INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9000663

Universal expositions of the Second Empire: A study in art and politics. (Volumes I and II)

Mainardi, Patricia Madelena, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1984

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

UNIVERSAL EXPOSITIONS OF THE SECOND EMPIRE: A STUDY IN ART AND POLITICS

by

PATRICIA MAINARDI

VOLUME 1

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1984

COPYRIGHT BY

PATRICIA MAINARDI

1984

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 29th,1984
date

Distinguished Professor Linda Nochlin
Chairperson of Examining Committee

April 29th, 1984
date

Professor William H. Gerdts
Executive Officer

Distinguished Professor John Rewald

Professor Diane Kelder

Professor Jack Spector
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

UNIVERSAL EXPOSITIONS OF THE SECOND EMPIRE:
A STUDY IN ART AND POLITICS

by

Patricia Mainardi

Advisor: Distinguished Professor Linda Nochlin

During the Second Empire (1852-1870), the world of art changed rapidly from one that had preserved many aspects of centuries old tradition, to one that developed most of the attitudes and institutions of our modern era. Universal Expositions, combining art and politics, acted as catalysts for many of these changes. This study attempts to assess the significance of these first international exhibitions of contemporary art, presented in the context of Industry and Commerce. It treats in depth the painting of France, England, Belgium, and Germany, and the fate of history, genre, and landscape painting during this period. It also examines the development of such modern concepts as paid admission, retrospective shows, the split between popular and cultivated taste, and the disenfranchised avant-garde.

Part One, "The Origins of Universal Expositions in France," analyzes traditional rivalries between Academy and Guild, and traces the parallel histories of exhibitions of art and of craft in France. Extended treatment is given to

the series of Expositions publiques des produits de l'industrie française (1798-1849) and to the first Great Exhibition of Products of Industry of All Nations, held in London in 1851. Part Two, "The Universal Exposition of 1855: The Apotheosis of Eclecticism," describes the results of the Government's attempt to obtain the support of all factions by proclaiming eclecticism the Genius of France, arranging individual retrospective exhibitions for leading French artists regardless of style, and attempting to depoliticize art. Part Three, "The Universal Exposition of 1867: The Death of History Painting," discusses the combination of factors which resulted in the widespread recognition that the Great Age of History Painting was over. This event also marked the triumph of Bourgeois taste, genre painting succeeding that of history, small intimate painting replacing the large public painting of the first half century, thus bringing to a close the Second Empire.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In 1978, in a seminar on Early Impressionism given by Eunice Lipton at Hunter College, C.U.N.Y., I realized that 1867 had seen major retrospective exhibitions by Ingres, Rousseau, Courbet, and Manet, all held in connection with that year's Universal Exposition. The fact seized my imagination--the art history of the century compressed into one moment! My enthusiasm was soon mixed with puzzlement, for, in an area as richly mined as nineteenth century French art history, it was a surprise to find that Universal Expositions had received little critical attention. This study is my attempt to understand the events, their significance, and why they have been virtually ignored. Portions of it have been given as papers: "The Origins of Universal Expositions in France," at the 1981 Frick Symposium in the History of Art; "The Death of History Painting in France," at the General Session of the 1982 College Art Association Conference chaired by Isabelle Hyman and Carol Lewine; "The Political Origins of Modernism," at the session "Judging Modernity: Manet Revisited," chaired by Thierry de Duve at the 1984 College Art Association Conference. Several articles have also been published: "Edouard Manet's 'View of the

Universal Exposition of 1867,'" in Arts Magazine 54, January 1980; "The Death of History Painting in France," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1982; "French Sculpture, English Morals: Clésinger at the Crystal Palace, 1851," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1983; and "Report from Paris: Eighty-Nine Eighty-Sixed," Art in America, February 1984.

The subject soon became a thesis, begun under the supervision of John Rewald, completed under the direction of Linda Nochlin. I hope that my work at its best reflects what I have learned from them, for they have each had a profound influence on this study. Diane Kelder made many valuable suggestions in the course of my work, and Jack Spector was much more than an outside reader, for, as advisor and friend, he was involved from the beginning. I would like to express my gratitude to all the members of my committee. In addition, I had the good fortune of having two "unofficial" advisors, in other words good friends who argued art and politics with me at every opportunity, and whose point of view has often shaped my own--Stuart L. Campbell and Louis Finkelstein. At the C.U.N.Y. Graduate Center my "unofficial" advisors included Professors Milton W. Brown, William H. Gerdts and Rose-Carol Washton Long, and I would no doubt have sunk under details had it not been for Mrs. Sara Armentano, Administrative Assistant in the art history department, and Peter Harris, Director of

Educational Resources, who helped me to assemble the photographic material.

My study was begun while I was on the faculty of Goddard College, a milieu which will always evoke warm memories. When Goddard closed in 1981, a Chester Dale Fellowship from the Center for Advanced Studies in the Visual Arts of the National Gallery of Art made possible a stay in Paris, where I did most of my research. While in France, a residence grant from the Cleveland Institute of Art took me to its summer program in Lacoste, and the American College in Paris provided part-time employment that permitted me to lengthen my stay. I would like to thank Bernard Pfriem, Director of the Cleveland Program, and G. Stephen Ryer from the American College. In addition, the art history department of the Graduate Center, C.U.N.Y. provided a dissertation grant to cover many of my thesis-related expenses. Much of the writing was done at the Artists for Environment Foundation in Walpack Center, New Jersey, where Trish Denby, Acting Director, invited me in the Spring of 1983.

Among those who aided my research, I am especially grateful to Kenneth Carpenter of the Kress Library of the Harvard Business School, and, in Paris, Jean Adhémar, Editor of Gazette des Beaux-Arts, Madeleine Fidell-Beaufort of the American College, Geneviève Lacambre, curator of the

Musée d'Orsay, Mme Laffitte-Larnaudie of the archives of the Institut de France, François Pérot, curator of the Petit Palais, and Eliane Wauquiez, curator of the Musée des arts décoratif. Friends and colleagues to whom I owe debts of gratitude are numerous, but in particular I would like to thank Dudley Barksdale, Joel Blatt, Peter de Francia, Patricia Dunsmore, Pascale Falk, Samuel Gelber, Susan Koslow, Joel Isaacson, Judith Wolfe, Jean Ziegler. And the staff of A.B. Computus in Ridgewood, New Jersey, Sharon, Mel, Ian and Harold, who taught me word processing in record time.

When I returned from Paris to defend my thesis and make final revisions, and my living arrangements fell through at the last moment (Artists for Environment Foundation closed), do you know where I stayed? With my parents. For their generosity, encouragement, and ability to withstand almost anything, I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Vonda and Louis E. Mainardi, with love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- VOLUME 1 -

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... iv

INTRODUCTION..... 1

PART ONE

THE ORIGINS OF UNIVERSAL EXPOSITIONS IN FRANCE

Chapter

I. TRADITIONAL RIVALRIES..... 15

II. BUILDING THE TEMPLE OF INDUSTRY..... 33

A Matter of Semantics..... 38
Artistes et Fabricants..... 42
Artistes et Chefs-d'oeuvre..... 45

III. THE CRYSTAL PALACE, 1851..... 54

French Sculpture, English Morals: Clésinger's Bacchante at the Crystal Palace..... 59
The Painting Exhibition That Might Have Been..... 65
From the Palace of Crystal to the Palace of Industry..... 75

PART TWO

THE UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION OF 1855: THE APOTHEOSIS OF ECLECTICISM

IV. SECOND EMPIRE ART POLICY: THE 1850S..... 84

The Cast of Characters..... 85
And The Results..... 90

V. ADVANCE PLANNING: GETTING THE SHOW UNDER WAY. 97

Le Palais de l'Industrie..... 99
The Imperial Commission..... 102
Le Palais des Beaux-Arts..... 105
Paid Admission..... 108
A Show of Artists or a Show of Works..... 116

VI. FOUR HEROES AND A SELF-MADE MAN..... 128

Ingres..... 128
Delacroix..... 132
Decamps..... 136
Vernet..... 138
Courbet..... 139

VII. CHOOSING THE ARMS OF FRANCE: THE JURY..... 151

And The Results..... 156
Installation..... 159

VIII. CRITICAL THEORIES: THE APOTHEOSIS OF ECLECTICISM..... 167

IX. LOOKING AT FRENCH ART: ECLECTICISM IN PRACTICE..... 184

Ingres..... 185
The Old Guard..... 191
Delacroix..... 194
Landscape Painting..... 199
Decamps..... 203
Genre Painting..... 206
Vernet..... 209
Courbet..... 211

X. LOOKING AT FOREIGN ART: REFLECTIONS IN A FRENCH MIRROR..... 228

Belgium..... 229
Germany..... 231
England..... 237

XI. CROWNING THE VICTORS..... 250

XII. THE END OF AN ERA..... 265

- VOLUME 2 -

PART THREE

THE UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION OF 1867:
THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING IN FRANCE

XIII. SECOND EMPIRE ART POLICY: THE 1860S..... 283

XIV. INDUSTRY'S REVENGE..... 299

XV. ARTIST MALCONTENTS..... 321

The Salon of 1867..... 321
Courbet..... 329
Manet's View of the Universal Exposition.... 332

XVI. THE DEATH OF INGRES..... 366

XVII. THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING..... 373

Cabanel..... 381
Historical Genre..... 384
Genre..... 390
English Genre..... 393
German Genre..... 396
Japanese Genre..... 398
French Genre..... 400
Gérôme..... 403
Meissonier..... 405

XVIII. LANDSCAPE: THE PATH NOT TAKEN..... 418

Rousseau's Fate..... 433

XIX. THE TRIUMPH OF GENRE..... 454

XX. THE END..... 478

.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 489

ILLUSTRATIONS..... 527

ILLUSTRATIONS

Paintings and sculpture exhibited in Universal Expositions are marked: *1851, *1855, *1867. Titles are those used in the exhibition catalogues; where these differ greatly from museum titles, the latter are given in parentheses at the end of the citation. Dimensions are in meters.

1. Entrance Portal to the Palais de l'Industrie, Sculpture by Elias Robert, 1851. Photograph by Guevin, 1865. B.N.

2. The Salon of 1699, Grande Galerie, Louvre. B.N.

3. Fête de l'Etre Suprême, Paris, 20 prairial, an II (10 May 1794). B.N.

4. Fête de la Fondation de la République, Paris, 1 vendémiaire, an VII (22 September 1798). B.N.

5. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Champs-de-Mars, Paris, an VI-VII (September 1798). B.N.

6. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Courtyard of the Louvre, Paris, an IX-X (September 1801). B.N.

7. Statistics for National Expositions of Industry, 1798-1849. Chart from 1878 Rapports du Jury International.

8. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Interior of the Louvre, Paris, 1819. B.N.

9. Instrumens de précision, Armurerie, Imprimerie, Serrurerie. Engravings after grisaille decorations by Nicholas-Louis-François Gosse for the 1834 Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Paris. From Moléon et al., Musée Industriel.

10. The Crystal Palace. The Great Exhibition of Products of Industry of All Nations, London, 1851. B.N.

11. The Interior of the Crystal Palace. The Great Exhibition of Products of Industry of All Nations, London, 1851. B.N.

12. Jean-Jacques Pradier, Phryné, 1845, plaster, 1.80. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Troyes. *1851.

13. Antoine Etex, Cain's Family, Marble, 2.05 x 1.65 x 1.70. Lyons. (La famille de Caïn). *1851.

14. August DeBay, Eve and her children, Plaster. Angers. (Le Berceau primitif). *1851.

15. Jean-Baptiste Clésinger, La Bacchante, 1847, Marble, .64 x 1.94. Petit Palais, Paris. *1851.

16. Jean-Baptiste Clésinger, La Femme piquée par un serpent, 1847, Marble, .56 x 1.80. Louvre.

17. Picture Gallery proposed for 1851 Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, London. A.N.

18. A. Deroy, Vue du Palais de l'Industrie, 1855. B.N.

19. Thérond, Entrée de l'Exposition des Beaux-Arts, avenue Montaigne, aux Champs-Elysées, 1855. B.N.

20. Map of the Universal Exposition of 1855, Paris. B.N.

21. Gustave Doré, La Foule du Dimanche à l'Exposition. Le Journal Pour Rire, 27 juillet 1855.

22. Photograph of Ingres Installation at the 1855 Universal Exposition showing L'Apothéose de Napoléon Ier, 1853 (destroyed). B.N.

23. Eugène Delacroix, La Chasse aux Lions, 1855, (partially destroyed), 2.60 x 3.59. Musée de peinture et de sculpture, Bordeaux. *1855.

24. Eugène Delacroix, La Liberté guidant le peuple, Le 28 juillet 1830, 1830, Salon of 1831, 2.60 x 3.25. Louvre. *1855.

25. Photograph of Delacroix Installation at the 1855 Universal Exposition. B.N.

26. Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, Les Experts, 1837, .464 x .641. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929, The H.O. Havemeyer Collection. *1855.

27. Horace Vernet, La Barrière de Clichy, ou la défense de Paris en 1814, 1820, .975 x 1.305. Louvre. *1855.

28. Gustave Courbet, L'Atelier du peintre, allégorie réelle déterminant une phase de sept années de ma vie artistique, 1855, 3.61 x 5.98. Louvre.

29. Honoré Daumier, Vue prise dans un atelier, quelques jours avant l'ouverture de l'exposition. Le Charivari, 4 mai 1855.

30. Grand Central Salon of the French Exhibition, Palais des Beaux-Arts, Universal Exposition, 1855. B.N.

31. Paul Chenavard, Calendrier d'une philosophie de l'Histoire. From Théodore Silvestre, Histoire des artistes vivants.

32. Marcelin, Le Public à l'Exposition (Beaux-Arts), La couleur de monsieur Ingres, "--Moi, ça me ravit! --Moi, ça m'enrhume!" Le Journal Pour Rire, 17 novembre 1855.

33. François-Joseph Heim, Le Roi Charles X distribuant des récompenses aux artistes à la fin de l'exposition de 1824, d. 1825, Salon of 1827, 1.73 x 2.56. Louvre. *1855.

34. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Le Siècle d'Auguste: naissance de N.S. Jésus-Christ, 1855. Engraving from L'Illustration, 14 juillet 1855. Painting in Musée de Picardie, Amiens. *1855.

35. Paul Flandrin, Montagnes de la Sabine, 1838, 2.01 x 1.50. Louvre. *1855.

36. Jean Baptiste Camille Corot, Souvenir de Marcoussy, près Montlhéry, ca. 1855, .97 x 1.30. Louvre. (La Charette. Souvenir de Marcoussis, près Montlhéry). *1855.

37. Théodore Rousseau, Groupe de chênes, Apremont, 1852, .635 x .995. Louvre. *1855.

38. Constantin Troyon, Les Boeufs allant au labour; effet du matin, d. 1855, 2.60 x 4.00. Louvre. *1855.

39. Paul Huet, Inondation à Saint-Cloud, d. 1855, 2.035 x 3.00. Louvre. *1855.

40. Gustave Courbet, La Roche de Dix-Heures, .855 x 1.60, 1855. Louvre. *1855.

41. Jean François Millet, Un Paysan greffant un arbre, 1855, .81 x 1.00. Neue Pinakothek, Munich. *1855.

42. Charles-François Daubigny, Ecluse dans la vallée

d'Optevoz (Isère), 1855, .44 x .56. Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, Rouen. *1855.

43. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, Une Rixe, 1855, .44 x .56. Windsor Castle, Windsor. *1855.

44. Honoré Daumier, Ce Monsieur Courbet, fait des figures beaucoup trop vulgaires, il n'y a personne dans la nature d'aussi laid que ça!. Le Charivari, 8 juin 1855.

45. Nadar, St. Courbet, peintre et martyr. Comment M. Courbet nous offrira l'année prochaine la 101e édition de son portrait. Le Journal Pour Rire, 13 octobre 1855.

46. Alfred Stevens, Ce qu'on appelle le vagabondage, ca. 1855, 1.32 x 1.62, Musée national du chateau de Compiègne. *1855.

47. Henri Leys, Les Trentaines de Bertal de Haze, 1854, .90 x 1.335. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels. *1855.

48. Peter von Cornelius, Destruction du genre humain par l'envoi des quatre cavaliers (Apocalypse C.VI), la peste, la famine, la guerre et la mort, 1846, cartoon for frescoes for Campo Santo, Berlin. Staatliches Museum, Berlin. *1855.

49. Wilhelm von Kaulbach, La Tour de Babel, cartoon for Berlin Museum, 1.495 x 1.720. Koninklijk Museum Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. *1855.

50. Ludwig Knaus, La Promenade, 1855, .97 x .76. Musée des arts décoratifs, Paris. *1855.

51. Franz-Xavier Winterhalter, L'Impératrice entourée de ses dames d'honneur, d. 1855, 3.00 x 4.20. Musée national du château de Compiègne. *1855.

52. Cham, Le Public observant la plus stricte neutralité vis-à-vis de l'école prussienne. Le Charivari, 14 juin 1855.

53. Sir Edwin Landseer, Animaux à la forge, exhibited in 1844, 1.422 x 1.118. The Tate Gallery, London. (Shoeing). *1855.

54. William Mulready, Le Loup et l'agneau, 1853, .60 x .51. The Royal Picture Collection, Buckingham Palace, London. (The Wolf and the Lamb). *1855.

55. John Everett Millais, Ophélia, d. 1852, .762 x 1.118. The Tate Gallery, London. *1855.

56. Cham, M. Prudhomme à l'Exposition. Le Charivari, 25 juin 1855. "--Mon ami, je crois qu'il y a une legère faute de dessin dans ce tableau anglais! --Madame, les Anglais sont nos alliés, je n'avouerai donc jamais qu'ils ont pu commettre une faute dans un de leurs tableaux, je ne le dois pas et ne le ferais pas!"

57. Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts. Médailles d'Honneur. Paris 1855, popular print. B.N.

58. Adolphe Yvon, La Prise de la tour de Malakoff, le 8 septembre 1855, Salon of 1857, 6.00 x 9.00. Musée National du Château, Versailles.

59. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Sortie d'un bal masqué, Salon of 1857, .50 x .72. Musée Condé, Chantilly. *1867.

60. Bertall, A la fin de son Exposition universelle, Courbet se décerne à lui-même quelques récompenses bien méritées en présence d'une multitude choisie, composée de M. Bruyas et son chien. Le Journal Pour Rire, 12 janvier 1856.

61. Pinot et Sagaire, Vue Générale de Paris et l'Exposition Universelle de 1867, Epinal print. B.N.

62. L. Dumont, Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée, masthead engraving.

63. G. Randon, Au Temple de Mémoire. Courbet, Maître Peintre. Le Journal Amusant, 15 juin 1867.

64. Gustave Courbet, Paysage, d. 1865, .94 x 1.35. Louvre. (Le Ruisseau couvert, Ornans). *1867.

65. G. Randon, Le Temple du Goût, "L'Exposition d'Edouard Manet." Le Journal Amusant, 29 juin 1867.

66. Edouard Manet, Vue de l'Exposition Universelle de Paris, 1867, 1.08 x 1.965. Najonalgalleriet, Oslo. (Fra Verdensutstillingen, Paris 1867).

67. Berthe Morisot, Vue de Paris des hauteurs du Trocadéro, 1872, .45 x .81. Collection Mr. and Mrs. Hugh N. Kirkland, Palm Beach, Florida.

68. J.A.D. Ingres, L'Apothéose d'Homère, d. 1827, 3.86 x 5.15. Louvre. *1855.

69. Alexandre Cabanel, Naissance de Vénus, Salon of 1863, 1.30 x 2.25. Louvre. *1867.

70. Stefano Ussi, Le Duc d'Athènes, 1.62 x 2.25. Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna, Rome. (La Cacciata del Duca di Atene). *1867.

71. Henri Leys, L'Archduc Charles, âgé de 15 ans (plus tard Charles-Quint) prêtant serment entre les mains des bourgmestre et échevins d'Anvers, 2.31 x 1.85, ca. 1863. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Bruxelles. *1867.

72. William von Kaulbach, Engraving after the Cartoon for L'Epoque de la Réformation, 1862, for fresco at Neuen Museum, Berlin. Present whereabouts unknown. From Muther, The History of Modern Painting. *1867.

73. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Phryné devant le tribunal, Salon de 1861, .80 x 1.28. Hamburger Kunsthalle. *1867.

74. Ludwig Knaus, Garçons Cordonniers, 1861, .41 x .485. Marburger Universitätismuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschicte. (Kartenspielende Schusterjungen). *1867.

75. Hokusai, Folding and Unfolding, The Mangwa. B.N. *1867.

76. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Arnautes jouant aux échecs, d. 1859, .38 x .27. The Wallace Collection, London. (The Draught Players). *1867.

77. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, Le Capitaine, d. 1861, .23 x .15. The Wallace Collection, London. (A Cavalier, Time of Louis XIII). *1867.

78. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, S.M. l'Empereur à Solférino, d. 1863, .435 x .76, Salon of 1864. Louvre. *1867.

79. Paul Huet, Grande marée d'équinoxe aux environs de Honfleur, d. 1861, Salon of 1861, 1.01 x 1.645. Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, Bordeaux. *1867.

80. Théodore Rousseau, etching after Le Chêne de roches, Salon of 1861, *1867, now in a private collection, The Netherlands. Etching: .124 x .167, 1861. B.N.

81. Jean-François Millet, Des Glaneuses, Salon of 1857, .835 x 1.11. Louvre. *1867.

82. Eugène Fromentin, Fauconnier arabe 1863, Salon of 1863, .74 x .95. Louvre. (Chasse au Faucon en Algérie). *1867.

83. Francois-Louis Français, Bois sacré, d. 1864, Salon of 1864, 1.09 x 1.34. Musée de Lille. *1867.

84. Jules Breton, La Bénédiction des Blés (Artois), d. 1857, 1.30 x 3.20. Louvre. *1867.

85. Charles-François Daubigny, Le Printemps, Salon of 1857, .96 x 1.93. Louvre. *1867.

86. Théodore Rousseau, Paris vu de la Terrasse de Belleville, .610 x 1.15, n.d. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Bruxelles.

87. Trichon, Distribution solonnelle des récompenses par l'empereur, au Palais de Champs-Elysées, le ler juillet 1867. B.N.

88. Gustave Brion, La Lecture de la Bible; intérieur protestant en Alsace, engraving by Rajon from GBA of the painting shown in the Salon of 1868. Present whereabouts unknown.

INTRODUCTION

International Exhibitions have been held throughout the world since 1851, when the English built the Crystal Palace in London and invited all the nations of the world to come and display their products. Designed to encourage industry and international trade, these huge sprawling shows were encyclopedic in the nineteenth century, and included a broad range of human productivity in all spheres, agriculture, industry, science and art. Within this context, the fine arts played a minor but significant role, for no Exposition could call itself truly universal while ignoring so important an aspect of human productivity. Art exhibitions were small or unofficial, however, until 1855, when, at the first French Exposition Universelle, the fine arts were accorded official status. From then on, all French Universal Expositions have included large international art exhibitions. In the nineteenth century, they frequently provided the only opportunity French artists had for viewing the contemporary art of other countries as well as for re-evaluating the recent past. Obviously they were of major importance; one has only to remember the counter-exhibitions staged by Courbet in 1855 and Manet and Courbet in 1867 to realize

that they would not have gone to such expense for minor and insignificant events.

Universal Expositions were, to be sure, conservative events in art (although progressive in industry) and prizes tended to go to older established artists, often of the previous generation. Their significance, however, is not limited to that of the artists rewarded. In the organization of the early Expositions, the various converging and conflicting forces in France were compelled to work together for the first time: the Imperial Commissions included representatives of the official world of Government, the Académie des beaux-arts, industrialists and aristocrats, collectors, artists and critics. As a result of this move towards representation of all special interest groups (characteristic of the Second Empire), the world of art was irrevocably changed. If one compares the art world before and after the Second Empire, it is evident that after 1870 our modern system was in place. The best artists no longer expected a career of Government medals, honors and commissions. The Salon and the Académie des beaux-arts had lost their former authority, private galleries, dealers, even private art training had replaced Government institutions, and artists had begun to organize their own exhibitions. The classical system of categories in art, according history painting the highest prestige, had been overturned: the best painting of the second half

of the nineteenth century was small in size, intimate in subject. Art historians are virtually unanimous in placing the origins of "modernism" in the Second Empire, and yet exactly how this came about has always been something of a mystery. It is my thesis that the two Universal Expositions of the Second Empire served as catalysts for the collision of art and politics which produced many of the institutions and attitudes of our modern art world.

This is a study of the interaction between the world of art and that of politics in the origin and development of the French Universal Exposition. I have focused my study on the period of the Second Empire, for it was during this regime that the Expositions received their definitive form, and, in turn, exercised the greatest influence on the world of art. I have focused on the exhibitions of painting and drawing, for, by general consensus, it was here that the fate of the French School was to be decided. As the institution of the Universal Exposition cannot be discussed apart from its Second Empire context, my study is as much about the period as about the shows. In this I am indebted to two major studies, Joseph C. Sloane's French Painting Between the Past and the Present. Artists, Critics and Traditions from 1848 to 1870, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art exhibition catalogue The Second Empire 1852-1870. Art in France Under Napoleon III.[1] Although my interpretation of the period is different, I have benefited

greatly from these works, as well as Stuart L. Campbell's The Second Empire Revisited. A Study in French Historiography.[2]

Perhaps it is the very enormity and shapelessness of Universal Expositions that explains why they have received so little serious scholarly attention. For the art historian, the task is doubly difficult, for the art exhibitions cannot be treated apart from their industrial context, and it is precisely in this latter area that the basic research has not been done. What studies exist, such as Adolph Démy's 1907 Essai historique sur les expositions universelles de Paris, Raymond Isay's 1937 Panorama des Expositions Universelles or the study compiled by the Comité français des expositions, Cinquantenaire 1885-1935, are public relations as much as (if not more than) scholarship.[3] In their own way they are a tribute to the importance of the subject, for the Expositions have been too closely identified with French prestige to admit even a mildly critical approach. Although much valuable material has been correlated in these studies, misstatements of fact abound and footnotes are either inadequate, just plain wrong, or lacking altogether. The most basic (and baseless) assertions are made and repeated without verification. As an example, Jacques-Louis David is usually cited as the architect of the first National Exposition of Industry in 1798; a visit to the Archives

Nationales in Paris would have revealed that it was actually the work of the architect Chalgrin. The projected 1989 Exposition (recently cancelled) has already produced several additional publications, such as Pascal Ory's Les Expositions Universelles de Paris and the mammoth catalogue of the Musée des arts décoratifs Le Livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989; both are in the same, by now hallowed, tradition of public relations.[4] The only promising note is the work of Madeleine Rebérioux whose recent article "Approches de 1'histoire des expositions universelles à Paris du second empire à 1900" sets forth an ambitious methodology through which various aspects of the Expositions can be analyzed by a group of specialists working together.[5] Professeur Rebérioux has actually been working with such a group for several years, under the auspices of the Université de Paris à Saint-Denis (Paris VIII) and the Musée d'Orsay, but this is a long term project which will not produce results for several years. Curiously enough, the two most interesting interpretations of Universal Expositions have been written by non-specialists. Walter Benjamin's "Paris-- The Capital of the Nineteenth Century" placed them within the context of the ideology of capitalism, and Werner Hofmann in The Earthly Paradise has discussed them in a wider context of symbolic content.[6]

There has been very little art historical writing on

this subject. Minda de Gunzburg and Philippe Roberts-Jones have both written theses on the 1855 Exposition.[7] The former, for the Ecole du Louvre, is largely a compilation of critics' opinions on the French painting exhibition. The latter, an interesting thèse annexe for the Université Libre de Bruxelles, proposes a "two-speed" interpretation of modern art history, with the taste of the public lagging behind that of cultivated amateurs. In addition, Frank Anderson Trapp has published two articles; one identifies many of the works in the installation photographs of the 1855 French painting exhibition, the other is a general survey of the 1867 Exposition.[8]

The lack of art historical interest in these events may be partially explained by the discipline's bias towards "modernism" which has, until recently, caused scholars to examine art apart from its historical context. In part, it may also be due to the complicated nature of the subject, involving, by necessity, research in disciplines other than art. Much of the material is contained in handwritten official reports scattered through hundreds of dossiers located in Paris either at the Archives Nationales or at the Archives du Louvre. There are also published catalogues, reports, and documents which often run to dozens of volumes for each Exposition. Besides the official records, thousands of articles were published by contemporaries, and the major art critics produced

book-length studies. The weight of the primary source material is enormous and has, no doubt, crushed many a promising research proposal. It has taken me the better part of three years to read through this material, and will probably take several decades more to thoroughly assimilate it. This study, then, presents a "first draft" of its meaning. No doubt I, and others, will revise this interpretation in the future. Nonetheless, my work will stand as the first major attempt to understand the significance of the French Universal Expositions of Art of the Second Empire.

My study is divided (like Gaul) into three parts. The first part treats the Origins of Universal Expositions in France. As the history of this early period is largely unwritten, I have had to go into somewhat greater detail than would be required merely to serve as an introduction, but in order to adequately understand the clash between art and industry in the nineteenth century, it is necessary to trace traditional rivalries between art and craft. The opening chapters discuss the seventeenth century split between the Académie des beaux-arts and the guilds which resulted in two parallel and rival traditions which thereafter maintained an uneasy co-existance, first one then the other triumphing. The French Revolution initiated a second phase in these traditional rivalries, for in 1798 the Directory initiated a series of National Expositions of

Industry, eleven of which were held by 1849. My discussion emphasizes the Government's attempt to raise the status of industry by modeling these exhibitions on those of the fine arts. This period was brought to a close in 1851 by the British Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, the first of the International Exhibitions characteristic of the second half century. An international sculpture exhibition was held, and, for the first time, the French were obliged to confront foreign taste and compete with foreign artists, with some amusing results.

Part Two treats the Universal Exposition of 1855, the first held in France, and the first to include an official fine arts section. The subtitle of this section, "The Apotheosis of Eclecticism", signifies both the intention and the result of decisions made by the Imperial Commission. Eclecticism in this sense does not refer to a composite work of art, but to Napoléon III's policy of encouraging representatives of all special interest groups to rally to his regime, a strategy which has been widely discussed by historians such as Theodore Zeldin, but not yet recognized as the art policy of the period.[9] My major point is that in order to appease all factions at home and to present a united front in the face of foreign competition, the Imperial Commission was forced to recognize the validity of the diverse strains in

contemporary French art. Major artists, regardless of style, were courted with flattery and commissions, and individual retrospective shows were awarded to the representatives of the leading movements of the period, each identified with a special interest group necessary to the survival of the regime. The hegemony of the Académie des beaux-arts over the French School was broken, and, despite its protests, all styles were sanctioned by Medals of Honor. Thus was abandoned traditional aesthetic leadership by Government and Academy. The immediate result was an uneasy co-existence among all styles, which would henceforth have to compete for public favor.

A significant part of my discussion consists of an analysis of the art criticism developed to meet the challenge of the international art exhibition. Its sources are traced to Victor Cousin's philosophy of eclecticism and theories of cyclical history developed from Vico and Herder. I show how both French and foreign artists and styles were seen in terms of burning nineteenth century political issues and how the Government successfully depoliticized art by redefining it in formalist terms. Finally I examine the results of the Universal Exposition of 1855, principally the general awareness that it marked the close of an era and that the second half century would belong to a new generation and a new aesthetic movement, namely Naturalism.

Part Three deals with the Universal Exposition of 1867 and is focused on the theme of "The Death of History Painting in France." The eclecticism established in 1855 is shown to have been an interim stance for, in effect, it substituted the rule of popular taste for the authority of Government or Academy. Conservative art critics blamed this on Democracy and saw quite clearly that it was the inevitable concomitant of the political and economic changes which had taken place since 1789. The Bourgeoisie had replaced the Aristocracy as the ruling class, and the Universal Exposition of 1867 celebrated the triumph of its taste.

By 1867, the entire previous generation of history painters had died, Ingres, the last survivor, just before the Universal Exposition. A huge memorial show of the work of Ingres was held to demonstrate to the world the superiority of French history painting. Instead, it had the reverse effect from that anticipated, for it only served to emphasize that the great era of history painting in France was over. The elected Jury awarded most of the Medals of Honor to genre painters, the favorites of collectors and the public, and Meissonier was hailed as Ingres' successor, the leader of the French School. The difference between popular and cultivated taste, characteristic of our modern period, was clearly

articulated by major critics in 1867, for they recognized that contemporary landscape painting was superior to genre, despite the popular favor accorded the latter. Some of the reasons for this are suggested in my discussion which also analyzes the fate of Rousseau and landscape painting in general.

My study closes with an analysis of the Salon of 1868, where the reforms promised in 1867 were actually carried out, with disappointing results. A Jury elected by Universal Suffrage among artists awarded the Medal of Honor, traditionally reserved for a history painter, to a mediocre painter of genre. History painting and the Academy had been dethroned and would never again regain their former authority, but their place had been taken by genre painting and popular taste, which presented no great improvement. At the same time, the slackening of regulations on censorship resulted in detailed critiques of the Government art administration. By 1868 Second Empire art policy had run its course. Through its vacillating and contradictory decisions, it had succeeded in discrediting Official and Academic art institutions, and allowed the Bourgeoisie, the new ruling class, to emerge as the arbiter of taste.

Although historians have traditionally emphasized the negative aspects of the Second Empire, the recent trend has

been to understand how much of our modern world was born between 1852 and 1870.[10] This was certainly the case in art, for Napoléon III was the very prototype of the uncultivated modern ruler. If the art world of 1871 was drastically different from that of 1851, the credit must go to him, for he accomplished much by doing little. In the aesthetic void that he created, art institutions and attitudes became "modern" by taking on the image of the ruling economics--Capitalism, the ruling politics--Democracy, and the ruling class--the Bourgeoisie. And, as we shall see, it was the Universal Expositions which provided the forum for this transformation.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. Joseph C. Sloane, French Painting Between the Past and the Present. Artists, Critics and Traditions from 1848 to 1870, Princeton, N.J., 1973; Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Second Empire 1852-1870. Art in France under Napoleon III, 1978.

2. Stuart L. Campbell, The Second Empire Revisited. A Study in French Historiography, New Brunswick, N.J., 1978.

3. Adolph Démy, Essai historique sur les expositions universelles de Paris, Paris, 1907; Raymond Isay, Panorama des Expositions Universelles, Paris, 1937; Comité français des expositions, Cinquantenaire 1885-1935, Asnières, 1935.

4. Pascal Ory, Les Expositions Universelles de Paris, Paris, 1982; Paris, Musée des arts décoratifs, Le Livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989, 1983. See my "Report from Paris: Eighty-nine Eighty-Sixed, Art in America, February 1984, 33-37.

5. Madeleine Rebérioux, "Approches de l'histoire des expositions universelles à Paris du second empire à 1900,"Bulletin du centre d'histoire économique et sociale de la région Lyonnaise 1 (1979): 1-17.

6. Walter Benjamin, "Paris--The Capital of the Nineteenth Century," Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism, Quintin Hoare, trans., London, 1973, 157-76; Werner Hofmann, The Earthly Paradise. Art in the Nineteenth Century, Brian Battershaw, trans., N.Y., 1961, 165-194.

7. Minda de Gunzburg, "La Peinture française et la critique à 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855," (Thèse de 1'Ecole du Louvre, 1970); Philippe Roberts-Jones, "Opinions de Quelques Critiques sur la Peinture Française à 1'occasion de 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855" (Thèse de Doctorat: Thèse Annexe, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1954).

8. Frank Anderson Trapp, "The Universal Exhibition of 1855," The Burlington Magazine CVII (June 1965):300-305; "Expo' 1867 Revisited," Apollo, February 1969, 112-131.

9. See Theodore Zeldin, The Political System of Napoleon III, London, 1958.

10. See, for example, Alain Plessis, De la fête impériale au mur des fédérés, 1852-1871, Paris, 1979.

PART ONE

THE ORIGINS OF UNIVERSAL EXPOSITIONS IN FRANCE

CHAPTER I

TRADITONAL RIVALRIES

Above the entrance portal of the Palais de l'Industrie at the first French Universal Exposition, there stood a sculptural group by Elias Robert showing the allegorical figure of France offering crowns to Art and Industry (Figure 1). A contemporary account lamented that while Industry, energetic and confident, held a hammer and leaned on an anvil, Art, sad and dejected, gazed listlessly out into space.[1] Why, on this momentous occasion, should Art have been so dispirited? To answer this question, traditional rivalries between art and craft in France must be understood.

The institution of the exposition was a powerful ideological weapon in this conflict. The first government sponsored exposition of painting and sculpture had been held in 1667 during the reign of Louis XIV under the auspices of the newly founded Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture.[2] The first government sponsored exposition of industry, however, was not held until after the Revolution, in 1798, under the auspices of the Directory. The former was intended to serve the interests of the

Monarchy, the latter those of the Bourgeois Republic.

This dialectic between Art and Industry, the Monarchy and the Bourgeoisie, had a long history in France, extending back to the beginning of guild chronicles. Although theoretically equal, some guilds were more privileged than others. Those in the luxury trades ranked highest, among them painters and sculptors, concentrated in the corporations of Ymagiers Tailleurs and Paintres et Tailleurs d'ymages.[3] Proud of the elevated status they enjoyed, their regulations stated: "Leurs mestiers n'apartient a nule ame, fors que a sainte yglise et aus princes et aus barons et aus autres riches homes et nobles."[4]

In 1391 corporation regulations were reorganized, and the Communauté des Maîtres Peintres et Sculpteurs de Paris dates its origins from this year. To the early regulations were added warnings to sculptors to use only good wood, well-dried, and to painters to use heavy strong cloth for picture supports; no foreign art could be sold in Paris unless first inspected by the gardes du métier for, it was averred, foreign art was frequently of inferior quality.[5] The first recorded exemptions from the strict regulations of the Communauté were made by Charles VI in 1399, eight years after this attempt to stop the influx of foreign art and, presumably, foreign artists.[6] Corporate regulations

and privileges were reconfirmed periodically, whenever there was widespread anxiety over royal attempts to bypass the system. This happened only once in the fifteenth century, but repeatedly during the sixteenth, when François I began inviting prominent Italian artists to France.[7] These exemptions, sometimes based on merit, sometimes on Court favor, became more and more common. Henri Testelin, one of the founders of the Academy and no friend of the guilds, nonetheless acknowledged that, by the end of the reign of Louis XIII (d.1643), the title of Peintre or Sculpteur du Roi had been so freely bestowed on incompetents that it no longer carried any prestige.[8]

The Communauté itself would cease to exist if enough artists were given exemptions, and it was this fear, no doubt, that prompted it to attack court artists by requesting Parliament in 1646 to curtail their numbers and privileges.[9] As the Parliament represented the Aristocratic and Bourgeois opposition to the Monarchy, it supported the Communauté, and a long fight ensued which precipitated the foundation of the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in 1648.[10] Active in this project were the painter Charles LeBrun, recently returned from Italy, and Martin de Charmois, former secretary to the French ambassador to Rome. The petition Charmois drew up and read to the ten-year old Louis XIV stated of the petitioning artists: "Ils ont recours à la puissance souueraine pour

estre remis en leur lustre, ainsy qu'ils estoient du temps d'Alexandre dans l'academie d'Athenes, ou chacun sçait qu'ils occupoient le premier rang entre les autres arts liberaux."[11] His statement that painting and sculpture were included among the liberal arts was, of course, untrue; the traditional seven liberal arts (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) were those intellectual pursuits practiced "freely," that is, outside guild restrictions, by free men.[12] Painting and sculpture were considered work of the hand, not the brain, and so were excluded, nor had they any muse. In the schema formulated in the twelfth century by Hugo of St. Victor, painting, sculpture and architecture were included as a subdivision of armatura (armaments) among seven mechanical arts corresponding to the liberal arts. The other mechanical arts he listed as lanificium (wool-working), navigatio (navigation), agricultura (agriculture), venatio (hunting), medicina (medicine), theatrica (theatre). This schema was followed until the Renaissance when, first in Italy and later in France, artists began the attempt to raise their status and free themselves from guilds and classification with the mechanical arts.

