisely the works of Mallarmé. Perhaps Derrida does not directly refer to the mirror form but he does stress the circularity of the structure in Mallarmé's works and ponders on its function as a world the reader must cut into, whose perfection he must spoil in order to enter. The special role that structure can play is also addressed by Paul Ricoeur in *La métaphore vive* where he explains that metaphor can function not only on a traditional word level or on a phrase one but through the actual body of the discourse itself.

But even in Baudelaire's works the process of mirroring is also simulated in a technical sense. “The poem's form also replicates its content both aurally and visually in its placement on the page” (Etheridge 50). The very structure of the text uses this type of correspondence and most importantly of inversions characteristic to mirrors: the text is divided between two parts that operate in a way similar to a dialogue – a revisiting and reversal of both the order of elements and their meaning – as is the case in *Rêve parisien who opposes the dream and the waking state as two sides of a mirror*. The structure of the text often revolves around a verse working as mirror line between the two images. What is

perhaps even more interesting is the actual use of the word mirror in the text which draws attention to the author's awareness of the arrangement and the process that generates the structure of his text as in *Rêve parisien*:

*Non d'arbres, mais de colonnades  
Les étangs dormants s'entouraient  
Où de gigantesques naïades,  
Comme des femmes, se miraient (Baudelaire 181).*

This type of hint or doubling – the presence as both form of the discourse and direct reference draws attention to the artificiality of art and to the presence of the author and of his gaze – which is a tendency we later find in both arts. Instead of hiding himself and his involvement, the author actually chooses to draw the reader's/viewer's attention to himself and to "fabricated" nature of the poem or painting.

As soon as we become aware of the painting, the poem or the mirror in terms of its form as well as its content, this duality occurs and we understand its significance as surface as well as as symbol. In the decades following Baudelaire's publications, this duality became more pronounced in Parisian poetry and painting, perhaps most notably in the works of Mallarmé and Manet (Etheridge 61).

If the artwork functions as mirror and attention is drawn to both the reader-art relationship and the author-art one, this places the two in a mirroring correspondence, with the actual artwork as mirror line. This hypothesis suddenly brings light to Baudelaire's intriguing choice of words in his famous introduction: "hypocrite lecteur – mon semblable – mon frère!" (Baudelaire, "Au lecteur" 15).

This attitude towards reception often appears in the form of meta-textual references, for instance actually including in the body of the poem several re-workings or comments on one's own lines. We may also see this particular interest artists and writers of this time share for the subjective and relative nature of the view as the actual explanation for the apparently strange taste they share for artificiality. Making the structure visible, reflecting on the process of creation and the "man-made" status of the artwork is also visible in the contrast between the style and technique used in the two images.

This use of technique to create difference between the two corresponding images establishes a dialogue between the two images that takes part in inducing the circular movement between the two even when both images individually appear as static. In *Hérodiade* this shifting of the gaze between model and mirrored image is also replicated in the dialogue between the two characters that gives the particularities of the form of the poem, mimicking that of a play.

*Hérodiade*'s looking at herself in the mirror represents at once a static gesture, the contemplation of the self but also the refusal of the outside world, preferring to look and experience the reflection of one's beauty in a "cadre gelée". However her refusal of all things



that represent sensorial and active engagement in life is accompanied and countered by a self examination and a voluptuous and transfixed contemplation of the very act of renunciation that becomes in itself a living experience.

The dialogic nature and mirror structure of Mallarmé's works is also doubled on a linguistic scale through the reflection and discrepancy between sound and written form which often appears in his poems. This mechanism constitutes one of the most characteristic traits of Mallarmé's poetry.

## 7. SURFACE VERSUS SYMBOL

Stating the double nature of both art and mirror, Wilde also exposes the threats both of these pose: "Those who go beneath the surface do so at their peril. Those who read the symbol do so at their peril" (Wilde xxiii).

In contemplating the reflective surface, the viewer is almost hypnotically drawn to it to the point of the strange and dangerous desire to penetrate this surface. This undoubtedly explains the association between the actual mirror as an object and other reflective surfaces – a widow, but especially the water surface. By associating the mirror with numerous words naming different types of reflecting and moreover of moving water in *Hérodiade* mirror and water contaminate each other's meanings – the mirror begins to gain the attributes of water beyond its mere reflective qualities: the parallel between mirror and reflective water surface grants the first those other characteristics and significations of water as a penetrable surface, a moving mass, with the ability to penetrate in its own turn, also implying the possibility of being lost in it – or drowned.

