ISSN: 2710-0170

# Natural Simplicity and Royal Privilege in Marie Antoinette's Pastoral Image

Yunfei Liu

Beijing Bayi School International Department, Beijing, China

## Abstract

**This paper examines how Marie Antoinette's pastoral dress and portraiture intersected with Enlightenment ideas of nature, femininity, and social distinction. Reading Rousseau alongside Rococo painting, royal portraits, and revolutionary satire, it argues that natural simplicity functioned as a contested visual language rather than as evidence of the queen's direct adoption of Rousseau's philosophy. Vigée Le Brun's chemise portrait of 1783 and Wertmüller's family portrait of 1785 associate the queen with informality and domestic feeling, yet preserve signs of wealth and dynastic status. The carefully designed environment of Trianon similarly joined rural imagery to exclusive royal consumption. Satirical prints of 1789 and 1791 reveal a political culture increasingly willing to challenge inherited rank and recast the queen as extravagant and foreign. These images do not establish a direct progression from pastoral fashion to revolutionary hostility; they show how changing audiences and political circumstances could unsettle the meanings of royal appearance. Fashion thus offered a way to present virtue while exposing tensions between personal identity and public authority.**

## Keywords

**Marie Antoinette; Jean-Jacques Rousseau; Pastoral Fashion; Pastoral Rococo Royal Portraiture; Gender; French Revolution; Art History; European History.**

## 1. Introduction

The French Enlightenment brought competing accounts of reason, progress, and human nature into public debate. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was particularly critical of the dependence and rivalry encouraged by social inequality[1]. In *Julie, or the New Heloise* (1761) and *Émile, or On Education* (1762), domestic affection, education, and cultivated rural settings offered ways to reconsider the relationship between nature and society[2][3]. These concerns overlapped with a broader taste for informal dress and country retreats. After Louis XVI gave Marie Antoinette the Petit Trianon in 1774, she developed it as a setting for a more private way of life. By the early 1780s, her muslin gowns and straw hats offered a striking alternative to ceremonial court dress[4][5].

Fashion historians have already connected Marie Antoinette's clothing with politics and royal identity, particularly in the work of Caroline Weber and Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell[4][6]. This paper brings their insights into dialogue with Rousseau and a small group of visual sources. It asks how the queen's pastoral appearance could suggest natural virtue while also making royal privilege visible. The question concerns cultural associations and interpretation: resemblance between an image and a philosophical ideal does not, by itself, prove that the queen or her painters deliberately followed Rousseau.

The argument proceeds from Enlightenment thought and pastoral art to portraits of 1783 and 1785, then to revolutionary prints of 1789 and 1791. Marie Antoinette's informal appearance could present her as approachable, sensitive, and maternal, but it remained dependent on costly materials and exclusive surroundings. Moreover, royal clothing had public obligations

ISSN: 2710-0170

that private taste could not easily displace. Using close visual analysis alongside historical context, this paper argues that tensions within pastoral simplicity existed before the French Revolution. Revolutionary satire intensified the contest over royal representation without simply reproducing or reversing the same costume.

## 2. Historical Contexts

### 2.1. Rousseau and the Cultural Appeal of Nature

Rousseau's position cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between reason and feeling, or between corrupt cities and virtuous villages. In the *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men* (1755), he distinguishes natural self-preservation and pity from the competitive desire for recognition that develops in social life. His account does not describe existing peasants as people still living in the state of nature. His account of natural goodness is more complex than the familiar opposition between innocent individuals and a corrupt society. It examines how dependence, comparison, and inequality reshape human relationships[1].

In *Julie, or the New Heloise* (1761), the estate of Clarens links rural surroundings to domestic order and emotional attachment, though its apparent naturalness depends on careful management[2]. *Émile* (1762) similarly asks how education might protect human development from damaging social pressures. In Book V, its treatment of Sophie also places femininity within a restrictive framework of modesty, domestic responsibility, and responsiveness to men[3]. Rousseau's natural ideal was therefore neither an uncomplicated endorsement of rural life nor a program of equal freedom for women. This tension matters when his writing is used to interpret the public image of a queen.