To this end, Charmois recounted how previous Kings had honored artists, how François I had invited Leonardo to France where, under current guild restrictions, not even Michelangelo or Raphael would be allowed to work. His

petition set forth in detail the concept of the "learned artist" who, in contrast to the "ignorant artisan," needed years of study to perfect his art.[13] It was a brilliant attempt to link up painting and sculpture with the already accepted liberal arts, and it was successful, for, in his response, Louis XIV condemned the "ignorance and vulgarity" of most artisans and pronounced painting and sculpture to be a branch of the liberal arts.[14]

From 1648 until the 1790s when both corporations and academies were suppressed, there was constant feuding.[15] Political opposition to the King could be legally expressed through court decisions against his Academy. He retaliated by giving Academicians privileges above those awarded to even the most privileged of corporations, and, as early as 1663, required all court artists to join.[16] Thus was established the liaison between craft and the Bourgeoisie on the one hand, against the fine arts and the Monarchy on the other.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both King and Academy did their utmost to accentuate this division between art and craft. Despite their efforts, painting and sculpture were usually included, as they had traditionally been, among the arts mécaniques. The first official dictionary of the French language, published by the Académie française in 1694, defined Mécanique thus:

> Cette partie des Mathematiques qui a pour objet les mechines. . . Se dit les Arts qui ont principalement besoin du travail de la main. "On divise les Arts en Arts liberaux & en Arts mechaniques. la Ménuiserie, la Serrurerie est un Art mechanique". . . Il signifie aussi, Sordide, mesquin. "Un mestier bien mechanique. cela est bien mechanique pour un Gentilhomme. ils vivent d'une maniere mechanique. Il est bas. 17

The term beaux-arts did not officially enter the French language until 1798, for the reorientation of the system of the arts into those which admit of progress based on the accumulation of knowledge--what we now call sciences--and those based on individual talent and concepts of beauty and taste--what we now call fine arts or beaux-arts--was just coming into being.[18]

In breaking away from guild rule, Academicians emphasized the theoretical and non-commercial aspects of their profession; as it was characteristic of artisans to keep open shops, they refused to do so. According to Testelin, this decision took place c.1648-1649:

> Cette proposition mise en avant une assemblée générale de l'Académie, il y fut décidé que tout membre du corps académique, sous peine d'en être exclu, s'abstiendroit de tenir boutique ouverte pour y étaler ses ouvrages, de les exposer aux fenêtres ou autres endroits extérieurs du lieu de sa demeure, ou d'y apposer aucune enseigne ni inscription pour en indiquer la vente, et de ne rien faire enfin qui pût donner lieu à confondre l'état honorable d'académicien avec l'état mécanique et mercenaire des maîtres de la communauté. 19

The very idea of exhibition was tainted with the commercialism that Academicians were trying to escape, and

so it was with little enthusiasm that in 1663 they received new statutes which specified that at the annual election of officers, each Academician would have to participate in an exhibition by bringing a work with which to decorate their meeting rooms in the Palais Royal.[20]

By 1666 they had held only one such exhibition; in that year Colbert intervened, proposing that each Academician be required to discuss the work in his presence.[21] In desultory fashion, with many postponements and abstentions, the Academicians obeyed, the exhibition of 1667 often being cited as the first official Salon. In 1673 the exhibition, too large for the meeting rooms, was moved to the courtyard of the Palais Royal, and in 1699 Mansart, the current Protecteur of the Academy, arranged to have it moved into the Louvre where it rapidly acquired prestige and remained for the next 150 years (Figure 2).[22] Mansart's decision was a stroke of genius; a contemporary account in Le Mercure Galant reveals a motivation as much political as aesthetic:

> Mrs de l'Academie Royale de Peinture & de Sculpture celebroient autrefois la Feste de Saint Loüis par l'exposition de leurs plus beaux Ouvrages, qu'il estoit permis au Public de venir admirer; mais comme ils estoient dans une cour, où ils avoient à craindre les injures du temps, qui obligeoient souvent de les retirer avant que la curiosité du public fust satisfaite, l'usage de cette feste avoit esté insensiblement aboly, mais Mr Mansard, Surintendant & Ordonnateur des Bastimens du Roy, & Protecteur de l'Academie, voulant renouveller tout ce qui peut contribuer à l'avancement des beaux Arts, & ayant pour cet

> effet obtenu du Roy que les Ouvrages des Peintres & Sculpteurs seroient exposez dans la Grande Gallerie de son Palais du Louvre, le peuple a marqué par son concours le plaisir que luy a donné l'exposition de tant de chef d'oeuvres. Les Etrangers les ont admirez, & font demeurez d'accord qu'il n'y a que la France capable de produire tant de merveilles, & qu'elle est bien redevable au Roy, qui par sa protection & par ses liberalitez, donne lieu aux beaux Arts de parvenir à un si haut degré de perfection qu'il n'y a point aujourd'hui de Nation qui pust oser pretendre d'y parvenir. 23

In studying the subsequent history of expositions in France, it is well to keep in mind these origins. They were proposed and maintained by Government which derived political benefits from cultural prestige; they were received with interest by the public, which regarded them as a spectacle, and with distaste by the Academicians, who thought them vulgar. Throughout the nineteenth century, the Academy maintained a contradictory attitude towards the Salons: it wanted to abolish them or hold them as infrequently as possible, for they still bore the odious taint of commercialism; at the same time it wanted to maintain total control of them and limit participation to Academicians, or at least fellow travellers. Implicit in both attitudes was the principle that the most distinguished artist worked only on commission and would exhibit solely for didactic purposes; to exhibit unsold work was like being a shopkeeper.

If it is understandable that painters and sculptors did not want to be considered ignorant artisans practicing

a mechanical art, it is equally comprehensible why this was no more attractive to members of the Communauté who, to begin their own ascent in status, modelled their language and institutions on those of Academicians, even retitling their corporation "l'Académie de Saint-Luc."[24] Considering the variety of work done under its auspices--in addition to the fine arts, everything from theatre sets to funeral decorations--it is surprising that the Académie de Saint-Luc did not take the opportunity to mount the first industrial exposition. Instead, when it began holding regular exhibitions in 1751, it did its best to imitate the official Salon.[25] There were seven exhibitions in all, the fine artists meeting with increasing hostility from the artisan members. Violent scenes erupted in 1764, no exhibitions were held for ten years, and 1774 saw the last. Certainly more research ought to be done on the Académie de Saint-Luc, particularly investigating the aesthetic, social and economic pressures which brought about the most ambitious series of privately sponsored exhibitions before the Impressionists and resulted in a repetition of the schism between art and craft that had originally precipitated the founding of the Académie royale in 1648.

A similar problem existed in the Académie royale des sciences, and demonstrates what Roger Hahn has called "the age-old disdain for techne especially persistent in

France."[26] This Academy was founded in 1666, somewhat later than the others, held its first public meeting in 1699, and was only legally recognized in 1713.[27] This corresponds to the lower esteem in which science, as opposed to literature and art, was held by the Monarchy. From the beginning, artisans such as inventors were excluded, emphasis being placed on more theoretical pursuits such as mathematics. The one exposition of industry recorded in France before 1798 was held in Paris in 1683 and included only machines demonstrating laws of physics.[28] As a result of this neglect, France lagged behind Northern countries such as England, Holland and Germany, and did not develop the applied science and technology necessary for advances in theoretical knowledge.[29] In England, for example, from the foundation of the Royal Society for Improving Natural Knowledge in 1645 inventors were honored; beginning in 1761 the Society of Arts held exhibitions of machinery.[30] If Northern attitudes towards work can be attributed to a Bourgeois Protestant ethic which assigns it a high value, France can be seen as belonging to the Aristocratic, Catholic and Latin tradition which, valuing the spiritual component in work, downgrades the "merely" physical.

There were, of course, those in France who understood the necessity of encouraging industry and artisans. Colbert worked tirelessly to this end and even tried to persuade Louis XIV to receive merchants at court.[31] But

after his death, his work atrophied and commercial regulations which were progressive in the seventeenth century became regressive in the eighteenth. Diderot understood very well that a nation that disdained industry could not survive; in his Encyclopédie he repeatedly attacked French prejudice against the mechanical arts.[32] Contempt for commerce and manual labor, however, made investment in industry unattractive to the Aristocracy, who preferred to invest in land and offices; it would take a Revolution to revamp the structure of French society.

By the late eighteenth century, blame for the stagnating economy was placed on the guild system, accused of preventing all progress. Louis XVI abolished it altogether in 1776; within a few months, pressure from Court and Parliament had forced its reinstatement.[33] The next year, however, he issued a Déclaration clarifying the relationship between the Académie royale and the Académie de Saint-Luc for, as he explained, "les arts de peinture et de sculpture ne doivent point être confondus avec les arts mécaniques."[34] He decreed that anyone who dealt in art or art materials had to join the Communauté, while all painters and sculptors would be forced to join the Académie royale which would operate the only legal art school. This decree not only outlawed the Académie de Saint-Luc, but it also--and this has passed unnoticed by subsequent historians--completed the split between art and craft in

France. Until 1777 there had always been artists of unquestioned eminence, such as Vincent and Vigée-Lebrun, who, by their presence in the Académie de Saint-Luc, gave prestige to an alternate system of art. From this date on, however, there was to be only one system for the fine arts. This was further clarified by a later decree which stated: "Tout artiste, membre de l'Académie, qui fera commerce de tableaux, dessins, matières et meubles destinés à la mécanique des arts, ou se mettre en société avec des marchands brocanteurs, sera exclu de l'Académie."[35] This was the real artistic legacy left by Louis XVI, and the Revolution did nothing to undo it.

In 1791 the National Assembly decreed the suppression of the guild system in its entirety, with all its rights and privileges; in 1793 the National Convention suppressed the last privileged groups, namely the Academies.[36] In 1795 when the Institut national des sciences et des arts was established to replace the defunct Academies, the order of prominence was reversed, both in its title and the order of classes: the sciences were now first and the arts last.[37]

With one stroke, the old rights, privileges and monopolies were gone and the guilds and Academies were abolished. Artists gained the right to exhibit their work and from 1791 on, the Salon was theoretically open to all. The right to work and freedom of production were

established and industry was free to develop, but the old contempt for the arts mécaniques proved harder to erase.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

An abstract of Part One was presented under the title of "The Origins of Universal Expositions in France" at the Frick Symposium in the History of Art, N.Y.C., 1981.

1. See "Le Palais de l'Industrie" in Alexandre Dumas et al., Paris et les Parisiens au XIXe siècle. Moeurs, arts et monuments, Paris, 1856, 312.

2. Although there was a small exhibition in 1665, the first Salon is usually considered to be that of 1667. See Institut de France, Procès-verbaux de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture 1648-1792, Anatole de Montaiglon, ed., 10 vols., Paris, 1875-81, I:318, 9 avril 1667; also see André Fontaine, "L'Origine des Salons," Revue Politique et Littéraire, Revue Bleue, 14 mai 1910, 625-30.

3. The first compilation of corporate customs and regulations was made by Etienne Boileau, Provost of Paris, ca.1268. See his Le Livre des Métiers, René de Lespinasse and François Bonnardot, eds., (Histoire Générale de Paris), Paris, 1879, XLIV, XCVI-XCVII, CXLII; hereafter referred to as Boileau. All regulations and official documents pertaining to the corporations were either summarized or published by René de Lespinasse, ed., Les Métiers et corporations de la ville de Paris, XIVe-XVIIIe siècle,(Histoire Générale de Paris), 3 vols., Paris, 1886; hereafter referred to as Lespinasse.

4. Boileau, 129, art.XII; the regulations are published 127-30.

5. Lespinasse, II:192-96.

6. See Anatole de Montaiglon, ed., Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Académie Royale de peinture et de sculpture depuis 1648 jusqu'en 1664, 2 vols., Paris, 1853, II:187-223. The memoires are identified as those of Henri Testelin, the first secrétaire of the Academy; the exemptions he refers to would have been brevets to individual artists and thus not included in Lespinasse.

7. See 24 mai 1548, Lettres patentes de Henri II; 6 juillet 1555, Lettres patentes de Henri II; 22 novembre 1582, 8 juillet 1583, Lettres de privilèges pour les peintres, enregistrées ensemble au Parlement le 2 août 1583; novembre 1595, Edit d'établissement de la communauté des peintres; Lespinasse, II:192-96. Also see Jules Guiffrey, Histoire de l'Académie de Saint-Luc (Archives de l'Art Français, Nouvelle Période IX) Paris, 1915, 5-6.

8. Montaiglon, I:11-12. Testelin claimed that at this time there were three categories of artists: the maîtrise, the privilégiés, and the véritables gens d'art. Needless to say, it was his opinion that the last group comprised the founders of the Academy.

9. The petition of the Communauté is published in Montaiglon, I:18-24.

10. Ibid. On the foundation of the Academy, also see Nikolaus Pevsner, Academies of Art Past and Present, Cambridge, England, 1940, 82-108.

11. Charmois' Requête is published in Louis Vitet, L'Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture, Paris, 1861; see "Pièces justificatives," 195-207.

12. On these categories, see Paul Oskar Kristeller, "The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics," Journal of the History of Ideas XII (October 1951): 496-527, XIII (January 1952): 17-46.

13. For a thorough discussion of this issue, see Rensselaer W. Lee, Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting, N.Y., 1967, 41-48.

14. Louis XIV's response, Arrêt du Conseil d'Etat, 27 janvier 1648, is given in L'Institut de France, Lois, Statuts et Règlements concernant les Anciennes Académies et l'Institut de 1635 à 1889, Léon Aucoc, ed., Paris, 1889, CIV-CVI; hereafter referred to as Aucoc.

15. Pevsner provides a good summary of these feuds, and the compilations of legal documents cited above give ample evidence of continued friction. The one exception I take to Pevsner's account is his citation of Simon Vouet as the leader of the maîtrise against the Academy. Testelin didn't mention him and specifically named Mignon as the leader of the opposition; see Montaiglon, 75ff. Vouet, who died in 1649, was not listed as a member of the Communauté in the membership lists published by Guiffrey. It is unlikely that such a painter as well known as Vouet would have been omitted from all contemporary accounts had he played a significant role.

16. By Brevet du Roy, 28 décembre 1654, Academicians were freed from a variety of taxes and services required of members of the Communauté, and given various legal privileges equal to those enjoyed by members of the Académie française, established in 1635; see Lespinasse, II:204-207 and Vitet 236-39. For the requirement that all court artists join the Academy, see Arrêt du Conseil, 8

février 1663, Aucoc, CXXIII.

17. "Mechanique," Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise, Paris, 1694.

18. "Art," Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise, 5e ed., 2 vols., Paris, an VII (1798); also see Kristeller.

19. Montaiglon, I:61-62. The Procès-verbaux of the Academy do not mention this early decision, but a later discussion leaves no doubt that it was a long established custom; see the entry for 2 décembre 1684 in Institut de France, Procès-verbaux, II:291-92.

20. Ibid., II:257, art.XXV; also see 24 décembre 1663, Statuts et Règlements in Aucoc, CXXVII-CXXXVI, and Fontaine.

21. Institut de France, Procès-verbaux, I:297-98, 9 janvier 1666.

22. For the early history of expositions in France, see Institut de France, Procès-verbaux, I-III, passim; Paris, Le Livret de l'exposition faite en 1673 dans la Cour du Palais-Royal, Anatole de Montaiglon, ed., Paris, 1852; Paris, Liste des tableaux & des ouvrages de sculpture, exposez dans la grande gallerie du Louvre, 1699; "Exposition des ouvrages de Mrs de l'Académie de Peinture & de Sculpture," Le Mercure Galant, septembre 1699, 224-27; Florent LeComte, "Description des Peintures, Sculptures & Estampes exposez dans la grand Gallerie du Louvre dans le mois de Septembre 1699," Cabinet des singularitez d'architecture, peinture, sculpture, et graveure, 3 vols., Paris, 1699-1700, III:241-273; "La Première Exposition de Peinture au Louvre, en 1699," Magasin Pittoresque, XVIII (septembre 1850):305-307; Pierre Marcel, "Notes sur les 6 Expositions du règne de Louis XIV," Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 9 janvier 1904, 10-13, 16 janvier 1904, 19-20; André Fontaine, "L'Origine des Salons," Revue Politique et Littéraire, Revue Bleue, 14 mai 1910, 625-30; Georg Friedrich Koch, Die Kunstausstellung, Berlin, 1967.

23. "Exposition des Ouvrages de Mrs de l'Academie de Peinture & de Sculpture", Le Mercure Galant, septembre 1699, 224-27; this account disproves Démy's contention that the Académie des sciences held an exhibition in the Louvre at the same time.

24. See 9 mars 1730, Statuts de la Communauté des peintres et sculpteurs et de l'Académie de Saint-Luc, in Lespinasse II:215-219; also see Guiffrey, 59-64.

25. On the Salons of the Académie de Saint-Luc, see

Guiffrey, Histoire, 42-44, 88-92. The seven exhibitions included 186 artists and 1252 works of art of which at least half were portraits; also see J.J. Guiffrey, ed., Livrets des expositions de l'Académie de Saint-Luc à Paris pendant les années 1751, 1752, 1753, 1756, 1762, 1764, 1774, Paris, 1872. For lists of productions legally requiring the services of a member of the Communauté, see Lespinasse, II:216, art.3 and 217, art.15.

26. See Roger Hahn, The Anatomy of a Scientific Institution. The Paris Academy of Sciences 1666-1803, Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1971, 4-5.

27. See Aucoc, LXXXIV-XCII; also Le Mercure Galant, mai 1699, 1-15.

28. See Paris, Explication des modèles des machines et forces mouvantes, que l'on expose à Paris dans la rue de la Harpe, vis-à-vis Saint Cosme, Paris, 1683; also Walter G. Endrei, "The First Technical Exhibition," Technology and Culture 9 (April 1968): 181-83.

29. See Maurice Daumas, Les Instruments scientifiques aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, Paris, 1953, 138-39; Hahn, 15, 41, 185ff.

30. Hahn, 111; Daumas, 138-40; for an account of exhibitions in England, see Kenneth W. Luckhurst, The Story of Exhibitions, London/New York, 1951.

31. Andrew Trout, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Boston, 1978, 123ff; G.R.R. Treasure, Seventeenth Century France, London, 1966, chap.21.

32. See Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers par une société des gens de lettres, 35 vols., Paris/Neufchastel, 1751-65: "Industrie,""Art," "Maîtrise," s.v.

33. Février 1776, Edit du roi portant suppression des jurandes et communautés de commerce, arts et métiers, Lespinasse, I:162-75; août 1776, Edit du roi rapportant celui de février 1776, ibid, I:175-88.

34. 15 mars 1777, Déclaration, Aucoc, CXLVIII-CLIII.

35. 2 septembre 1777, Statuts et Règlements que le roi veut être observés par l'Académie Royale de peinture et de sculpture, art.XXXIV.

36. 2-17 mars 1791, Décret portant suppression de tous les droits d'aides, de toutes les maitrîses et jurandes et établissment des patentes, Lespinasse, I:188-91; 8 août

1793, Loi portant suppression de toutes les académies et sociétés littéraires patentées ou dotées par la nation, Aucoc, CCIII-CCV.

37. 22 août 1795 (5 fructidor, an III), Constitution de la République française, Aucoc, 3; also see 25 octobre 1795 (3 brumaire, an IV), Loi sur l'organisation de l'instruction publique, ibid., 6-7.

CHAPTER II

BUILDING THE TEMPLE OF INDUSTRY

It is one of the ironies of history (but surely an example of dialectical materialism) that the concept of the Universal Exposition--the great festival of Capitalism--owes its origins to Robespierre. It was obviously an idea whose time had come, for after the Revolution the French economy was in shambles. With the Aristocracy gone, the luxury trades had collapsed; survival as a nation depended on industrial development which in turn was held back by traditional values and traditional rivalries. As part of the attempt to unite the French people, Jacques-Louis David orchestrated a series of public festivals into powerful weapons of political propaganda.[1] Involving thousands of people, they combined music and drama, oratory and chorus in great choreographed spectacles. Robespierre's 1794 Fête de l'Etre Suprême was undoubtedly the finest of these, including among its features an artificial mountain (Figure 3). In the same year, he proposed to the National Convention a new series of fêtes, one of which would honor industry.[2] Robespierre's fall and David's imprisonment postponed this fête, and it was not until 1798, under the Directory, that the idea was

again taken up.

There are various accounts of the origin of this first industrial exhibition. The most credible was written by Anthelme Costaz, a contemporary, and is worth quoting in its entirety, although, in translating the Revolutionary calendar back into the Gregorian one, he has mistakenly given the date as 1797 instead of 1798.