The reference to the depth or inside of the mirror also appears in the line to "mes souvenirs qui sont/ Comme des feuilles sous ta glace au trou profond" (Mallarmé, "Hérodiade" 45). This compulsive and unreasonable desire to penetrate the reflexive surface – to be reunited with oneself is perhaps most remarkably expressed by Baudelaire in *L'homme et la mer*: "Tu te plais à plonger au sein de ton image" (Baudelaire 31).

In Baudelaire's works however the risk posed by this transgression is also present. In *Le poison*, seeing oneself in the other's eyes contains the threat of hating or loving yourself in others, something which contains in itself the risk of losing one's identity by becoming dissipated, scattered among too many mirrors – as well as the confounding of one's gaze who cannot see beyond one's reflection and into the depths of the water: "Tout cela ne vaut pas le poison qui découle/ De tes yeux, de tes yeux verts,/ Lacs où mon âme tremble et se voit à l'envers" (Baudelaire 60). We cannot help but link this possible threat to the superstition related to breaking mirrors. Again we notice the association between the reflecting gaze and water which inevitably leads us back to Narcissus falling into the water while trying to get closer to his reflection. This popular association of terms seems to reunite the reflective surface and the depth. If one can lose oneself in the mirror, one can definitely also lose oneself in art and for this we suppose both characteristics offered by Wilde must collaborate – the viewer must see both the surface and the symbol. Finally the risk posed by the mirror and by the immersion in art is that of the "Displacement of the image of the self" which is "uprooted and projected into unfamiliar realms" (Etheridge 47).

## 8. CONCLUSION

By defining both literature and visual art's ideal status in relation to the mirror, Baudelaire actually highlights his view of the close connection between the two. Obviously these two arts follow different paths and moreover a different pace, but we do find however that there are certain points in the evolution of both when they find themselves in a much closer relationship, of simultaneity and even dialogue. Certainly, the themes in both arts are in close connection with the ideas and preoccupations of the age of their production. However, we find certain eras to bring a much closer and simultaneous development of technique as well as of content, and the later part of the 19th century proved to be a time when all arts started to search for a mirroring or mimicking of the content through the form, through the actual structure of the work. Since the productions of both arts shared not only common themes and ways of seeing but also the same desire to entwine content with form – we find the late 19th century to be a particularly relevant time for the dialogue between the two arts.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAUDELAIRE, Charles. *Les fleurs du mal*. Paris, France Graphic Publications, 1990.
- MALLARMÉ, Stéphane. *Œuvres complètes*, éd. établie et annotée par Henri Mondor et G. Jean-Aubry, Paris, Gallimard, 1989.
- WILDE, Oscar. *The picture of Dorian Gray*, ed. with an introd. and notes by Isobel Murray, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- BASSET, Virginie. *Baudelaire, Wilde and the Spatial Dynamics of Decadence*. The University of Melbourne, January 2014.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. *The Arcades Project*, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. *Diseminarea*, trad. și postf. de Cornel Mihai Ionescu, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 1997.
- ETHERIDGE, Kate. *Dynamic Reflections: Mirrors in the Poetic and Visual Culture of Paris from 1850 to 1900*. Lincoln College DPhil Medieval and Modern Languages, 2016.
- GOLSAN, Katherine. "The Beholder as flâneur: Structures of Perception in Baudelaire and Manet." *French Forum* 21.2 (May 1996).
- ISKIN, Ruth E. "Selling, Seduction, and Soliciting the Eye: Manet's Bar at the Folies-Bergère." *The Art Bulletin* 77.1 (March 1995).
- LAUDE, Patrick. "Rodensch et Mallarmé: le miroir, la profondeur et le sens." *Romance Notes*, vol. 27, no. 3, 1987, pp. 223–230. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/43800856](http://www.jstor.org/stable/43800856).
- LESSING, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, trans. Edward Allen McCormick. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962.
- MICHAUD, Guy. "Le thème du miroir dans le symbolisme français" in *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises*, 1959, n°11. pp. 199-216.
- MALLARMÉ, Stéphane, and LENSON, David. "Herodiade." *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 30, no. 4, 1989, pp. 573–588.
- SCOTT, Maria C. *Baudelaire's 'Le Spleen de Paris': Shifting Perspectives*. Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

—— “Reading the Look and Looking at Reading in Baudelaire.” *The Modern Language Review* 104.2 (April 2009).

RICŒUR, Paul. *La Métaphore vive*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1975.

STAROBINSKI, Jean. *L’œil vivant*. Éditions Gallimard, 1961.

—— *La Mélancolie au miroir*. Alençon, Julliard, 1990.