Printed books, correspondence, conversation, and elite sociability helped circulate such ideas. Salons of the time hosted by influential women were one part of this culture, but they were not a single channel through which philosophy passed unchanged into fashion[7]. Readers could admire emotional sincerity and rural retreat without embracing Rousseau's criticism of hierarchy. The relevant connection is therefore a shared vocabulary of nature and feeling. That vocabulary made pastoral dress intelligible, while allowing it to serve purposes far removed from the social criticism found in Rousseau's writings.

### 2.2. Pastoral Art and the Trianon Estate



Figure 1. François Boucher, Shepherd and Shepherdess, 1760. Oil on canvas. Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe[8].

ISSN: 2710-0170

Pastoral imagery was established in Rococo art before Marie Antoinette became queen. Boucher's *Shepherd and Shepherdess* (Figure 1) shows an affectionate couple surrounded by foliage, flowers, and animals. Their repose makes the countryside appear pleasurable and secure, while agricultural labor recedes from view. The Staatliche Kunsthalle museum identifies the work as a commission for Margravine Karoline Luise of Baden, placing its rural subject within an aristocratic collecting culture[8]. Such pictures offered cultivated audiences an imagined escape from formal life. Their luxurious sensuality, however, should not be equated with Rousseau's moral criticism of luxury.




Figure 2. Claude-Louis Châtelet, View of the Petit Trianon from the Entrance, late eighteenth century.

Figure 2 places the Petit Trianon château within a landscaped estate, revealing the formal architecture around which a more varied landscape developed. The estate took shape in several stages. Marie Antoinette received Trianon in 1774, while the Queen's Hamlet was commissioned in 1783 and completed in 1786. Its buildings combined reception spaces with agricultural facilities, and its farm had a practical role. Versailles explicitly rejects the persistent story that the queen and her companions simply dressed up and pretended to farm. The hamlet served for walks, entertaining, and the education of the royal children[9].

The coexistence of practical agriculture and aristocratic recreation made the estate more complex than a purely theatrical rural retreat. Carefully composed views, rustic exteriors, and refined interiors allowed the countryside to be experienced through selective comfort. Trianon's apparent informality required planning, money, and labor, while access depended on the queen's invitations[4][9]. Its naturalness was cultivated rather than untouched. This setting helps explain the appeal of pastoral dress: it offered a different presentation of elite life without dissolving the social arrangements that sustained it. Rousseau's writing provides a useful comparison, but the estate cannot be treated as a straightforward architectural expression of his philosophy.

ISSN: 2710-0170

# 3. Visual Analysis

## 3.1. The Chemise Portrait and the Limits of Royal Informality



Figure 3. Élisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun, Marie Antoinette in a Chemise Dress, 1783. Oil on canvas. Hessische Hausstiftung, Kronberg[10].

Vigée Le Brun's *Marie Antoinette in a Chemise Dress* (Figure 3) departs from the richly embroidered fabrics and ceremonial settings associated with royal state portraiture. The queen wears a white gown gathered at the waist with a golden sash, together with a broad straw hat decorated with feathers and ribbon. Soft folds, puffed sleeves, and loosely falling curls create an impression of ease. Yet the ensemble is not undecorated: the hat, sash, and carefully arranged flowers make simplicity itself a sophisticated visual effect. The portrait offers an alternative form of royal elegance rather than a convincing image of peasant clothing.

The gown's looser silhouette can be compared with Rousseauian ideals of modesty and freedom from social artifice. Nevertheless, its appearance cannot establish whether the queen wore stays beneath it, and the garment should not be described as proof of a complete rejection of bodily support. Chemise dresses could be worn with or without stays[11]. Likewise, the portrait cannot reveal Marie Antoinette's private philosophical convictions. What it does make available is a reading of femininity through softness, flowers, and apparent spontaneity. These features could suggest feeling and gentleness without making the queen's identity less aristocratic.