> L'idée d'établir des expositions, au sujet des arts mécaniques, est venue, à l'occasion d'une fête ordonnée, en 1797, par le directoire exécutif, pour célébrer l'anniversaire de la fondation de la république. Il voulait que cette fête eût un grand éclat, et, afin de remplir ses intentions, François de Neufchâteau, alors ministre de l'intérieur, réunit plusieurs hommes éclairés pour les consulter sur les mesures à prendre. S'il y eut d'abord une assez grande divergence dans leurs vues, tous s'accordèrent sur ce point que se borner à établir des danses, des mâts de cocagne, d'autres jeux, ce serait répéter ce qu'on voyait partout; qu'il fallait trouver quelque nouveauté qui, en causant de la surprise, fût un moyen inconnu d'amusement. Alors, quelqu'un parla d'une foire, comme devant produire cet effet, en donnant à la fête une physionomie qui la ferait ressembler, mais, d'une manière grandiose, à celles des villages qu'anime ordinairement une grande gaité. Suivant un autre, aux danses, aux jeux, aux mâts de cocagne, à des courses de chars, de chevaux, il convenait de joindre une exposition des ouvrages de peinture, de sculpture, et de gravure, en ce qu'elle serait un moyen de plus de plaisir. Cette idée fit penser à François de Neufchâteau que les arts d'agrément étant l'objet d'une solennité semblable, il serait utile de faire jouir les arts mécaniques du même avantage. Cette propostion fut goûtée par tous les membres de la réunion, et ils lui donnèrent leur suffrage avec d'autant plus d'empressement que, de son exécution, devait résulter un spectacle nouveau et propre à étonner. 3

Looking back on it a half century later, on the occasion of the first international industrial exhibition, Léon de Laborde wrote:

> Les fêtes païennes de la Révolution étaient usées; on avait fouillé le carton de la corne d'Abondance et on savait qu'il était vide; on avait regardé de près tout l'Olympe, et l'illusion s'était dissipée en voyant les déesses sortir du cabaret dans un état que les dieux seuls, et des dieux de même origine, pouvaient tolérer. Ces solennités renouvelées des Grecs, ces processions dans lesquelles figuraient les produits de la terre, sous la protection de Cerès, avaient donc fait leur temps. Il fallait autre chose, et, on doit le dire, depuis que la déesse Raison était cassée aux gages, la raison prosaïque, la vraie raison, avait fait de sérieux progrès. [4]

This first Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française took place during the jours complémentaires, an VI (17-21 September 1798), a modest event in the Revolutionary New Year celebration of that year (Figure 4).[5] It was an event worthy of the Goddess of Prosaic Reason, for notably absent were the standard allegorical figures of earlier fêtes. 110 exhibitors marched across the Champ de Mars to an enclosed area behind the main fête where a tiny Temple of Industry, a replica of the Choreggic Monument of Lysicrates, had been erected (Figure 5).[6] They were accompanied by heralds, troops of cavalry, military bands, the jury and the Ministre de l'Intérieur François de Neufchâteau. After having ceremonially marched once around the exposition, the cortège returned to the main fête where, at the Altar of the Fatherland, Neufchâteau made the

opening speech. He stated: "Ce spectacle en effet est bien vraiment républicain; il ne ressemble point à ces pompes frivoles dont il ne reste rien d'utile."[7]

Neufchâteau was no idle dreamer; he was responsible for many pragmatic reforms in France, such as the standardization of weights and measures, the compilation of economic statistics by _département_ and the first population census.[8] The exposition of industry was intended to be a cultural reform, designed to free the _arts mécaniques_ from contempt and encourage their development. To this end, he spoke in his opening address of the traditional rivalry between the mechanical and liberal arts, of how the former had been so scorned that the very word _mécanique_ had pejorative connotations, how they had been forced to be "slaves of idle luxury" but now, elevated by the Revolution, would become instruments of social welfare and progress.[9] The jury then selected twelve "artistes" whose products were considered worthy of emulation, and these products--pencils and printed fabric, pottery and scientific instruments--were ceremonially placed inside the Temple of Industry, at the feet of a statue representing its deity.[10]

Shortly thereafter, Neufchâteau sent a memorandum to all _départements_ announcing that the exposition had been an enormous success and henceforth would be held annually. He

began thus: "Citoyens, les arts utiles sont enfin mis à leur place, et le Gouvernement républicain les a vengés de l'espèce d'avilissement auquel ils étaient condamnés sous le despotisme. Une nouvelle ère est donc commencée pour ces arts nourriciers."[11]

A new era had also begun in the history of exhibitions, for henceforth they would no longer be limited to the fine arts.

Neufchâteau was not able to carry out his plan for an annual exhibition of industry despite the efforts of Sieyès, President of the Directory, who proposed to make it part of the annual Fête de la Fondation de la République.[12] The measure appears to have been lost in the turmoil of the summer of 1799 which resulted in the coup d'état of 18 brumaire; the Directory was replaced by the Consulate and Bonaparte emerged as First Consul. Industry was not competely forgotten, however, for in the courtyard of the Louvre (renamed the Musée central des arts) was placed a statue of Industrie, probably the one which had graced the Temple of Industry the previous year.[13]

Not until 1801 was the plan revived, on the initiative of Chaptal, Napoléon's Ministre de l'Intérieur. The Rapport he presented to the Consuls recommending another exposition also suggested that it be held in the courtyard of the Louvre. This would be more convenient, he pointed

out, for it was in the center of Paris and valuable displays would be easier to guard.[14] His proposal was accepted and, as a result, the 1801 exposition is often--erroneously--cited as the first attempt to unite art and industry (Figure 6). This misunderstanding has proceeded from the coincidence of three major exhibitions, unrelated but sharing the same locale: the Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, the annual Salon, and Jacques-Louis David's private exhibition.[15] Salons had been held in the Louvre from 1699, fêtes from 1799, and David, who, like many artists of his time, had a studio there, took advantage of the crowds to invite the public to view his paintings for a fee, a practice he had initiated two years earlier. The confusion has been augmented--or perhaps caused--by David's participation in past fêtes, but the last one he designed was that of 1794; subsequent ones were the work of the architect Chalgrin.[16] Coincidence though it may have been, the simultaneity of the three expositions in such a distinguished locale added immeasurably to the prestige of industry.[17]

A Matter of Semantics

Despite the undercurrent of resentment and competition which characterized the relationship of art to craft, there was also the recognition that artists enjoyed a prestige that artisans and industrialists would like to share. As a

result, the terminology used in the early expositions is in need of clarification.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the distinction between the arts libéraux and arts mécaniques was slowly giving way; the beaux-arts gradually were breaking away from the latter to form a separate category of the former. By 1789 the transformation was complete, and the beaux-arts, under the dictatorship of the Academy, constituted a privileged corporation. Only Academicians could receive Government commissions or exhibit in the Salons, and within the Academy itself, the hierarchy of académicien, agréé, and élève was similar to the guild ranking of maître, compagnon and apprenti. As a result, the beaux-arts, only recently accepted into the arts libéraux, were soon under attack, primarily for monopolizing the practice of exposition. In the first "history" of industrial expositions in France, presented to the Institut National in 1802, Citoyen Camus explained this new attitude:

> Il y a moins de dix ans qu'on n'exposait encore que le produit de ces arts qu'on nommait libéraux, par où l'on voulait faire entendre qu'ils étaient exercés par des hommes libres, mais expression qui flétrissait les autres arts et qui les excluait nécessairement du concours honorable à l'exposition parce qu'on supposait qu'ils n'étaient pas libéraux. La philosophie a ni de la distinction orgueilleuse d'arts libéraux et d'arts non libéraux. Cette distinction a d'abord été affaiblie dans l'opinion; bientôt après elle a été entièrement renversée par la proclamation de la liberté publique: tous les

> arts ont été libéraux lorsque tous ont été exercés par des hommes libres, lorsque la forme de notre gouvernement assure à l'ouvrier , aussi bien qu'à l'artiste, son rang dans l'Etat. Alors l'exposition publique des produits de l';industrie nationale ou des arts mécaniques a été instituée, et elle a été liée à la fête de la fondation de la République avec beaucoup de raison, parce que c'est seulement dans une République, où la liberté est générale, que les arts mécaniques peuvent être appelés au concours honorable qui résulte de l'exposition. 18

The term arts mécaniques was rarely used after the first exposition, probably because of its pejorative sense. One finds instead a new term, arts utiles, which emphasized both the value now attached to industry and what was perceived as the growing "uselessness" of the beaux-arts, now often called arts d'agrément.[19] The very concept of the liberal arts was under attack; in a struggle for national survival, they seemed a luxury France could ill afford.

As painters and sculptors were considered artisans practicing a mechanical art until well into the eighteenth century, their claim to the title of artiste was barely secure by 1789; the Revolution ushered in an era of equality in which that title was, like the term citoyen, freely applied to all. Virtually everyone was considered an artiste practicing an art; there were no longer artisans with métiers. This resulted in some peculiar rhetoric, as when the Procès-verbal of the 1798 exposition referred to "des artistes français des aciers, des limes, des cristaux, des poteries, des toiles peintes."[20]

In the early publications, the divisions between exhibitors was that of *artistes* and *fabricants*, the first category comprising all those who had a direct relation to production, the second including those who owned the means of production but did not themselves work with their hands. The quarrels mentioned in the reports between *artiste* and *fabricant* (usually over prizes) were between worker and employer and not, as has been stated, between artists and artisans.[21]

Throughout the nineteenth century it was emphasized that the industrial expositions were in the tradition of the Salon; any relationship to medieval fairs or markets--considered crassly commercial ventures--was vigorously denied.[22] It was the idea of Progress which distinguished these *expositions* (the very word in French preserves a didactic meaning) from the *foires* and *bazars* of previous epochs. As in the Salon, there were honors and medals, not cash prizes, in order to stress the intellectual rather than commercial aspects of production. There were even *beaux-arts* sections in the industrial expositions; they included such products as wallpaper, fabrics, jewelry, furniture, bronzecasting, and art supplies. There were, however, *no* exhibitions of painting and sculpture *per se*, although examples were sometimes included to illustrate materials or processes.[23]

The net result of all these semantic changes has been to confuse subsequent historians, who have not understood them as part of the Revolutionary attempt to remake all structures, including language, in the light of new politics.

Artistes et Fabricants

Repeatedly decreed as an annual event, the Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française was repeatedly postponed because of political exigencies. Nonetheless, eleven were held between 1798 and 1849. Kings, Emperors and Presidents came and went, Industry remained. Of all the Gods, Virtues and Fêtes of the Revolution, Industry alone survived to become the reigning deity of the nineteenth century. Such expositions were held under the Directory (1798), the Consulate (1801,1802), the Empire (1806), the Restoration (1819, 1823, 1827), the July Monarchy (1834, 1839, 1844) and the Second Republic (1849). Regardless of regime, the ruler of the nation visited the exposition and presided over the awards ceremony; regardless of regime, the number of exhibitors and honors increased (Figure 7). There were 110 exhibitors and 23 honors in 1798; the Salon that year had 736 exhibitors. By 1849, there were 4532 industrial exhibitors and 3738 honors, while that year's Salon had only 2586 exhibitors and 49 honors.[24] The Légion d'honneur, founded by Napoléon

to honor the new aristocracy of merit, was extended by his royal successors to include industrialists; from 1819 on, an increasing number were so honored: 23 in 1819, 51 in 1849. In comparison to the 51 industrialists elevated in 1849, only 9 artists at that year's Salon received the same honor.[25] Gradually industrialists were gaining ground that artists were losing.

Even the decor of the industrial expositions was designed to place them in the more prestigious beaux-arts tradition. A Temple of Industry and classical arcades characterized the first three. In 1819 industrialists succeeded in having their exposition moved inside the Louvre, where the conjunction of art and industry could be savored to the fullest (Figure 8). By 1827 the Louvre had become too small and the President of the Jury asked Charles X to move the next one.[26] By the time that exposition was held in 1834, Charles X had been replaced by Louis-Philippe, but the manufacturers had their way and the exposition took place on the Place de la Concorde, in temporary buildings expressly constructed for the event. Their decor consisted of allegorical subjects representing the arts mécaniques: little naked putti were depicted setting type, weaving, hammering, printing, manifesting by their participation the dignity of these pursuits (Figure 9).[27]

That same year, M. Rey published a Mémoire sur la nécessité de bâtir un édifice spécialement consacré aux expositions générales des produits de l'industrie in which he demanded of the King:

> Enfin, pourquoi ne leur assignerait-il pas, dans la capitale de tous les arts et de toutes les industries, un lieu qui serait pour elles une sorte de sanctuaire, et dont la présence attesterait qu'elles occupent un rang élevé dans l'estime pubique? Jetons les yeux sur ce qui nous entoure. L'Histoire naturelle, les Beaux-Arts, la Magistrature, les Jeux scéniques, la Médecine, la Bourse, ont un palais; tous les arts enfin, toutes les sciences, toutes les institutions sociales, en France, ont des palais dont l'Etat les dote; et les manufactures de qui, avec l'Agriculture, tout le reste dérive, de qui tout reçoit le mouvement et la vie, les manufactures n'en ont point encore! 28

Despite Rey's plea, the expositions continued to be held in temporary structures, the decor manifesting the evolving aspirations of the manufacturing classes. In 1849 it included eighteen grisaille paintings representing Chemistry, Physics, Geography, Astronomy, Painting, Architecture, Sculpture, Furnishings, Ceramics, Agronomy, Horticulture, Metallurgy, Mechanics, Goldsmithing, Clockmaking, Photography, Glassmaking and the Manufacture of Stringed Instruments.[29] This mixture of the arts libéraux, the beaux-arts and the arts mécaniques represented a typical nineteenth century vision of what constituted valid areas of human endeavor. It also represented a blatant attempt to elevate the traditionally lowest category, the arts mécaniques, by setting it in such

distinguished company. In this attempt one hears distant echoes of Charmois' 1648 petition to Louis XIV claiming a place for painting and sculpture among the liberal arts.

Artistes et Chefs-d'oeuvre

As Neufchâteau pointed out at the first industrial exposition, under the ancien régime industry had been harnessed to the production of luxury goods. With the departure of the Aristocracy, the attention of the Republic turned towards mass production for its new citizens. But under the guild system, aesthetic standards revolved around the chef-d'oeuvre, the masterpiece, intended as a virtuoso accomplishment. Mass production, on the other hand, emphasized quantity over quality, machine over hand labor, and favored cheapness and simplicity. An ever growing contradiction was forming between standards of industrial and art production, once united in common striving after "the masterpiece." Neufchâteau may have referred to the products of 1798 as "nouveaux chefs-d'oeuvre," but by 1802 Chaptal could write bluntly "Le gouvernement estime peu les tours de force, fruit ordinaire d'une patience stérile ou d'une adresse minutieuse."[30] The dilemma of wanting to reach a mass market with cheaply produced goods while at the same time preserving traditional high standards of workmanship--the Saint-Simonian ideal--was resolved as manufacturers increasingly sacrificed aesthetic standards

to mass production, to satisfy the taste, however abased, of the greatest number at the cheapest price. The devotees of progress had assumed that the removal of guild regulations would bring about competition which would steadily raise the quality of merchandise. They had not counted on the possibility that the same competition and lack of regulation would result in a lowering of standards.

Stéphane Flachat, a Saint-Simonian, was horrified at the shoddy goods and poor taste that characterized the 1834 exposition; the disillusionment he expressed over the taste of the Bourgeoisie would become a growing concern as the century progressed:

> L'avènement politique de la bourgeoisie et la chute des classes privilégiées ont donné à l'industrie et aux beaux-arts des directions toutes contraires. Ces classes, au moment de leur chute, avaient constitué une école, et, si détestable qu'elle fût, le luxe s'y logeait à l'aise; l'habileté des ouvriers pouvait s'y déployer sans crainte. Un grand prix était attaché à la perfection de leur travail. . . . Ecoutez les meilleurs fabricans, ceux de l'intelligence la plus active, du sens le plus fin; ce qu'ils vous feront surtout remarquer à leur exposition, c'est qu'ils ont cherché à y satisfaire <u>à tous les goûts</u>; ce n' est pas le leur qu'ils imposent; le consommateur, ce Protée aux mille têtes, leur dicte tous les siens; la fortune est à qui l'aura le mieux deviné, à qui se sera trouvé prêt pour le jour du caprice. 31

The same free market economy, whose effect on the quality of manufactured goods was so harshly criticized by Flachat, was operating with equal success on the <u>beaux-arts</u>. The

Academy, which functioned in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries like a guild, a closed corporation monopolizing the field and setting its own standards, had been stripped of its monopoly in 1791. Henceforth the fine arts, like the industrial arts, were forced to obey the laws of supply and demand. Criticism that the Salon had become a picture shop became especially intense during the reign of Louis-Philippe, the Bourgeois King (1834-1848). Linked as this criticism often was to a condemnation by Legitimists of the Bourgeoisie as a class, it nonetheless contained more than a grain of truth.[32] Léon de Laborde published a lengthy analysis of this new situation in his Application des arts à l'industrie:

> L'exposition des tableaux, statues et gravures remplaçant celle des académiciens, dut se soumettre à des conditions nouvelles pour répondre à un but entièrement différent. Ce n'étaient plus les oeuvres d'un petit nombre d'artistes dont le mérite était constaté par leur position même, et qui consentaient à montrer à un public restreint des tableaux commandés à l'avance pour une destination spéciale; c'était le concours où tous venaient faire leurs preuves et tenter la fortune du succès et de la célébrité sans autre droit que le talent, sans autre juge qu'une foule d'amateurs désormais immense. . . . Laissés à eux-mêmes et n'ayant de débouchés à leur activité que dans les expositions publiques, les artistes se formèrent une manière mesquine et un goût de petit genre qui permettent de produire, sans préoccupation de la destination des oeuvres faciles et de petites dimensions, qui conviennent à tous les appartements, à toutes les fortunes, à tous les goûts. 33

Indiscriminate production for all tastes and purses is exactly what had been encouraged in industry. It was an

unforeseen--and unwelcome--side effect that the same phenomenon should be manifest in the elevated sphere of the beaux-arts. At the Universal Expositions, the issue would become critical.

By 1849 the word artiste had virtually vanished from the official publications of the industrial expositions. There were now fabricants and ouvriers; artistes were those who showed their work in Salons.[34] The divergence of art and craft was virtually complete when, in 1851, the Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations began a new era, many of the traditional rivalries resurfaced.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. On the fêtes see David Lloyd Dowd, Pageant Master of the Republic. Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1948, and Mona Ozouf, La Fête revolutionnaire, 1789-1799, Paris, 1976.

2. Archives Nationales ADVIIIA 60, "Rapport fait au nom du comité de salut public par Maxmilian Robespierre sur les rapports des idées religieuses et morales avec les principes républicains, et sur les fêtes nationales. Séance du 18 floréal, 1'an second de la République française;" see art.VII, 36-37.

3. Claude Anthelme Costaz, Histoire de 1'administration en France, 2 vols, Paris, 1832, II:315-16. As the Revolutionary new year began in September, even contemporaries often erred when translating dates back to the Gregorian calendar. A different account came from Mazade d'Avèze, who was at the time Commissaire of Gobelins, Sèvres and Savonnerie. He claimed that the original idea was his and that he had actually organized the first such exposition which was scheduled for 1er jour complémentaire, an V (17 September 1797). It was cancelled when the Directory decreed that all nobility had to be thirty leagues from Paris on that day. Mazade averred that on his subsequent return to Paris he did indeed mount the show, but he provided no date. His claims were presented in a memoir written many years later in an attempt (unsuccessful) to obtain a Government pension; see his Idée première de 1'Exposition de 1'industrie française, an V de la République (1797), Paris, 1845. The first part of his story was somewhat collaborated by an article in Gazette Nationale, 1er jour complémentaire, an V (17 Sept. 1797), 1456, entitled "Grande fête au Château de Saint-Cloud." Although Mazade claimed that products of Parisian merchants were also to be exhibited, the announcement mentioned only those of the national manufacturies. No confirmation is available for the second exhibition he claims to have organized; his vagueness about the date and the long delay in putting forth his claim tend to discredit him. Nonetheless, histories of the national and universal expositions frequently cite his account.

4. Exposition Universelle de 1851, Travaux de la commission française sur 1'industrie des nations, 8 vols., Paris, 1856-73; Vol. 8: Léon de Laborde, Application des arts à 1'industrie, 216; hereafter cited as Laborde.

5. The event was added to the main fête on short notice; the first announcement was sent out on 9 fructidor,

an VI (28 August 1798). This and other documents of 1798 are contained in AN F12 985; some are reprinted in François de Neufchâteau, Recueil des lettres circulaires, 2 vols., an VII-VIII (1799-1800). The official announcements were published in Gazette Nationale, 11 fructidor, an VI (28 August 1798), 1366, and 18 fructidor, an VI (4 September 1798), 1395. The exposition was prolonged to 10 vendémiaire (1 October); see AN F12 985.

6. A complete description of the Fête de la Fondation de la République of 1er vendémiaire, an VII, can be found in the Procès-verbal, AN ADXVIII C 468, doc.58; also see the Programme, AN ADVIII-18. The entire issue of Le Rédacteur, 4 vendémiaire, an VII (25 September 1798), was devoted to an account of the fête and exposition; there were also lengthy accounts in Gazette Nationale, 1, 3, 9, 10 vendémiaire, 2 brumaire, an VII (22, 24, 30 September, 1, 23 October 1798), and Journal des Débats, Nos. 133-34; also see Paris, Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Catalogue des produits industriels qui ont été exposés au Champ-de-Mars. Procès-Verbal du Jury, vendémiaire, an VII (1798). Catalogues and reports for the industrial expositions will be hereafter cited by date alone; the bibliography contains complete listings.

7. Procès-verbal, AN ADXVIII C 468; the speech is included in Neufchâteau, Recueil, II: 292-97.

8. See Charles Simian, François de Neufchâteau et les expositions, Paris, 1889. There are also good discussions of Neufchâteau in James A. Leith, The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France 1750-1799, Toronto, 1965, 138 and A. Mathiez, La Théophilanthropie et la culte décadaire 1796-1801, Paris, 1904, 429ff.

9. AN ADXVIII C 468, doc.58.

10. Ibid. Unfortunately the statue has not survived.

11. See AN F12 985, circulaire, 24 vendémiaire, an VII, also published in Neufchâteau, Recueil, I:228-32.

12. AN C462, dossier 35, No.39: Le Directoire exécutif, au Conseil des Cinq cents, 8 thermidor, an VII (26 July 1799).

13. See Ministre de l'Intérieur Quinette, Fête de la Fondation de la République, 1er vendémiaire, an VIII, Programme, Paris, fructidor, an VII (1799).

14. Chaptal's Rapport présenté aux Consuls de la République par le ministre de l'intérieur was published in Gazette Nationale, 16 ventôse, an IX (3 March 1801), 691;

joined to it was the Arreté du 13 ventôse decreeing--once again--an annual exposition of industry.

15. The 1889 Rapport included a history of industrial expositions which stated, without evidence, that 1801 saw an unsuccessful attempt to unite art and industry; see I:28. This was subsequently repeated and embellished; see Comité français des expositions, Cinquantenaire 1885-1935, Asnières, 1935, 8 and Theodore Zeldin, France 1848-1945, 2 vols., Oxford, 1977, II: 613. On the exposition, see the 1801 Procès-verbal des opérations du Jury, and Catalogue des productions industrielles. Press accounts include Gazette Nationale, 3 vendémiaire, an X (25 September 1801), 3-6; Journal des Débats, 3e jour complémentaire, an IX, 1, 2 vendémiaire, an X (20, 23, 24 September 1801); Le Citoyen français, 1er jour complémentaire; the Programme was published in Gazette Nationale, 15 fructidor, an IX (3 September 1801). On the Salon, see Paris, Explication des ouvrages, an IX (1801). On David's show see the announcement in Gazette Nationale, 5e jour complémentaire, an IX (21 September 1801), 1506; on the occasion of his first private show he published a brochure justifying the admission fee; see Paris, Le Tableau des Sabines, exposé publiquement au palais national des sciences et des arts, an VIII (1799).

16. See Dowd, 119; The documents in AN FIC III-Seine 25 identify Chalgrin as the "architecte des fêtes nationales" and most of the correspondence is addressed to him. The role of Neufchâteau was also important, however, as Mathiez pointed out. Chalgrin is identified as the architect of the 1801 fête in Gazette Nationale of 3 vendémiaire, an X, 3.

17. See the account of Citoyen Camus, "Notes sur l'exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, qui a eu lieu dans les jours complémentaires de l'an 6 et de l'an 9, lues à la séance publique de l'Institut national, le 15 nivôse an 10," Gazette Nationale, 17 nivôse, an X (7 January 1802), 429-30; also see Journal des Débats, 17 nivôse, an X, 3. The florid style in which Camus described all the exhibitions was the cause of the misunderstanding, for his account formed the basis--usually unacknowledged--of most nineteenth century accounts. His phrase "nul art n'est excepté," later used to "prove" that art and industry participated in the same exposition, originally carried a footnote attributing it to Neufchâteau's circulaire of 9 fructidor, an VI, announcing the first industrial exposition; Neufchâteau was referring to the arts mécaniques not the beaux-arts.

18. Camus, 430.

19. See, for example, Blanchard de la Musse, De l'Influence des arts sur le bonheur et sur la civilisation des hommes, Paris, an X (1801).

20. 1798 Catalogue, 18; also see the untitled article in Gazette de France, 2 juillet 1805, 1127.

21. No one has advanced any evidence of quarrels between artists and artisans at the expositions, nor have I been able to find any. There is, however, the directive sent from the Ministre de l'Intérieur Decazes to the Préfets in 1819, apparently in response to criticism that "artistes" (i.e. artisans) were not receiving prizes; he stated: "Un mécanicien, un simple contremaître ou même un ouvrier doué de l'esprit observateur....Ce sont ces artistes que le Roi a voulu honorer." See 1819 Rapport du jury central, 392.

22. See Camus, and also the first history of the national expositions: Achille de Colmont, Histoire des expositions des produits de l'industrie française, Paris, 1855, 7.

23. The Procès-verbal of the third exposition (1802) divided the products into arts mécaniques (horlogerie, art monétaire, instruments de mathématiques et de physique) and beaux-arts (orfèvrerie, gravure, meubles). Subsequent catalogues and reports followed this schema, which became increasingly complex.

24. It became customary for each Rapport to show progress by listing the number of exhibitors in previous expositions. After 1849 the charts presented a complete summary; see Figure 7. Laborde published a chart for the Salons in his Application des arts à l'industrie, 20; the statistics for the 1849 Salon are taken from the 1850 Salon catalogue.

25. See the 1819 Rapport du jury central, 55-56; from then on, each Rapport listed those taken into the Légion d'honneur.

26. See the 1827 Rapport, xvi; his request was made at the awards ceremony, 5 October 1827.

27. Engravings of the paintings were reproduced in Moléon, Cochaud, and Paulin-Desormeaux, Musée Industriel, 4 vols., Paris, 1835-38, I:19.

28. Rey's memoir is contained in AN ADXI 67.

29. The decorations were described in the 1849 Rapport du jury central, I: xxix-xxxiii.

30. For Neufchâteau's speech, see AN ADXCIII C 468, doc.58; for Chaptal's statement, see the 1801 Procès-verbal, 35.

31. See Stéphane Flachat, L'Industrie, Exposition de 1834, Paris, 1834, 34.

32. For an analysis of this criticism, see Léon Resenthal, Du Romantisme au Réalisme, Paris, 1914, 3ff.

33. Laborde, 224-25.

34. In the arrêté and circulaire announcing the 1849 exposition, the word artiste didn't appear; this is a change from earlier expositions, although the term was used less and less as the century advanced; for the official announcements, see the 1849 Rapport du jury central I: v-x.

CHAPTER III

THE CRYSTAL PALACE, 1851

National exhibitions of industry were held with increasing frequency throughout Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century but were never popular in England, for British manufacturers were already leading the world and did not feel the need for what were seen as foreign-inspired events.[1] Nonetheless, it was England who initiated the era of international exhibitions by holding, in 1851, the Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations (Figure 10). So closely was it modelled on French precedents, that it took as its basis a detailed report covering all aspects of the 1849 Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, visited by Henry Cole and Digby Wyatt in preparation for an 1851 National Quinquennial Exhibition of British Industry.[2] Henry Cole described the interview with Prince Albert which followed their return.

> I asked the Prince if he had considered if the Exhibition should be a National or an International Exhibition. The French had discussed if their own Exhibition should be International, and had preferred that it should be National only. The Prince reflected for a minute, and then said, "it must embrace foreign productions" to use his words, and added emphatically, "International, certainly." [3]

The minutes of the meeting held the next day gave a less dramatic account, stressing that "particular advantage to British Industry might be derived from placing it in fair competition with that of other Nations."[4]

Although told in understated British style, the story is based on nineteenth century economic reality. The first half century had been characterized by customs barriers and strict controls on foreign trade to protect local industries. Around mid-century, an era of economic expansion began: the idea of uniting products of all nations in great international exhibitions followed logically from the necessity of selling to all nations. Just as logical was the British sponsorship of the first such event, for England was already the most advanced industrial nation with the most developed foreign markets.

The French failure to hold the first international exhibition resulted in national humiliation in which several lines of defense emerged, repeated to the present day. Most characteristic is that of Léon de Laborde: "L'Angleterre, copiste hardie, nous avait enlevé l'initiative d'une Exposition universelle."[5] It was (and still is) repeatedly stressed that France had held the <u>first</u> industrial exposition in 1798, that international ones had been suggested in 1833, 1844, 1849, but the idea had each time been defeated by a small clique of selfish

businessmen.[6] Prince Napoléon wrote the classic defense;

> Je tiens à revendiquer pour la France la première idée d'une Exposition universelle. Dès 1849, la proposition en avait été faite dans nos assemblées législatives. Si l'Angleterre nous a précédés dans l'application, il faut l'attribuer aux événements politiques, à certains intérêts trop faciles à effrayer, et aussi à la différence du génie des deux nations, l'une plus prompte a conçevoir, l'autre à réaliser.[7]

Only later did British historians claim that these shows were originally a British idea, traceable to the Society of Arts exhibitions of tools of industry which began in 1761.[8] French historians dispute this, either by pointing out that the 1798 Paris exposition included the products, not just the tools of industry, or by citing the 1683 Paris exposition of models of machinery.[9] In any case, W. Blanchard Jerrold's History of Industrial Exhibitions, published in 1851 in the Illustrated London News, gave credit to the French.[10]

In the Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, there was one major change in the structure taken over from France. The fine arts--painting alone excluded--would, for the first time, enjoy official status. The reason advanced by the Royal Commissioners for the exclusion of painting was that "being but little affected by material conditions, it seemed to rank as an independent art."[11] Léon de Laborde, who was the only French member of the Exhibition's Fine Arts Commission, had

reason for concern over the exclusion of painting. Asking himself how the French could best compete with the British, he had come to the conclusion that France's strongest asset was "le bon goût."[12] Art was the one area in which the French felt confident of their superiority; with the decision to exclude painting, they lost that competitive edge. The result was a barrage of French criticism attacking the British as Philistine.[13] The 1851 Great Exhibition was actually an advance over the eleven French ones in terms of the fine arts: for the first time sculpture was included as the work of individual artists, not the product of the Foundry or Atelier. Considered half art, half métier, sculpture occupied an ambiguous position throughout the nineteenth century, but here, for the first time in an industrial exposition, its creative aspect was recognized. Nonetheless, according to Laborde, French sculptors were unenthusiastic about participating.

> Malheureusement nos artistes prenaient en grande indifférence l'appel qui leur était fait. Ce n'était ni le trouble apporté dans les études par une révolution, ni le découragement, conséquence de l'interruption des travaux et des commandes, ni la crainte de faire courir les risques d'un long voyage à des oeuvres délicates et précieuses, qui les détournaient de ce concours: c'était une cause plus futile et plus grave à la fois: elle doit être franchement déclarée. J'avais sollicité et obtenu de la commission préparatoire française la mission de parcourir nos ateliers et de stimuler le zèle. J'allai partout, je ne trouvai de sympathie nulle part. "L'art n'est pas de l'industrie, me répondirent nos artistes: qu'irons-nous faire dans un bazar?" Porté par l'ensemble de mes études à n'admettre aucune distinction entre

> l'art et l'industrie, trouvant les esprits les plus éminents rebelles à cette idée, je me creusai la tête pour parvenir à préciser la distinction qu'ils prétendaient établir et pour amener le rapprochement qui me paraissait si désirable.... J'eus beau dire, j'eus beau prendre en exemple les plus grands artistes de l'antiquité et de la Renaissance, rien n'y fit. C'était un préjugé enraciné, et qu'y a-t-il de plus fort qu'un préjugé? L'opinion de l'Académie peut-être? Je le pensais alors, et je fis porter la question devant la classe des beaux-arts de l'Institut, espérant qu'un appel éclairé, venant de si haut, effaçerait ces lignes de démarcation que le temps et le progrès, la marche des idées et la fusion des classes ont balayées depuis longtemps. Je m'étais trompé: la vieille quérelle de l'art et des métiers se réchauffa comme au premier jour de la création de l'Académie de peinture et de sculpture. L'illustre corps décida que ses membres et les artistes seraient engagés à ne pas se commettre à Londres avec l'industrie. 14

Despite this setback, Laborde did convince some sculptors to exhibit. It turned out to be an Academician's nightmare, with both catalogue and installation conflating all types of work (Figure 11). Pradier, whose Phryné (Figure 12) obtained the Council Medal, the highest award, was listed along with Specimens of woolen yarn combed by machinery. Antoine Etex found his Cain's Family (Figure 13) neighbor to Madame Ernest's Specimens of stays without seams, and Auguste DeBay's Eve and her Children (Figure 14) made an appearance next to an artifical foot.[15] François Rude and David d'Angers prudently abstained.

Two hundred years of effort to elevate the status of the beaux-arts went for naught, it seemed, for the British had used sculpture to "decorate" the more important

displays. Jules Janin thought the Apocalypse was near:

> Mais, nous dit-on, l'ornement le voulait, et il fallait nécessairement de quoi remplire les places vides... Des places vides! y songez-vous, quand il s'agit du jugement dernier de l'industrie et de la sueur des travailleurs sous le soleil et dans les entrailles de la terre! Des places vides, quand c'était, il n'y a pas longtemps, le grand souci de tous les maîtres de savoir où se placer! Des places vides... le triste aveu que ce serait là de l'impuissance du genre humain! et, en fin de compte, le beau métier pour l'art sérieux, pour les artistes sérieux, de servir d'ornement et de jouet à l'oeuvre de l'artisan! Allez donc asseoir, maladroits, la Vénus de Milo sur une éclume; attelez l'Apollon du Belvédère à un ballot de marchandises, faites donc une enseigne à bière du Jupiter de Phidias! 16

Had Janin seen the allegorical figures Elias Robert would carve for the Palais de l'Industrie in 1855 (Figure 1), he might well have accused him of plagiarizing his metaphor.

French Sculpture, English Morals: Clésinger's "Bacchante" at the Crystal Palace

The 1851 Great Exhibition established a precedent for subsequent Universal Expositions, for it articulated the contradiction of industry that looked to the future and art that looked to the past. Antoine Etex's Cain's Family, for example, had made his reputation at the Salon of 1833; DeBay's Eve and her Children and Pradier's Phryné had both enjoyed success at the Salon of 1845, and Clésinger's Bacchante (Figure 15) had been the sensation of the Salon of 1848. The art exhibitions at these international events

were to be retrospective at best, retardataire at worst.

Naturally enough, French sculptors in 1851 were rewarded with honors; to do less would have been impolite to an invited guest.[17] And so was set another precedent, that Universal Expositions would honor abroad the very same artists who were most esteemed at home, and for the very same works. Yet there were exceptions which, because of their rarity, are all the more interesting, occasions on which differing values at home and abroad produced violent clashes of opinion. Such was the case of Clésinger in 1851.

Clésinger's first Salon success had come in 1847 with his Femme piquée par un serpent, now in the Louvre (Figure 16).[18] Popularly known as La Volupté, it was supposedly modelled from life cases of Apollonie Sabatier, the well known courtesan La Présidente who had been the mistress of many, including Baudelaire and Clésinger himself. The pose, characterized by Chopin as "plus qu'indécente," was somewhat delicately explained by Théophile Gautier: "Peut-être cette femme couchée, avant la morsure du serpent, ou en même temps, si vous voulez, avait reçu un baiser...."[19] The serpent, known to have been added at the last minute merely to ensure the work's acceptance by the jury as a classical subject, in no way challenged the general perception of the work as "tout-à-fait moderne."[20]

For Gautier, it was "un chef-d'oeuvre qui n'est ni une déesse, ni une nymphe, ni une dryade, ni une oréade, ni une océanide, mais tout bonnement une femme."[21] It was a *succès de scandale*, to be sure, but a success nonetheless, and it immediately established Clésinger, at 33, as one of France's leading sculptors.

In an attempt to capitalize on this success, and to defend himself from charges that he had merely produced a life cast, Clésinger soon began work on another sculpture, "une bacchante de huit pieds qu'on ne pourrait pas l'accuser d'avoir moulée sur nature," as he wrote to a friend.[22] His *Bacchante* was instantly recognized to be superior to the *Femme piquée*, "une nouvelle leçon du même texte," Fabien Pillet called it in *Le Moniteur Universel*,[23] and in the Salon of 1848 it won a first class medal. Gautier published, first in *La Presse* and later in *L'Artiste*, a long and glowing appreciation of *Bacchante*'s charms:

> Sa *Bacchante*, pour l'oeil comme pour l'esprit, est bien la soeur de sa *Femme piquée*, soeur reconnaissable, mais différente, comme doivent l'être les oeuvres des natures originales. Dans l'une, c'est l'ivresse, ou, si vous le préférez, la douleur de la volupté; dans l'autre, c'est le pur délire orgiaque, la Ménale echevelée qui se roule aux pieds de Bacchus, le père de liberté et de joie. [24]

Warming to his task, he went on to eulogize every part of *Bacchante*'s body: "Un puissant spasme de bonheur soulève

par sa contraction l'opulente poitrine de la jeune femme, et en fait saillir les seins étincelants." In sum, he pronounced it "un des plus beaux morceaux de la sculpture moderne."

Fabien Pillet, described the popular reception of the work: "On admire dans cette bacchante la beauté des formes, leur prodigieuse souplesse, l'élastique fermeté des chairs et une expression d'ivresse voluptueuse qui ne laisse aucun doute sur les divers genres de jouissances auxquelles se livraient sans réserve les prêtresses de Bacchus."[25]

It is not, then, surprising that Clésinger chose to send his Bacchante to London, no doubt expecting to reap similar praise in an international context. Alexis de Valon described the exhibition for the Revue des Deux Mondes:

> Plus loin, entourée des tapis des Gobelins, de Beauvais, d'Aubusson, des porcelaines de Sèvres, se tord la bacchante de M. Clésinger. . . . Cette statue pourra bien confirmer cependant l'opinion qu'on a de nous, et Dieu sait qu'elle n'est pas bonne. L'autre jour, j'allais retenir un logement pour un de mes amis; le prix était arrêté, quand le propriétaire, se ravisant: 'C'est pour un monsieur français? me demanda-t-il. --Oui, sans doute, répliquai-je. --Alors, je ne puis pas vous louer, continua-t-il; nous avons des ladies dans la maison.' [26]

The Exhibition jury proved to be of the same opinion as the innkeeper. In his official government report, Léon de Laborde stated that he had originally obtained a bronze

medal for Clésinger:

> Mais, au moment de la révision, un membre anglais du Jury s'opposa fortement, dans l'intérêt de la morale et, je crois même, de la religion, à récompenser 'une oeuvre dont la beauté ne faisait que rendre plus coupable l'intention immorale.' Je fis mes efforts pour écarter cette fin de non-reçevoir; je demandai à mes collègues de se considérer comme juges d'objets d'art et non pas d'actes de vertus: j'échouai; la XXXe classe, agissant comme Ve groupe, procéda à la révision de son propre travail et revint sur sa première décision: M. Clésinger fut rayé de la liste des récompenses. Tout ce qu'on m'accorda, ce fut d'insérer dans le procès-verbal les motifs de cette exclusion.... [27]

And indeed one can read in the official Reports by the Juries the following entry for Clésinger: "The Jury, for reasons totally independent of the acknowledged merits of this young artist, abstained, with regret, from awarding a high mark of approbation to this work." [28] Laborde could not, however, prevent the Royal Commissioners from publishing a Supplementary Report which described in detail the objections to the work:

> J. Clésinger, A Bacchante, °1709. A Bacchante who is rolling on the ground in a state of drunken excitement. This figure is remarkable for the masterly chiselling of the marble, the great knowledge of anatomy, and the beauty of the countenance; but these excellences do not sufficiently excuse the sculptor for having in this work allowed his imagination to be perverted and degraded to the service of a low sensuality. Moreover, the treatment of the hair is at variance with the principles of a good style, and there is a great want of taste in the arrangement of the folds of the drapery. The Jury considered this subject to be of an objectionable character, but have made Honorable Mention of the excellences pointed out above. [29]

More to the taste of the British was the coy sensuality and implicit voyeurism of Pradier's Phryné. "C'est un talent froid et académique," Baudelaire had written of him, and Pradier was indeed detested by the entire Romantic generation.[30] He depicted Phryné, the famed Athenian courtesan, stripped by her lawyer in front of the court which was trying her for impiety. On seeing her naked, the jury promptly acquitted her; the 1851 jury was no less appreciative of Phryné's charms, and, just as promptly, awarded Pradier a Council Medal, the highest award.[31]

The English reaction to Clésinger's Bacchante was either never known or soon forgotten in France where, in any case, the coup d'état of 2 December 1851 and the bleak beginnings of the Second Empire soon provided more serious subjects for discussion.[32] After 1851, the Bacchante entered the collection of Prince Demidoff, and disappeared from view. Clésinger, despite his disappointment in London, had discovered his métier, and spent the rest of his life turning out variations on this theme, resulting in considerable confusion as to their identity and dating.[33]

The Bacchante, never photographed and never exhibited after 1851, was donated to the city of Paris in 1922 by the princesse de Monaco and Georges Heine, and is now in the Petit Palais, in need of minor restoration before it can be

displayed. It deserves to be better known, however, as one of Clésinger's best works, as an early precursor of the erotic work of Rodin, and because, on the occasion of the first International Exhibition, it caused a major clash between French sculpture and English morals.