Roland Barthes's account of myth provides a way to interpret this effect. In *Mythologies*, cultural signs can make historically constructed values appear natural[12]. Applied here as a later analytical framework, this suggests how white muslin and flowers might encourage viewers to understand innocence or sincerity as personal qualities of the sitter. The interpretation is not evidence that all eighteenth-century viewers shared that response. Fine cloth, decorative accessories, and the labor needed to maintain an immaculate gown also permit a reading of wealth[10]. Pastoral simplicity could therefore communicate refinement and distinction even when it appeared to renounce display.

The portrait's reception demonstrates the limits of this visual strategy. Displayed at the Salon of 1783, it attracted objections because the gown resembled an undergarment and appeared insufficiently dignified for a queen. It was withdrawn and replaced by a portrait in a silk dress, *Marie Antoinette with a Rose* (1783)[10]. The controversy complicates the claim that informal costume successfully narrowed the distance between monarchy and public opinion. A style appropriate to sociable privacy could become objectionable when publicly attached to royal office. The conflict was not only between luxury and simplicity, but also between personal appearance and the ceremonial expectations imposed on a female sovereign.

ISSN: 2710-0170

## 3.2. Maternal Portraiture and the Persistence of Distinction



Figure 4. Adolf Ulrik Wertmüller, Queen Marie Antoinette and Her Children in the Park of Petit Trianon, 1785. Oil on canvas, 276 × 194 cm. Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, NM 1032[13].

Wertmüller's family portrait (Figure 4) presents another way of combining intimacy with rank. Marie Antoinette stands between her daughter, Marie-Thérèse Charlotte, and her eldest son, Louis-Joseph. Her pale, lustrous gown has a fitted bodice and layered trimmings, while her elaborate headwear retains a conspicuous sense of fashion. Compared with the chemise portrait, the clothing is more structured and ornamental. Its restrained palette directs attention towards the figures, while the sheen of the fabric and elaborate trimmings continue to suggest luxury. Informality emerges chiefly through the outdoor setting and relationships among the figures.

On the viewer's left, the daughter carries flowers and gathers part of her skirt; on the right, the young Dauphin stands close to his mother. The queen's extended arms connect the children to her central figure, presenting bodily proximity as a sign of affection. The boy's blue sash also preserves a visible marker of dynastic status. Set against his youthful appearance, the sash links childhood to inherited public responsibility. The children's presence does more than soften the queen's image: it also makes her role in the royal succession visible. Domestic feeling and political identity remain closely connected.

The work's commission prevents it from being understood solely as a response to hostile French publicity. Nationalmuseum records that Gustav III of Sweden selected the artist and that the portrait became a gift from Marie Antoinette to the Swedish king. It was exhibited at the Salon in 1785, where it was poorly received, and Wertmüller made adjustments before sending it to Sweden[13]. The picture could support an image of maternal virtue while also serving diplomatic exchange and the painter's career. Vigée Le Brun's better-known portrait of the queen with her children, painted in 1787, offers a later example of maternal representation by another court-associated artist[14].

The garden and distant classical architecture place the family within a designed environment, giving their encounter an air of cultivated ease. Rousseau's emphasis on domestic attachment provides a relevant comparison, but neither setting nor gesture proves direct philosophical influence. Bourdieu's *Distinction* offers another interpretive perspective: refined taste can sustain social difference even when it avoids overt ceremonial display[15]. The privilege of enjoying an exclusive garden is itself part of the image. Together, the two portraits show that royal femininity could be presented through naturalness and affection while remaining inseparable from status, artistic convention, and the demands of public representation.