The Painting Exhibition That Might Have Been

Either Laborde and the French critics were being less than candid when they railled against the British for being Philistine enough to omit painting in 1851, or perhaps they honestly did not know that there had been a serious attempt to include such an exhibition. A dossier in the Archives Nationales preserves the following unpublished correspondence which, because of its importance, is here quoted in its entirety:[34]

Londres, 4 Trafalgar Square
le 5 Avril 1851

A Monsieur le Ministre de l'Intérieur de la République Française, à Paris

Monsieur le Ministre

Nous avons l'honneur de vous exposer que par nos soins une exhibition de Peinture et Sculpture va s'ouvrir à Londres en même temps que celle des produits de l'industrie.

Si vous daignez prendre connaissance des conditions dans lesquelles sera faite cette exposition, presque exclusivement consacrée aux artistes français, et dont les statuts ainsi que les plans sont annexés à notre démande, nous osons espérer que vous voudriez bien nous apporter l'appui et le concours du Gouvernement

français pour l'exécution de cette entreprise, qui doit être pour les grands artistes de votre pays une occasion telle qu'ils n'en trouveraient de plus favorables pour être connus et appréciés dignement.

Qu'il nous soit permis d'ajouter, Monsieur le Ministre, que vous n'aurez pas favorisé une spéculation privée, mais bien une entreprise éminemment nationale et philanthropique puisque les recettes, ainsi qu'un de nos statuts nous l'impose, sont aux conditions (que vous trouverez ci-jointes) consacrées à des acquisitions ou à des commandes reservées aux artistes français.

Nous avons l'honneur d'être avec une considération respectueuse, Monsieur le Ministre, Vos très humbles et très obéissants Serviteurs.

Green, Prince et Cie

Attached to this letter was the following document, specifying the nature of the proposed exposition:

Note relative à l'Exposition de Peinture et de Sculpture des Artistes français dans le palais de Brompton à Londres.

A peu de distance du Palais de Cristal réservé à l'exposition des produits de l'industrie s'élçve un autre palais consacré à une exposition de Peinture et Sculpture.

Cet édifice construit sur la route de Brompton à quelques minutes de distance de l'exposition universelle couvre sur un terrain d'environ 3 arpens et demi une surface de 2800 mètres carrés.

Ce nouveau palais élevé aux frais et par les soins de Messieurs Green et Cie, Directeurs, est en fer et en verre isolé de toute autre construction avec une façade d'un côté sur la route de Brompton et de l'autre borné par un grand jardin. Il contient 17 Salons et galeries disposées sur le plan des galeries du rez de chaussée au palais national à Paris, savoir: trois grands Salons de 75 pieds Anglais sur 35, hauteur environ 38 pieds. Deux galeries de 75

pieds Anglais sur 32, 12 Salons de 25 p.A. sur 32, hauteur environs 20 p. Le développement des cloisons en fer, destinées à reçevoir les ouvrages de peinture est de 6500 mètres carrés.

Monsieur Green fait un appel spécial aux artistes français, jamais conditions plus favorables ne leur auront été réservées.

L'exposition de l'académie royale à Londres ouvre le 1er Mai et finit à la fin de Juillet, ainsi les productions des artistes Anglais qui y figurent presque exclusivement ne seraient point admis dans les galeries de Brompton.

Monsieur Green réserve aux artistes francais la jouissance exclusive de deux grands Salons, de l'une des deux grandes galeries et de six à huit des autres Salons. Toutes les sommes qui seront perçues à l'entrée seront, déductions faite des frais de construction et d'administration, appliquées en acquisitions ou commandes.

En aucun cas ces ouvrages d'art se peuvent être retenus comme garantie des frais de construction ou de toute autre dépense.

L'Exposition de peinture ouvrira environ 15 jours après l'exposition de l'industrie. Sa durée sera la même. Les ouvrages seront rendus dans le délai d'un mois après la fermeture.

Messieurs Green et Cie, Directeur, et le comité Anglais solliciteraient l'appui et le concours du Gouvernement français dans les conditions qui ont été faites aux exposants français de l'industrie à Londres, acceptant d'avance celles qui croirait devoir leur imposer Monsieur le Ministre de l'Intérieur.

The same dossier contains a scribe's copy of Green's letter and proposal, probably made in the French Ministry for administrative purposes. Besides minor stylistic changes, the copy omits sculpture from the proposed exposition (it would be included at the Crystal Palace in any case), specifies a French director, and includes a

malicious rewriting of the sixth paragraph which now reads: "L'exposition de l'Académie Royale à Londres est ouverte du 1er Mai à la fin de Juillet, et les artistes anglais qui n'y accordent aux étrangers qu'une hospitalité restreinte et un peu jalouse, ne seraient point admis dans les galeries de Brompton."

A third copy identical with this "edited" French version was resubmitted to the Ministry joined to a petition by twenty-eight artists urging acceptance of the proposal:

> Aux conditions précédemment énoncées et sous la réserve d'un Jury qui n'admettrait au palais de Brompton que les ouvrages qui pourront dignement représenter l'art français à Londres, les artistes français soussignés déclarent apporter leur adhésion au projet ci-joint soumis à l'approbation de Mr le Ministre de l'intérieur.

Léon Cogniet	Meissonier	Th. Rousseau
Eugène Delacroix	Th. Couture	Leleux
Barye	Ch. L. Muller	Nanteuil
Eugène Isabey	H. Lehmann	Hédouin
Corot	Vidal	Billotte
Lepoittevin	Landelle	Gendron
Steinheil	Pollet	Jalabert
Etex	A. Millet	H. Bellangé
Frémiet	C. Flers	
Ottin	G. Fisher	

This list is strikingly similar in composition to a Commission of artists elected 13 March 1851, with Cogniet as President, for the purpose of establishing a permanent fine-arts exhibition.[35] With the exception of Cogniet himself, always somewhat of a maverick, and Nanteuil,

Academiciens did not sign this petition; their absence lends credence to Laborde's accusation of a boycott.

As the British offer did not emanate directly from the Royal Commissioners, it presented a problem to the French, and it was probably at this point that the Ministre de l'Intérieur scrawled a hasty note on unmarked paper, undated, unsigned: "Je ne puis pas m'occuper de cette correspondance tant qu'elle ne soit pas accompagnée d'un avis pour me diriger sur le parti à prendre par l'administration." Whatever response he received must have been encouraging for there is a draft of a positive response to Green's letter:

> Ministère de l'Intérieur, 5e Division, 1er Bureau. 1851.
>
> Messieurs, J'ai reçu la lettre que vous m'avez adressée et qui est relative à une exposition de peinture et de sculpture, consacrée principalement aux oeuvres des artistes français, que vous voudriez faire à Londres en même temps que l'Exposition des produits de l'Industrie, et pour laquelle vous me demandez le concours et l'appui du Gouvernement français.
>
> Je verrais avec satisfaction qu'il fut possible de donner suite à un projet qui peut offrir aux artistes une occasion favorable de faire apprécier le mérite de leurs oeuvres. Je serai donc disposé à en faciliter l'exécution dans les limites de ce qui me paraîtra possible et convenable. C'est ainsi que je mettrai volontiers à la disposition du comité, qui sera sans doute désigné pour diriger l'Exposition, et s'occuper du choix des ouvrages qui devront en faire partie, un local où ces ouvrages pourraient être déposés et soumis à l'examen préalable. J'interviendrai même, au besoin, auprès de mon Collègue, le Ministre des Finances, pour qu'il veuille bien, de son côté, accorder toutes les

facilités désirables pour l'envoi et le retour des objets d'art qui devront être expédiés à Londres. Mais vous comprendrez, Messieurs, qu'avant tout, il est indispensable que je sois instruit d'une manière très positive de la constitution et de la composition du comité qui doit la diriger et qu'il ne pourra être donné suite à l'affaire que lorsque ce renseignement m'aura été transmis.

Agréez, Messieurs, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Le Ministre de l'Intérieur 36

It seems that the artists were not satisfied with the administrative attitude, however, for the next development was a petition addressed by Baron Taylor, President of the Comité de l'Association des Artistes, to Louis Napoléon himself. The petition, although not preserved, was probably similar to the previous one, and it had the desired effect: the Président de la République sent it to the Ministre de l'Intérieur, who sent it to the Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce, who had no one to send it to, for he was the one responsible for the French section of the 1851 Great Exhibition. Drafts of two of the letters have been preserved.

Ministère de l'Intérieur, 5e Division, 1er Bureau. Exposition de Londres.

Paris, le 10 Avril 1851. Le Ministre à M. le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce.

Monsieur le Ministre et chers Collègues, Le Comité de l'Association des Artistes a adressé à M. le Président de la République la demande d'une subvention sur les fonds votés pour l'Exposition de l'Industrie de Londres, qui permettrait aux artistes français d'envoyer leurs oeuvres en Angleterre, afin de concourir à l'Exposition des

ouvrages des peintres Européens qui y aura lieu prochainement dans un vaste local situé à James Square 13.

L'Exposition de l'Industrie étant dans vos attributions, il vous appartient d'effectuer sur la demande du Comité de l'Association des Artistes. Je vous la renvoie donc et je la recommande à tout votre intérêt.

Agréez

* * *

Ministère de l'Intérieur, 5e Division, 1er Bureau. Exposition de Londres.

Paris, le 10 Avril 1851. Le Ministre à M. Taylor, Président du Comité de l'Association des Artistes.

Monsieur, J'ai l'honneur de vous annoncer que je viens d'envoyer à M. le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce, qui a dans ses attributions l'Exposition de Londres, la demande d'une subvention que vous avez adressée à M. le Président de la République, afin de pourvoir aux frais que nécessitera l'Expedition pour Londres des tableaux que les artistes français voudront y faire figurer à l'Exposition des oeuvres des peintres Européens.

En mettant cette demande à M. le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce, je l'ai recommandé à tout son intérêt.

Agréez

Foot-dragging and lack of enthusiasm on the part of the French government appears to have provoked this letter from the French Director of the project, Zul. Goddé, to Guizard, the Government Directeur des Beaux-Arts. To it was attached a design of the proposed exhibition building, labelled "PICTURE GALLERY" (Figure 17). The architecture

was to be as classical as the Crystal Palace was modern, no doubt to reassure artists uneasy about the conjunction of art and industry.

Monsieur le Directeur

Chargé de la Direction et de l'organisation d'une Exposition de Peinture à Londres consacrée spécialement aux Artistes Français, et qui aura lieu dans un vaste local construit à cet effet, et sur le plan des Galeries du Palais national (à Brompton, Londres), J'ai accepté cette délicate mission sous la réserve de l'autorisation et de la surveillance du Gouvernement français.

Ce matin, J'ai eu l'honneur d'être reçu par Monsieur le Ministre de l'Intérieur qui a daigné accueillir ma demande avec une bienveillance extrême. Permettez moi d'insister auprès de vous, Monsieur le Directeur, pour que le rapport demandé par le Ministre soit immédiatement mis sous ses yeux. M. le Ministre a si bien compris l'urgence d'une décision qu'il a bien voulu ajouter qu'il n'attendait que votre rapport pour la prendre.

J'ai l'honneur de vous transmettre copie des pièces remises par moi ce matin à Mr le Ministre. Un plan des Constructions y est annexé.

Vous connaissez, Monsieur le Directeur, les noms éminents qui veulent bien figurer en tête du Comité. Permettez moi d'ajouter, Monsieur le Directeur, que les noms de nos premiers artistes qui adhérent au projet soumis à votre approbation, sont une garantie non moins précieuse. Il dépendra de vous, M. le Directeur, que cette Exposition nouvelle soit ainsi glorieuse et profitable pour les artistes dont la cause est remise à votre bienveillante intervention.

Agréez, Monsieur le Directeur, les respectueuses salutations de Votre devoué Serviteur

Zul. Goddé, Direction de l 'Exposition

française de Peinture à Brompton, Londres.

Paris, 15 Avril 1851

The efforts of Goddé, Baron Taylor and French artists all went for naught. The decision made two weeks later by the Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce appears to have been based solely on grounds of economy.

> Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Commerce. Division du Commerce extérieur. Exposition de Londres. A M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur. Paris, le 30 Avril 1851.
>
> Monsieur et cher Collègue; vous m'avez fait l'honneur de me transmettre, le 10 de ce mois, une demande du Comité de l'Association des Artistes, ayant pour objet de faire supporter par le Crédit de l'Exposition de Londres, le transport, en cette ville, des oeuvres des artistes français qui voudraient envoyer à l'exposition universelle de peinture qui se prépare en ce moment.
>
> Le crédit voté par l'assemblée legislative a, Monsieur et cher Collègue, une destination spéciale qui ne me permet pas d'en affecter une partie à une dépense de la nature de celle dont il s'agit. J'éprouve donc le regret de ne pouvoir accueillir la demande du Comité de l'Association des Artistes, à laquelle il vous appartiendrait peut-être plus spécialement de donner satisfaction.
>
> Agréez, Monsieur et cher Collègue, l'assurance de ma haute considération.
>
> Le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce

Across this letter was written: "Faire connaître cette réponse au comité des artistes." And so was written the last letter of the series:

> Ministère de l'Intérieur, Exposition de Londres. Paris, le 17 Mai 185-. Le ministre à M. Taylor, Président du Comité de l'Association des

Artistes.

Monsieur, Ainsi que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous en informer par ma letter de 10 Avril, J'ai transmis à M. le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce, en recommandant à son intérêt, la demande d'une subvention que vous avez adressée à M. le Président de la République afin de pourvoir aux frais que nécessite l'Expedition pour Londres des Tableaux que les artistes français voudront faire figurer à l'Exposition universelle qui a lieu dans cette ville.

M. le Ministre de l'Agriculture et du Commerce vient de me répondre que le crédit voté par l'Assemblée Legislative a une destination spéciale qui ne lui permet pas d'en affecter une partie à une dépense de la nature de celle dont il s'agit. Il ne peut donc accueillir la demande que vous avez formée, et comme, de mon côté, je n'ai aucun moyen de vous donner satisfaction, il ne me reste qu'à vous en exprimer tous mes regrets.

Agréez

M. le Ministre, le Directeur des Beaux-Arts

And so, if there was no painting in the 1851 Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, the fault lay not with the Philistine English, but with the stingy French, who refused to pay even the modest cost of shipping the work to London.

This exchange between French art and commerce in 1851 might well serve as an introduction to the era of Universal Expositions. Artists and industrialists were getting along no better than had artists and artisans two centuries before, but the Bourgeoisie had replaced the Monarchy as the nation's ruler, and had brought along its traditional preference for métier as opposed to art. As a result,

preference for métier as opposed to art. As a result, beginning in the Second Republic, the relationship between these two traditional rivals was transformed; Industry from now on would play the dominant role.

From the Palace of Crystal to the Palace of Industry

Despite the absence of painting, France did well at the London Exhibition, winning 1051 out of 5187 prizes. In the area of fine arts, France received more awards than any other country, including England.[37] Despite continued Government condemnation of the production of luxury goods throughout eleven national expositions, the first international one clearly showed France's strength to lie precisely in this area. Léon de Laborde thus had an opportunity to drive home his favorite point:

> Tous les grands pays industriels ont dirigé leurs efforts vers le bon marché. La France seule, par caractère, par disposition native et par cette éducation dont j'ai esquissé les principaux traits, a poursuivi la perfection de l'oeuvre par l'intervention des arts dans l'industrie, par la bonne fabrication et les soins apportés à l'exécution des moindres détails.... Pour la France, le bon marché consiste dans l'élégance de la forme, de l'arrangement, de l'ajustement, de la disposition générale; elle vise au bon marché de ce qui est seduisant; jamais au bon marché du laid et du grossier. 38

Of course France had, since 1798, directed manufacturers and juries to concentrate on mass-produced ordinary objects, but in an international context that was best

forgotten, for now it was luxury items, in which aesthetic quality had not been sacrificed to cheap quantity production, which were rewarded. Laborde even managed to circumvent the British attempt to exclude French national manufacturies from consideration for awards because they were subsidized, not competitive. He obtained the Council Medal for Gobelins and Sèvres for "originality and beauty of design" and "extraordinary excellence of execution," despite the fact that they had been excluded from competition in France since 1798.[39]

This contradiction was duly noted and utilized by the French opposition press. Revue des Deux Mondes, Orleanist and critical of the Second Republic, commented:

> La France, dont on veut faire le foyer de la démocratie universelle, la France, je le répète, est éminemment artistocratique par son industrie.... Ce pays de République démocratique s'inquiète peu des produits communs, mais il couvre le monde de ses oeuvres d'une richesse incomparable.... Tant qu'il y aura des gens riches sur la terre pour acheter nos soieries, nos velours, nos porcelaines, nos tapis, nos bronzes, nos tableaux, nos statues, qu'on ne s'inquiète pas de la prospérité de notre commerce. [40]

Polemics apart, the unanticipated success of the French fine arts section in London was a major factor in the reversal of attitude that occurred in France by the 1855 Exposition Universelle, France's answer to 1851. Not only was it the first to include an official international section embracing all the fine arts, but the Bourgeois

cost-accountants of the Second Republic were forced--temporarily--to give way before the necessity of establishing the glory of Empire. As Florent LeComte had written in 1699 of the first Salon, foreigners would come to admire and would be forced to admit that only France was capable of producing such masterpieces, and the glory would redound to the King (in this case Napoléon III) who, by his generosity and protection, had brought the arts to such a pinacle of perfection.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

The section of this chapter entitled French Sculpture, English Morals: Clésinger's "Bacchante" at the Crystal Palace was taken from my article of that title in Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1983, 215-220.

1. For a survey and bibliography of early expositions, see Kenneth E. Carpenter, "Industrial Exhibitions before 1851 and their Publications," Harvard Business School, Kress Library of Business and Economics Bulletin 7 (April 1971).

2. A good general account of British exhibitions is that of Kenneth W. Luckhurst, The Story of Exhibitions, London/N.Y., 1951. On the 1851 Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, see the Archives of The Victoria and Albert Museum, Collection of Printed Documents and Forms used in Carrying on the Business of the Exhibition of 1851, 6 vols.; the Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue, 3 vols. + supp.; the Reports by the Juries; the memoirs of Sir Henry Cole, Fifty Years of Public Work, 2 vols., London, 1884. Some recent accounts include Christopher Hobhouse, 1851 and the Crystal Palace, London, 1950; C.H. Gibbs-Smith, ed., The Great Exhibition of 1851, A Commemorative Album, London, 1950; Y. ffrench, The Great Exhibition, 1851, London, 1951. French accounts include the eight volume official report Travaux de la Commission française sur l'industrie des nations, and Michel Chevalier, Exposition universelle de Londres, considérée sous les rapports philosophiques, techniques, commercials et administratifs au point de vue français, 2 vols., Paris, 1851. On the relationship of 1849 to 1851, see the V. & A. Archives, I: (Document 10) "A Report on the Eleventh French Exposition of the Products of Industry, prepared by the direction of and submitted to the President and Council of the Society of Arts by Matthew Digby Wyatt, Architect. September 1849. London." Also see I: (Document 5) "Statement of Proceedings Preliminary to the Exhibition of Industry of All Nations, 1851."

3. Cole, I:123; for his account of the 1851 Exhibition, see 116-205.

4. V. & A. Archives, I: (Document 6) "Minutes of Meeting 30 June 1849 at Buckingham Palace. Prince Albert, T. Cubitt, H. Cole, F. Fuller, J. Scott Russell," 2.

5. Laborde, 234.

6. As virtually every French history cites these dates

without documentation, I have had to track down the sources (where they exist). In 1833, J. Boucher de Perthes suggested at a local industrial exposition that these events be made international; considering his position as a customs inspector, his speech is interesting only in that it later provided an apology for French priority in the conception of international expositions; see his Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie de l'arrondissement d'Abbeville, 1833, Abbeville, 1834. Démy's claim that the jury in 1844 asked for an international exposition is untrue; compare Démy, 32, and the 1844 Rapport du jury central, I:L. Four months before the opening of the 1849 exposition, L. Buffet, the Ministre de l'agriculture et du commerce, did send a circulaire to the members of the chambres de commerce asking if they would like to invite foreign industry to participate; they would not; see AN ADXIXD 256, "Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Commerce, Division de Commerce Intérieur, de l'industrie et de la police sanitaire et industrielle. Bureau de l'industrie. Circulaire No. 2. Paris, le 31 janvier 1849." There are many variations of these claims; see Laborde, 233, and Paris, Musée des arts décoratifs, Le livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989, 1983, 259.

7. See Prince Napoléon's Rapport sur l'Exposition Universelle de 1855, 2-3.

8. Luckhurst, 63-66; also see Gibbs-Smith, 5, for the claim that the exhibitions by the Society of Arts began as early as 1756-57; Luckhurst states that there is no direct evidence of this.

9. In general, French historians simply ignore the possibility of British precedence; for the French claim of 1683 as the first industrial exposition, see Gervais; for the dismissal of the British claim, see Poirier, 58, and A. Bitard, Histoire des expositions et des beaux-arts, Rouen, 1884, 19-20. Another tactic has been to consider industrial expositions as a development from French fine-arts exhibitions which began in the seventeenth century; this had the added advantage of providing a more prestigious pedigree; see the 1889 Rapport, I:5. Démy's assertion that members of the Académie royale des sciences exhibited in the Salon of 1699 is untrue; compare his p.10 and the account in Le Mercure Galant, septembre 1699, "Exposition des Ouvrages...". There has yet to be written a scholarly account of the history of industrial expositions.

10. W. Blanchard Jerrold, "The History of Industrial Exhibitions," The Illustrated London News, 21 June 1851, 372-73.

11. See Reports by the Juries, 1547.

12. Laborde, 234.

13. Ibid, 235; also see "Des Curiosités de l'Exposition Universelle à Londres en 1851," Magasin Pittoresque XIX (septembre 1851), 304.

14. Laborde, 235-38. Although the Procès-verbal of the Académie des beaux-arts does not mention this decision, it was frequently incomplete.

15. See the 1851 Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue 2: Nos. 1407-8; 1215-16; 45-46.

16. Jules Janin, "Les Représentants de la Presse Parisienne à Londres," The Illustrated London News en Français, 10 mai 1851, 19; Janin was the drama critic of the Journal des Débats. Other accounts in French periodicals include: "Exposition Universelle de Londres en 1851," Magasin Pittoresque IX (1851): 139-42, 265-67, 303-304, 337-44, 371-74; Alexis de Valon, "Le Tour du Monde à l'Exposition de Londres," Revue des deux mondes, 15 juillet 1851, 193-228; also see the weekly publication Le Palais de Cristal, Journal Illustré de l'Exposition de 1851.

17. Pradier received a Council Medal, DeBay and Etex Prize medals; see the 1851 Liste des Médailles et mentions honorables décernées aux exposants français.

18. On Clésinger's Femme piquée par un serpent, see the Clésinger dossiers, Documentation du Musée d'Orsay; Théophile Gautier, "La Femme piquée par un serpent de M. Clésinger," L'Artiste, 22 août 1847, 122-23 and engraving; Théophile Thoré, "Le Salon de 1847," reprinted in Salons de T. Thoré, 1844-48, Paris, 1868, 536; Gustave Planche, "Le Salon de 1847," Revue des deux mondes, mai 1847, 541-43; A. Estignard, Clésinger, sa vie, ses oeuvres, Paris, 1900; Luc Benoist, "Le Sculpteur Clésinger (1814-1883)," Gazette des Beaux-Arts (1928): II:283-96; Luc Benoist, "La Femme piquée par un serpent d'Auguste Clésinger," Bulletin des Musées de France, mai 1931, 95-97; Jean Ziegler, "Baudelairiana. Madame Sabatier (1822-1890), Quelques notes biographiques," Bulletin du Bibliophile, 1977, 365-82; Peter Fusco and H.W. Janson, The Romantics to Rodin, Los Angeles/N.Y., 1980, 175-76; Mainardi, "Appendix: Clésinger's 'Femme Couchée'" in "French Sculpture, English Morals."

19. Frédéric Chopin in a letter to his family in Poland, 8 juin 1847, Correspondance de Frédéric Chopin, Bronislas Edouard Sydow, ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1953-60, 3:284; quoted in Ziegler, 371. Théophile Gautier, "Sculpture," L'Artiste, 15 juillet 1848, 204. In his 1847

article, Gautier had stated "Elle avait reçu en pleine poitrine une des flèches d'or du carquois d'Eros..."; 123.

20. On the serpent, see Gautier, 1847, and Thoré, "Salon de 1847," 536.

21. Gautier, 1847, 122.

22. The accusation came from Planche; see his "Salon de 1847", 541-43. Clésinger wrote to his lifelong friend Charles Weiss; quoted by Ziegler, 373, from his journal (30 juin 1847, Bibliothèque municipale de Besançon). The Bacchante only measures 1.94 meters, but, considering the pose, is nonetheless larger than a life cast.

23. Fabien Pillet, "Beaux-Arts. Sculpture. Salon de 1848," Le Moniteur Universel, 17 avril 1848, 851; also see Gautier, 1847, who announced that Clésinger had just finished the Bacchante. Arsène Houssaye recounted that on 3 February 1848, Clésinger invited his friends to his studio where La Bacchante and La Femme piquée were both on display; the general preference was for the Bacchante; see Houssaye, "Le Salon de 1848," L'Artiste, 12 mars 1848, 1.

24. Théophile Gautier, "Le Salon de 1848," La Presse, 23 avril 1848, 1-2 and "Sculpture," L'Artiste, 15 juillet 1848, 204 and engraving.

25. Pillet, 851.

26. Valon, 224-225.

27. Laborde, 380-81. Laborde mistakenly called Clésinger's work La Femme piquée par un serpent, confusing it with the sculpture of the previous year; it is a mistake that many will make after him. The XXXe class was Fine Arts, the Ve groupe was heavy machinery. The British had a majority on the jury, eight of fifteen members.

28. 1851 Reports by the Juries, 685. In the section listing jury awards, only for Clésinger was an explanation attached.

29. Ibid., 701. A similar opinion was expressed in "The Great Exhibition," The Illustrated London News, Exhibition Supplement, 23 August 1851, 242.

30. Charles Baudelaire, Salon de 1846, David Kelley, ed., Oxford, 1975, 242-43.

31. 1851 Reports by the Juries, 700.

32. The 1851 Exhibition received little coverage in

the French press; the history of Clésinger's participation in it does not appear in any of the books, articles or catalogues on the artist. He may have refused his Honorable Mention as his name did not appear on the 1851 Liste des Médailles et mentions honorables.

33. See my article on Clésinger for an Appendix identifying and dating the various versions of this theme.

34. AN F21 525.

35. See L'Artiste, 13 mars 1851, 63.

36. There are two drafts of this letter preserved in the Archives. The last sentence of the text has been crossed out and rewritten several times; as the meaning was the same throughout, I have chosen the most coherent reading.

37. 1851 Reports by the Juries, cci, cciii.

38. Laborde, 383-84.

39. Ibid., 376, 380; 1851 Reports by the Juries, cxcix.

40. Valon, 227.

PART TWO

THE UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION OF 1855: THE APOTHEOSIS OF ECLECTICISM

CHAPTER IV

SECOND EMPIRE ART POLICY: THE 1850S

Until the Second Republic, the world of art still clung to centuries old tradition: artists of major importance were usually recognized by the Government and produced, on commission, large-scale history paintings for public consumption; contemporary taste was defined by the Academy and cultivated amateurs who played quasi-Governmental roles in assuring that the King or Emperor had (or seemed to have) suitably elevated aesthetic judgment.[1] By the end of the Second Empire, the modern art world had emerged. Henceforth, neither Academy nor Government would be able to set the rules: a new power, the Bourgeoisie, had emerged, demanding recognition of its own taste. If culture can be said to follow economics, then one might consider the Revolution of 1789, with its economic shift of power from the Aristocracy to the Bourgeoisie, as leading inexorably, almost a century later, to the aesthetic shift described here.

The major art event of the 1850s was the Universal Exposition of 1855, as much a political as a cultural event. This study, then, should begin with a survey of the

political protagonists in the French art world of the 1850s, for it was they, and not artists, who set official standards of taste.

The Cast of Characters

Napoléon III (1808-1873): By all accounts he liked pretty girls better than paintings, but if he had to have paintings too, he liked paintings of pretty girls. Nor was he adverse to portraits of himself or Napoléon I, depictions of Imperial victories, nor, for that matter, to anything anyone else of importance liked; it wasn't worth splitting hairs over questions of taste. Maxime DuCamp's account of Napoléon's visit to the Salon of 1853 gave the flavor of the Emperor's taste:

> La veille de l'ouverture du Salon, j'y avais été; j'avais rencontré Morny, qui était président du jury, et nous causions ensemble, lorsqu'on vint le prévenir que l'Empereur arrivait. Je fis un mouvement pour me retirer; Morny me dit: "Restez donc, mettez-vous à la suite, vous entendrez de bonnes réflexions." Napoléon III, escorté de quelques officiers, de différents fonctionnaires et de tous les membres de jury, parcourut les salles au pas accéléré, sans dire un mot, sans faire une observation, passant devant les meilleures toiles avec une indifférence qu'il ne cherchait pas à dissimuler. On voyait qu'il accomplissait une des mille corvées que lui imposait son rôle de souverain. Parvenu dans la dernière galerie, dans celle où l'on avait entassé ces oeuvres mediocres que l'on semble ne recevoir que pour masquer la nudité des murailles. Il s'arrêta tout-à-coup devant un tableau qui représentait le Mont-Blanc: c'était pitoyable et ça donnait l'idée d'un groupe de pains de sucre de diverses dimensions. Longtemps il resta immobile, contemplant cette croûte, puis, se tournant vers

> Morny, qui était placé à sa gauche, il lui dit: "Le peintre aurait dû indiquer les hauteurs comparatives." Après cette "bonne réflexion," il reprit sa marche et s'en alla.

DuCamp ended by characterizing the taste of Napoléon III thus: "La peinture, lettre close; la musique, lettre morte; la poésie, lettre indéchiffrée."[2] Apologists for Napoléon III point out that his background was military, his youth occupied with insurrections, exile, and imprisonment, leaving little time for the pursuit of culture. Coldly received by artists at the 1849 Salon and lacking confidence in his own taste, he fell back (publicly) on that of his predecessors and (privately) on whatever was pleasant and undemanding.[3]

Empress Eugénie (1826-1920): Born Eugénia Maria de Montijo de Guzmàn, the daughter of a Spanish Grandee, she married Napoléon III in 1853. A religious Catholic, ultramontane, partisan of the Pope, her personal art collection was composed of Imperial portraits by Winterhalter, Cabanel and Dedreux. To put it kindly, her biographers state that she knew nothing at all about art and preferred interior decoration.[4]

Prince Napoléon (1822-1891): Cousin of Napoléon III and President of the 1855 Universal Exposition. His relations with Napoléon III were always difficult, for he was a self-proclaimed Socialist, outspoken in his views, ever hopeful of ascending to the throne. He described his

own taste thus:

> Un grand nombre d'artistes...ont pu retrouver dans le Prince Napoléon ce goût traditionnel et cet instinct du beau, l'une des plus originaires et des plus distinctives qualités de cette famille, qui a compté parmi ses sculpteurs et ses peintres de prédilection les plus rares talents de toutes les écoles: David, Canova, Gros, Bartolini.... 5

The breadth of his taste can be measured in the distance from David to Gros: for him this encompassed "toutes les écoles." He collected antiquities and is perhaps best known for the Maison Pompéienne he had built in Paris where he and his friends would dress up in Roman costumes. His apologists stress that he received his early education in Italy where he was deeply influenced by classical art, a taste he carried with him all his life, marrying Marie Clotilde, daughter of Victor Emmanuel II, and returning there after 1870.[6]

Princess Mathilde (1820-1904): Cousin of Napoléon III, sister of Prince Napoléon, mistress of Nieuwerkerke. Brought up in Rome and Florence, she was refused in marriage to Napoléon III during the years when everyone thought he was a worthless adventurer. She was married to an even more worthless adventurer, Anatole Demidoff, in 1841, and legally separated from him in 1845. She had meanwhile met Emilien, le comte de Nieuwerkerke; their liaison would exercise a major influence on the art policy of the Second Empire for, Emperor and Empress lacking

interest and taste in art, Mathilde, who lacked taste only, became the power behind the throne. Even-handed, she disliked both Ingres and Delacroix. She collected lightweight genre paintings, principally by Eugène Giraud, her painting teacher. Her reputation as a cultivated amateur rests on the fact that her weekly soirées were attended by artists of the calibre of Giraud, Hébert, Baudry, that she exhibited in the Salon from 1859 to 1866 and was among the first to recognize the talent of Bonvin and Tissot. Unfortunately she was among the last to recognize the genius of any of the major nineteenth century painters.[7]

Alfred-Emilien, le comte de Nieuwerkerke (1811-1892): Among his titles were: Directeur général des musées impériaux, Intendant des beaux-arts de la maison de l'Empereur; Président du Jury d'admission, Vice-Président du Jury International des récompenses de l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, 1855. The most powerful individual in the world of art during the Second Empire, he was nick-named Castor (beaver) by art students because it is an animal that builds with its tail. This was a semi-polite reference to his liaison with Princess Mathilde, his only known qualification for any of the above appointments. Originally a Legitimist and supporter of the comte de Chambord, Nieuwerkerke's taste in art was as murky as his politics. An amateur sculptor himself, he managed,

during his administration, to mistreat virtually every major artist of the period, from the Barbizon painters through Cézanne, including Ingres, Delacroix and Courbet. He did not collect paintings, he collected weaponry. Opportunist, ambitious, ruthless, he earned--and merited--the dislike of most of his contemporaries.[8]

Frédéric Bourgeois de Mercey (1803-1860): Chef de la section des beaux-arts du Ministère d'Etat; Commissaire général de l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, 1855. The very type of the cultured aristocratic amateur. He wrote a little, painted a little, was a friend to artists, an administrator who tried to do the right thing. Nieuwerkerke hated him and craved his job, which Mathilde eventually obtained for him after Mercey's death.[9]

Achille Fould (1800-1867): Ministre d'Etat, responsible for the Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, 1855. Characterized as an "homme d'argent," he came from a rich banking family and was an early supporter of Napoléon III. He pretended to have an interest in art only during his years as Ministre de la Maison de l'Empereur.[10]

Le comte de Morny, later duc de Morny (1811-1865): Président du Corps Législatif, Membre du Conseil supérieur du commerce, de l'agriculture et de l'industrie; Président de la section des beaux-arts de la Commission Impériale, Président du Jury International des récompenses, Exposition

Universelle des Beaux-Arts, 1855. Half-brother to Napoléon III, he was his trusted ally and the chief architect of the 1851 coup d'état. He was also a collector of catholic taste, a speculator in art who amassed collections only to sell them at auction for profit. Napoléon III may not have known anything about art, but he knew enough to put Morny in charge to watch out for Imperial interests.[11]

And the Results...

With a cast of characters like this, it is not surprising that the art policies of the Second Empire were undistinguished. The Imperial couple's lack of interest was manifest in the invitation list to Compiègne: during the entire Second Empire, among several thousand guests, Cabanel was invited three times, Baudry, Meissonier and Doré twice, and twenty-two other painters (among them Delacroix and Ingres) once.[12] Even Prosper Mérimée, long-time friend of the Empress and director of the theatre at Compiègne, complained of the low level of culture at the court.[13]

As a result, Nieuwerkerke and Princess Mathilde made most of the day-to-day decisions on government policy, with Morny watching over important events such as the Universal Exposition of 1855. As Viel-Castel wrote in his Mémoires, the old aristocracy of birth was being replaced by the new aristocracy of intrigue.[14]

The primary purpose of Second Empire patronage was to conciliate the Church, which had supported the coup d'état, and to glorify the regime. Thus the largest portion of the beaux-arts budget (38%) was spent for religious works, including many copies donated to provincial churches. History painting made up the second category (18%), of which 1/3 was devoted to depictions of contemporary events such as Imperial victories. The third important category consisted of portaits of the Emperor or Empress (15.6%). Altogether, then, painting with a discernible political purpose received 71.6% of the budget, leaving less than 30% for all other categories, in particular, genre, landscape and still life.[15]

The frivolity with which commissions were awarded is demonstrated by an incident recounted by Viel-Castel, which took place in 1852 when Romieu was Directeur des beaux-arts.

> Edouard Ney a une maîtresse danseuse à l'Opéra, soeur de Marquet, maîtresse de Roqueplan. Cette sauteuse s'est mise en tête de peindre; Dieu sait quelle peinture elle fait! Aussi tôt Romieu lui fait une commande d'un tableau; comme ladite Marquet est incapable de l'entreprendre, elle donne quelques cents francs à un rapin qui l'exécute.
>
> Müller, le peintre, exprime à Marquet son étonnement de la faveur imméritée qui lui échoit lorsque de véritables artistes meurent de faim.
>
> La cabotine se fâche, jure de se venger, et Müller sera forcé de composer avec elle, de faire acte de soumission.

L'entourage du Président est détestable. [16]

Official records confirm that "Mlle Marquet" received eight hundred francs for a copy of Murillo's La Vièrge au Chapelet (the choice of subject is droll), the commission given 24 April 1852 by Romieu on the request of E. Ney. The painting was sent to a Church in Yonne which was, no doubt, delighted with this example of official largesse.[17]

An example of how art was used for political ends is provided by an 1856 notice in L'Artiste, announcing: "A l'occasion de la fête de l'Empereur, M. le Ministre d'Etat a distribué un certain nombre de tableaux religieux à divers églises de la France."[18] In addition to the twenty-six départements benefiting, twenty-six préfectures were given a bust of Napoléon I, thus completing the program of installing this sculpture in every préfecture in France. An 1857 note from Buon of the Maison de l'Empereur to Nieuwerkerke reminded him of the importance of having the inscription Donné par l'Empereur on the frames of all paintings sent to provincial museums.[19] Nor did Napoléon III choose the paintings to be purchased, as did Louis-Philippe. In the Salon of 1857, for example, Buon, Achille Fould and Nieuwerkerke went through the Salon together, (the blind leading the blind) but the final list was made by Nieuwerkerke, the inscription on the frame being the limit of the Emperor's interest.[20]

Given this attitude towards art, can it be doubted that the first Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts was conceived and executed to be the fulfillment of political rather than aesthetic ends?

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. A good discussion of the art world of the previous period is contained in Rosenthal, 1-78.

2. Maxime DuCamp, Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle, 2 vols., Paris, 1949, I:130.

3. The literature on Napoléon III is extensive. See, for example, Roger L. Williams, Gaslight and Shadow, The World of Napoléon III, 1851-1870, N.Y., 1957; Theodore Zeldin, The Political System of Napoleon III, London, 1958; T.A.B. Corley, Democratic Despot, A Life of Napoleon III, London, 1961; Stuart L. Campbell, The Second Empire Revisited: A Study in French Historiography, New Brunswick, N.J., 1978. For his taste in art, also see Philippe de Chennevières, "L'Empereur et l'Impératrice," Souvenirs d'un Directeur des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1883-1889, Part II, 1-19. Chennevières was more positive, and possibly less reliable, than most in his evaluation of the Emperor's taste.

4. On Eugénie's taste in art, see Chennevières; Harold Kurtz, The Empress Eugénie, 1826-1920, London, 1964, 330; Alfred Leroy, L'Impératrice Eugénie, Paris, 1964, 117-140. On her taste in interior decoration, see Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Second Empire, 12.

5. Visites et études de S.A.I. le Prince Napoléon au Palais des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1856, 57.

6. On Prince Napoléon, see Edgar Holt, Plon-Plon: The Life of Prince Napoléon, 1822-1891, London, 1973; Albert Soubies, Les Membres de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts depuis la fondation de l'Institut, 3e Série, (1852-1876), Paris, 1911, 197-201. On the Maison Pompéienne, see Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Second Empire, 63-64, 259-60. On his collection, see Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités par M. Fröhner, conservateur-adjoint des musées impériaux, Paris, 1868; the sale was held on 23 March 1868 and identified as that of Prince Napoléon (annotated catalogue, B.N.)

7. The best biography of Princess Mathilde is that of Marguerite Castillon du Perron, La Princesse Mathilde, Paris, 1963. She was mentioned often in Mémoires du Comte Horace de Viel-Castel sur le règne de Napoléon III, 1851-1864, L. Léouzon Le Duc, ed., 6 vols., Paris, 1883-84, see especially III: 27 avril 1855. Her taste in art was discussed by Frédéric Masson, "La Princesse Mathilde," in the sale catalogue of Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, Collection de S.A.I. Madame la Princesse Mathilde,

Catalogue des tableaux anciens, tableaux modernes, objets d'art et d'ameublement..., 17-21 mai 1904, reprinted in Les Arts, mai 1904. In addition to works by Giraud, her collection contained works by Toulmouche, de Nittis, Philippe Rousseau, Bonnat and one Meissonier watercolor.