ISSN: 2710-0170

## 3.3. Revolutionary Prints and the Contest over Royal Appearance

The prints that follow belong to the French Revolution itself. They demonstrate changes in the political uses of bodies, clothing, and social identity, but neither directly satirizes the queen's chemise gown. Figure 5 addresses the relationship among the estates; Figure 6 targets Marie Antoinette through animal caricature and a pun on her Austrian origins[16][17]. Their connection with the portraits is therefore comparative. They show how a visual culture that could confer dignity on elite appearance could also challenge inherited authority and assign hostile meanings to familiar signs of fashion.




Figure 5. Anonymous, Vive le Roi, Vive la Nation / J'savois ben qu'jaurions not tour, 1789. Hand-coloured etching. A version is cataloged by the Library of Congress[16].

Figure 5, *Vive le Roi, Vive la Nation / J'savois ben qu'jaurions not tour* (1789), depicts a reversal of social hierarchy through an unusual arrangement of bodies. A well-dressed peasant woman nursing a baby rides on the back of a noblewoman, who leans on a nun for support. These figures represent the Third Estate, the nobility, and the clergy, respectively, placing the traditionally subordinate estate above the privileged orders. The words above, "Vive le Roi. Vive la Nation," proclaim support for both king and nation, while the phrase below announces that the common people's turn has come. As the Library of Congress's description explains, the image satirizes the changing relationship among the Three Estates[16]. Clothing supports this message but complicates any simple link between elaborate dress and aristocratic rank, because, surprisingly, the most brightly dressed woman at the top represents the peasantry, even above the noblewoman's feathered headwear. Whereas Marie Antoinette's pastoral portraits use informal dress to suggest natural virtue, this print makes appearance part of an ironic visual joke about shifting status. The print also shows the peasant's maternal body outside royal portraiture occupying a position of symbolic authority. It thus establishes a broader political context in which inherited privilege, and the signs through which it was expressed, was increasingly open to challenge.

ISSN: 2710-0170




Figure 6. Anonymous, La Poule d'Autruyche, c. 1791. Satirical print. The title plays on the French words for ostrich and Austria[17].

Figure 6 makes the queen herself an object of ridicule. A bird with an elongated neck and fashionable headwear replaces the dignified royal body. The title links *autruche* (ostrich) with *Autriche* (Austria), where Marie was originally from, turning foreign birth into an accusation of political alienation. The accompanying inscription mocks the queen's appetite for wealth, claiming that she can easily digest gold and silver but cannot swallow the Constitution[17]. The inscription anchors the animal imagery in contemporary constitutional debate, directing viewers towards a political reading of its grotesque body. The joke combines alleged appetite for wealth with resistance to political change.

Stuart Hall's account of representation helps clarify the relation between these images. Meaning is produced through cultural codes and context rather than fixed permanently within an object or garment[18]. The feathered headwear of a noblewoman in caricature can invite ridicule, whereas fashionable accessories in Marie's portraiture we saw earlier support elegance. Different social contexts, makers, genres, and audiences selected and represented different features of royal identity. The prints reveal hostile possibilities within that contest, not a complete record of public opinion or a direct causal link between informal dress and the monarchy's collapse.

## 4. Conclusion

Marie Antoinette's pastoral appearance participated in a wider culture that valued nature, emotional sincerity, and domestic affection. Rousseau's writings illuminate that culture, but they do not supply a simple explanation of her choices. Rococo pastoral art, the designed landscape of Trianon, and the conventions of royal portraiture each contributed to an image whose naturalness was carefully constructed. The chemise portrait made informality visible, while Wertmüller's family group combined maternal feeling with dynastic identity. Both exposed the difficulty of presenting a queen as a private individual while maintaining the dignity expected of royal office.

The contradiction between simplicity and privilege was therefore present before revolutionary satire sharpened attacks on royal authority. Exclusive spaces and refined materials sustained the appearance of ease; hostile viewers could interpret that ease differently from its admirers. The prints of 1789 and 1791 show changing claims about social rank and the queen's political identity, although they do not directly document a reversal in the meaning of her muslin gown.

ISSN: 2710-0170

Read together, these works demonstrate that fashion helped negotiate identity, gender, and power, while its meanings remained dependent on audience, genre, and historical circumstance.

## References


[1] Barthes, R. (1972). Mythologies (A. Lavers, Trans.). Hill and Wang.

[2] Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

[3] Centre des monuments nationaux. (n.d.). Marie-Antoinette. [https://www.paris-conciergerie.fr /var/cmn_inter/storage/original/application/df7f71e7de9e0739d2b287a6c9e5267b.pdf](https: //www.paris-conciergerie.fr/ var/cmn_inter/ storage/original/ application/ df7f71e 7de9e07 39d2b287a6c9e5267b.pdf)

[4] Château de Versailles. (n.d.). Fashion at Versailles. [https://en.chateauversailles.fr/news/life-estate/fashion-versailles](https://en.chateauversailles.fr/news/life-estate/fashion-versailles)

[5] Château de Versailles. (n.d.). The Queen's Hamlet. [https:// en.chateauversailles. fr/discover/ estate/ estate-trianon/queen-hamlet] (https://en. chateauversailles. fr/discover /estate/ estate-trianon/queen-hamlet)

[6] Château de Versailles. (n.d.). Élisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun. [https:// en.chateauversailles. fr/discover/history/great-characters/elisabeth-louise-vigee-brun](https:// en.chateauversailles. fr/discover/history/great-characters/elisabeth-louise-vigee-brun)

[7] Chrisman-Campbell, K. (2015). Fashion victims: Dress at the court of Louis XVI. Yale University Press.

[8] Englander, D. (2020). 1783 – Élisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun, Marie Antoinette in a chemise dress. Fashion History Timeline, Fashion Institute of Technology. [https:// fashionhistory. fitnyc.edu/ 1783-vigee-le-brun-antoinette-chemise/](https://fashionhistory.fitnyc.edu/1783-vigee-le-brun-antoinette-chemise/)

[9] Goodman, D. (1994). The republic of letters: A cultural history of the French Enlightenment. Cornell University Press.

[10] Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. Sage.

[11] Library of Congress. (n.d.). Vive le roi, vive la nation: J'savois ben qu'jaurions not tour (Collection record, Item 2009633429). [https:// www.loc.gov/ pictures/ item/ 2009633429/] (https://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/2009633429/)

[12] Nationalmuseum. (n.d.). Queen Marie Antoinette of France and two of her children walking in the park of Trianon (Collection record, NM 1032). [https:// collection. nationalmuseum.se/ sv/collection/item/18035/](https://collection.nationalmuseum.se/sv/collection/item/18035/)

[13] Rousseau, J.-J. (1979). Emile, or on education (A. Bloom, Trans.). Basic Books.

[14] Rousseau, J.-J. (1984). A discourse on inequality (M. Cranston, Trans.). Penguin.

[15] Rousseau, J.-J. (1997). Julie, or the new Heloise (P. Stewart & J. Vaché, Trans.). Dartmouth College Press.

[16] Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe. (n.d.). Shepherd and shepherdess (Collection record). [https://www.kunsthalle-karlsruhe.de/en/kunstwerk/shepherd-and-shepherdess/? tour=57555] (https://www.kunsthalle-karlsruhe.de/en/kunstwerk/shepherd-and-shepherdess/?tour=57555)

[17] University of Alberta, Anne Lambert Clothing and Textiles Collection. (n.d.). The chemise dress. [https://clothingtextiles.ualberta.ca/dhe_chemise-dress/] (https:// clothingtextiles. ualberta.ca/ dhe_chemise-dress/)

[18] Weber, C. (2006). Queen of fashion: What Marie Antoinette wore to the revolution. Henry Holt.