8. As Nieuwerkerke was almost universally disliked, the only positive biography is that of his protégé Chennevières; see "Le comte de Nieuwerkerke," Souvenirs, Part II, 83-110; its reliability may be gauged by his attribution of Nieuwerkerke's rapid advancement to his friendship with Napoléon III. Other sources include Frédéric Henriet, "Le Comte de Nieuwerkerke," Le Journal des Arts, 21, 23 janvier 1893; Pierre Malitourne, "Sculpteurs contemporains, Le Comte Emilien de Nieuwerkerke," L'Artiste, 3 août 1856, 57-60; Emile Galichon and Edouard de Beaumont, "Collection de M. le Cte de Nieuwerkerke," GBA, 1 mai 1868, 409-30; Edouard de Beaumont, "Les Armes. Préface du catalogue en préparation de la collection de M. le Comte de Nieuwerkerke," GBA, 1 novembre 1868, 373-89. As there is no adequate work on this important figure, I am preparing a study of his career.

9. See Soubies, 203-205; also Frédéric Bourgeois de Mercey, Etudes sur les beaux-arts depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours, 3 vols., Paris, 1855-57. Chennevières' negative evaluation of Mercey, in his memoirs of Nieuwerkerke, was unjustified.

10. Soubies, 201-203.

11. On Morny, see Maurice Parturier, Morny et son temps, Paris, 1969, and Gerda Grothe, Le Duc de Morny, Ramond Albeck, trans., Paris, 1967. For his taste in art, see Albert Jacquemart, "Les Cabinets d'amateurs à Paris. La Galerie de M. le duc de Morny," GBA 14 (janvier-juin 1863): 289-306, 385-401. He held auctions in 1842, 1843, 1845, 1848, 1852 and there was a posthumous sale in 1865. See Galerie de M. le duc de Morny, Tableaux et objets d'art, Paris, 31 mai-12 juin 1865. At his death, his collection of contemporary art included Decamps, Diaz, Gérôme, Meissonier, Th. Rousseau and (although it is not mentioned) Courbet. On Morny and Courbet, see my article "Gustave Courbet's Second Scandal: Les Demoiselles de Village," Arts Magazine, January 1979, 95-109.

12. Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Second Empire, 12-13.

13. Kurtz, 122.

14. Viel-Castel, II: 27 juillet 1853.

15. These figures are taken from Pierre Angrand, "L'Etat mécène--Période autoritaire du Second Empire (1851-1860)," GBA, mai-juin 1968, 303-48. Although M. Angrand has not published the figures from 1860-1870, he has kindly informed me that he has found no great changes in the second decade of the Second Empire. His article contains a good overview of the Government Art Administration. In view of these statistics, it is difficult to accept the thesis of Albert Boime that the Second Empire attempted to impose realism as its official style; see his "The Second Empire's Official Realism," in Gabriel P. Weisberg, ed., The European Realist Tradition, Bloomington, Indiana, 1982, 31-123.

16. Viel-Castel, II: 30 octobre 1852.

17. AN F21 96, dossier 54 (Marquet).

18. L'Artiste, 24 août 1856, 111-12.

19. Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1857; correspondence of 17 octobre 1857.

20. Ibid.; correspondance of 3 and 23 octobre 1857. Chennevières stated that the Imperial couple chose the paintings bought on the civil list, but as it contained a high proportion of religious works, it is doubtful if this represented the personal taste of Napoléon III. Eugènie, who might be imagined to prefer such works, is instead credited by Chennevières with having chosen Baudry's La Perle de la vague from the Salon of 1863; considering her prudishness, this is highly unlikely. More work needs to be done on the personal taste of all of these important Second Empire figures.

CHAPTER V

ADVANCE PLANNING: GETTING THE SHOW UNDER WAY

The origins of the 1855 Universal Exposition were frankly avowed by its President, Prince Napoléon: "le succès de l'Exposition universelle de Londres excita notre émulation. A peine les portes du Palais de Cristal étaient-elles closes que de toutes parts on se mit à réclamer pour Paris l'honneur d'un semblable concours."[1] Whatever idealistic motives of "emulation" might have existed were probably mingled with financial ones as well, for the Great Exhibition had gained almost L200,000, a sum which was later used to finance the South Kensington complex of museums and schools.[2] In addition to the desire to turn a profit and encourage French industry, there was also a strong political motivation which, in case it had passed unnoticed, was announced by Prince Napoléon in his speech to the Emperor at the opening ceremonies: "Vous avez voulu que les premières années de votre règne fussent illustrées par une exposition du monde entier, suivant en cela les traditions du premier Empereur, car l'idée d'une Exposition est éminemment française...."[3] As has been shown, the National Expositions of Industry, while

undeniably a product of the Revolution, cannot be attributed to Napoléon I. But the Prince was not speaking to an audience of historians, and, the provenance he presented being attractive enough, it was accepted without question.

The innovation of having an Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts in addition to that of Industry would serve as a valuable apology for the French claim of having had the first "truly Universal" Exposition. The idea, however, did not come from London, but from the Académie des beaux-arts, even before the 1851 Great Exhibition. The original proposal was the work of the marquis de Pastoret (1791-1857), an Academician, Legitimist and supporter of the comte de Chambord.[4] He read his plan to the Academy on 1 March 1851:

> Cette proposition consiste à exprimer le voeu qu'il soit ouvert à Paris une exposition générale d'objets d'art, pour les artistes vivants de la France et de l'étranger, où l'on pourrait admettre des ouvrages du commencement de ce siècle afin de montrer la marche de l'art, à partir de cette époque jusqu'à notre temps. 5

A committee formed to study Pastoret's proposal suggested that such an exposition be held in the Louvre, under Government sponsorship, when renovation there was completed. A letter to this effect was sent by the Académie des beaux-arts to the Ministre de l'Intérieur; there was no response for two years.

Art was not long to be excluded from international competition, however; after the unsuccessful British attempt to hold such an exhibition in 1851, there was, that same summer, an Exposition générale des beaux-arts in Brussels.[6] International in that it included artists from many countries, it was in reality not too different from the Salon, for artists participated as individuals, not as members of a national section. The same distinction held for the International Exhibitions of 1853 in Dublin and New York; both events included only unofficial, albeit international, exhibitions of fine art.[7]

Le Palais de l'Industrie

If the idea of having an international fine arts exhibition preceded the Universal Exposition by several years, so also did the plan for a Palais de l'Industrie. Complaints about the temporary buildings erected for National Expositions of Industry had been mounting since 1827 when M. Rey had written his Mémoire sur la nécessité de bâtir un édifice spécialement consacré aux Expositions générales des produits de l'industrie.[8] The annual Salon had become too large for the Louvre and, after 1848, it too was regularly moved to a different locale. And so on 27 March 1852 Napoléon III decreed the construction of the long-overdue Palais de l'Industrie "d'après le système du palais de cristal de Londres;" it was to house all future

national exhibitions (Figure 18).[9] It would be better than the Crystal Palace, as numerous French commentators pointed out, for the Crystal Palace was made of glass, an unfortunate symbol for the aspirations of an upstart Empire: "A la place d'un rempart de verre, l'exposition aura chez nous des murailles de granit."[10] Although architectural historians have never ceased to condemn the Palais de l'Industrie for its eclecticism, contemporaries were well pleased with it for the symbolic qualities it conveyed.[11] But artists were not pleased with the prospect of their Salon being permanently evicted from the prestigious Louvre to be moved into a "modern" building far from the center of Paris, sharing space with industrial exhibitions. As early as 1 April 1852, two days after the publication of the decree, L'Artiste reported their dissatisfaction.[12]

The building was not erected at Government expense, however, but by a private holding company, la Compagnie du Palais de l'Industrie, which would hold title until 1889, after which it would revert to the Government. The Government donated the terrain (on the Champs-Elysées where the present Grand Palais is located), guaranteed the shareholders 4% interest on their investment, and conceded to the Compagnie the right to charge admission to all events held there.[13] For the first time, the Government had abrogated its responsibility to construct its own

monuments. Noblesse oblige was giving way to Capitalism, and the Eiffel Tower would follow the Palais de l'Industrie as a profit-making national monument.[14] Reflecting on this turn of events, Delacroix wrote in his Journal:

> On parle de vendre les Champs-Elysées à des spéculateurs! C'est le palais de l'industrie qui a mis en goût. Quand nous ressemblerons un peu plus aux Américains, on vendra également le jardin des Tuileries, comme un terrain vague et qui ne sert à rien. [15]

The hybrid character of the Palais de l'Industrie, mortared with public interest and private greed, soon became apparent in the conflicts which arose over its role in the Universal Exposition of 1855. Prince Napoléon claimed that the disputes between the Imperial Commission and the Compagnie du Palais de l'Industrie were caused by the Compagnie's inordinate craving for profits above all other considerations.[16] He was being a bit ingenuous, however, for the Compagnie had been set up as a profit-making enterprise; it was unrealistic to expect charitable sentiments from businessmen, particularly in the nineteenth century.

So it was that when prints and drawings of France's newest public monument began to appear in the Spring of 1855, the Compagnie had them seized, claiming that it alone had exclusive reproduction rights, which it would sell to the highest bidder.[17] Artists became alarmed when the Compagnie's claims became so inclusive that even their

right to include the building in a drawing or painting was jeopardized. Protests to Prince Napoléon resulted in his assurance that he would not sustain the claims of the Compagnie, but, as the situation remained unresolved, Goupil brought suit against the Compagnie in the name of all artists and publishers. The suit was heard at the Tribunal de police correctionnelle on 4 April 1855, and the decision handed down two weeks later. In typical Second Empire style, it was decided without being decided: the rights of architects and proprietors to images of their own buildings was recognized in principle, but the Compagnie lost the case because the Government was regarded as the proprietor of the Palais de l'Industrie, and had not sold the reproduction rights. Nor would it after this dispute. The basic issue was left unresolved, to flame up again in 1889 over the Eiffel Tower. Meanwhile, the Palais de l'Industrie was placed in the public domain of images.

The Imperial Commission

The 1855 Universal Exposition was announced by decree 8 March 1853.[18] Two months later, Napoléon III asked his Ministre d'Etat, Achille Fould, to invite a small group of artists, amateurs, and experts to Saint-Cloud to discuss with him and Empress Eugénie the possibility of also holding a Universal Exposition of Art.[19] Both Prince Napoléon and Mercey credited the idea to Eugénie, but this

was doubtless a gracious gesture on their part; the proposal probably emanated from that of the marquis de Pastoret and the Academy in 1851.[20] Pastoret had, in the intervening time, abandoned his Legitimist politics and rallied to the Empire; he was rewarded by being appointed Sénateur in 1852.[21] This alone, however, does not explain his presence on every Commission and Jury of the fine arts exhibition, the only individual so honored who was neither a high government official nor an artist. Thus was his role tacitly acknowledged.

Most of the important decisions were made at the Saint-Cloud meeting: the exhibition would be retrospective, there would be no limit to the number of works each artist could submit, and there would be prizes and paid admission.[22] The Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts was decreed on 22 June 1853 and from the beginning a variety of motives could be discerned:

> Considérant qu'un des moyens les plus efficaces de contribuer au progrès des arts est une Exposition universelle, qui, en ouvrant un cours entre tous les artistes du monde, et en mettant en regard tant d'oeuvres diverses, doit être un puissant motif d'émulation, et offrir une source de comparaisons fécondes;
>
> Considérant que les perfectionnements de l'industrie sont étroitement liés à ceux des beaux-arts;
>
> Que cependant toutes les Expositions des produits industriels qui ont eu lieu jusqu'ici n'ont admis les oeuvres des artistes que dans une proportion insuffisante;

> Qu'il appartient spécialement à la France, dont l'industrie doit tant aux beaux-arts, de leur assigner, dans la prochaine Exposition universelle, la place qu'ils méritent. 23

The last reappeared constantly as a leitmotif throughout the Exposition. "Il appartient à notre pays de donner l'exemple de cette alliance qui va si bien à son génie initiateur," said Prince Napoléon.[24] France would make up for the humiliation of losing the first International Exhibition to England by being the first to include the fine arts. And, just in case artists were inclined to boycott an exhibition with Industry, the Salons of 1854 and 1855 were cancelled.[25]

By a decree of 24 December 1853, an Imperial Commission of thirty-seven members, with Prince Napoléon as President, was appointed to oversee the organization of the Universal Exposition.[26] The Commission was composed of the highest notables from the administration and the spheres of learning, the arts, industry and commerce, all men who had rallied to the Empire. There were representatives of Government, such as the comte de Morny and Baroche, President of the Conseil d'Etat; financiers such as Emile Pereire and Schneider, who owned Le Creusot; a sprinkling of aristocrats such as the marquis de Pastoret and the duc de Mouchy. Especially there were Saint-Simonians, among them Frédéric LePlay who would later be named Commissaire Général of the Exposition. There were also five artists:

Ingres and Delacroix, the engraver Henriquel-Dupont, the sculptor Simart and the architect Visconti; Delacroix was the only non-Academician. Nieuwerkerke was excluded, despite his official position, for he was disliked by the entire Imperial family (Mathilde excepted). He was furious; Mathilde complained to Fould; he remained excluded.[27]

No doubt many of the thirty-seven appointments were honorary or advisory, for a sub-committee of twelve was named to do the actual work of organization.[28] This was a no-nonsense group of representatives of industry and commerce with LePlay as President. The Imperial Commission as a whole was divided into two sections, one for agriculture and industry, the other for art.[29] The art section seems to have had more latitude for, unrepresented on the sub-committee, it was left, by default, to define the art exhibition. It had twelve members: the five artists (four after the resignation of Henriquel-Dupont), the amateurs Mérimée, Moskowa and Pastoret, the political figures Baroche and Morny, one representative from the world of finance, Mouchy, and one from the museums, Saulcy, curator of the Musée d'artillerie (no wonder Nieuwerkerke was furious). Frédéric de Mercey was named its Secrétaire.

Le Palais des Beaux-Arts

Even before the appointment of the Imperial

Commission, plans were moving ahead for the Universal Exposition of Art. At the awards ceremony of the 1853 Salon, Prince Napoléon had announced it in glowing terms, reminiscent of the marquis de Pastoret's original proposal:

> C'est une grande et féconde pensée, Messieurs, que d'avoir rattaché l'inauguration du nouveau Louvre qui s'élève, à l'ouverture de l'Exposition décrétée pour 1855, l'Exposition universelle où viendront s'étaler, auprès des produits de l'industrie du monde entier, les oeuvres d'art de quelques peuples privilégiés, parmi lesquels la France tient le premier rang.[30]

The artists' participation was essential and an exhibition in the Louvre would offer the necessary dignity to offset the "taint" of industry. One of the earliest Government memoranda on the subject stated unequivocally: "Dès qu'à paru le décret, les artistes se sont très vivement émus de la question du local. Ils attachent une fort grande et bien naturelle importance à ce que leurs oeuvres soient séparées aussi loin que possible de l'Exposition de l'Industrie."[31] And yet, a few months later, unannounced, Fould signed a contract with the Compagnie for the construction of a temporary building along the Seine, linked to the Palais de l'Industrie; the fine arts exhibition was to be housed there.[32] The Government explanation was that the Louvre renovation would not be completed in time, but it must also be recalled that the unification of the two expositions was the official French rationalization of the importance of their, as opposed to

the British, Exhibition. Although Prince Napoléon later claimed that the separation of the fine-arts display from that of industry was regarded from the beginning as of paramount importance, Mercey gave a different version, stating that the Imperial Commission had always wanted to unite the two shows under one roof.[33]

Artists were not pleased to hear that their Exposition would be held in the annex to the Palais de l'Industrie; an article in the Journal des Débats immediately recalled the installation of 1851:

> Inutile d'abord de rappeler que l'industrie et l'art devant avoir chacun, au palais des Champs-Elysées, son département spécial, les oeuvres d'art ne s'y trouveront pas, comme dans Hyde-Park, mélangées avec les produits industriels: la charmante Phryné de Pradier, par exemple, si elle devait y figurer...n'aura pas à s'indigner de la concurrence du marteau-Pilon ou de moulin-Nillus. [34]

By the summer of 1854, it was clear that the Industrial Exposition would prove too large for the Palais de l'Industrie; a British commission caused panic by announcing that it alone could fill all the available space.[35] The fine-arts building, an immense hall of 1200 meters, was hastily requisitioned for industry (it became the Galerie des Machines), and, to the artists' delight, the show was--temporarily--rescheduled for the Louvre.[36] As a last resort, the architect Hector LeFuel was asked to design a Palais des Beaux-Arts, a temporary building

erected on rented land behind the Palais de l'Industrie, between avenue Montaigne and the rue Marboeuf (Figures 19 and 20). The Compagnie drove a hard bargain in return for its cooperation. The Government, having been forced to advance the capital for the building (and for all the other annexes as well), would be reimbursed from entrance fees, but all profits would be shared equally.[37] On 15 November 1854, the art community was informed of the future location of the Universal Exposition of Art; the show would not take place in the Louvre after all. L'Artiste was frankly disappointed, and so, no doubt, were the artists.[38]

Paid Admission

Both Prince Napoléon and Frédéric de Mercey stressed paid admission as one of the great innovations of the 1855 Universal Exposition. The official rationale was put forth by Prince Napoléon in his opening speech:

> Dans notre pays, c'est habituellement le Gouvernement qui se charge de toutes les grandes entreprises; pour arrêter l'exagération de cette tendance, Votre Majesté a donné un grand essor à l'industrie privée. La compagnie à laquelle l'exploitation du Palais de l'Industrie a été concédée devait trouver dans le prix d'entrée la rémunération du capital employé à la construction: de là la nécessité d'un prix d'entrée. 39

Probably more to the point was the example of English profits in 1851. In the face of profits to be made, the centuries-old French tradition that exhibitions should be

free was abruptly terminated. Abruptly the Age of Monarchy ended, with its noblesse oblige, its free spectacles to amuse the people, free entry into public monuments and expositions. Abruptly the Age of Capital began in yet another sphere of life, the inspirational and didactic purposes of expositions giving way to entertainment, and entertainment becoming a commodity to be bought and paid for. In his Rapport, Prince Napoléon formulated the defense of paid admission; his arguments have become familiar in our modern period:

> Je considère l'établissement d'un prix d'entrée comme une mésure équitable; au lieu de faire supporter obligatoirement à tous une dépense faite au profit d'une partie de la nation, on la fait ainsi acquitter volontairement par ceux-là mêmes qui en retirent avantage. En dernière analyse, il faut toujours que quelqu'un paye. Faire retomber la charge sur l'Etat au lieu de public qui jouit de l'Exposition, c'est faire payer sous forme d'impôt, à tout le monde, c'est-à-dire à l'artisan et au cultivateur des départements, aussi bien qu'à l'habitant de la capitale, une dépense dont les premiers ne retirent aucun bénéfice immédiat. 40

To understand the profound dislocation caused by this new concept of paid admission, it is necessary to look at its history in France. The idea must be credited to Jacques-Louis David; the year, fittingly enough, was 1799, the eve of the new century. David decided to exhibit his new painting of the Sabines, not at the Salon, but in his own studio, and charge an admission fee. Like Prince Napoléon, he felt the need to justify himself and so

published a pamphlet which contained eight pages of apology for his innovation. A true man of his time, David knew that the best defense of anything was the claim that the Ancient Greeks had done it but that it was frowned upon during the ancien régime: he stated that Zeuxis had charged to see his works, but the "fausses délicatesses" of pre-Revolutionary France had not permitted it. "De nos jours, cette pratique est observée en Angleterre où elle est appelée exhibition," David explained, adding that artists should be reimbursed by the public for the privilege of seeing their works.[41] The experiment was a success and David repeated it in 1801 when the second National Exposition of Industry coincided with the annual Salon.[42] But it did not become a trend, and exhibitions continued to be free. For if, in conservative quarters, exhibitions still preserved a taint of commercialism, the whiff of a bazaar, how much worse to add to that the idea of the theatre--the "show" with paid admission! David was correct, however, in his attribution of the custom to England, for there, from the first Royal Academy exhibition in 1769, paid admission was an established custom.[43] Exhibition of a single painting to a paying public was also practiced in England: Géricault even sent his Radeau de la Méduse across the channel in hopes of financial gain. But, with the exception of dioramas (which were not considered art), the idea did not catch on in France.

In 1848, however, under the Second Republic, the National Assembly removed the budget of the annual Salon from the Direction des musées and reassigned it to the Ministère de l'Intérieur.[44] The expenses connected with the fine-arts could then be discussed dispassionately, like any other budget item, without any sense of noblesse oblige. One day of paid admission per week was instituted at the Salon, government commissions fell over 50%, and the budget for "Encouragements aux Beaux-Arts" was cut.[45] The expenses entailed in mounting a huge annual Salon were resented. An 1849 memorandum from the Commission du Budget to the Ministère de l'Intérieur, asked:

> La Commission demande si ces expositions continueront à être annuelles? La situation fâcheuse dans laquelle se trouvent les artistes à la suite d'une Révolution et les voeux qu'ils expriment généralement rendent les expositions annuelles momentanément nécessaires.
>
> L'administration se propose du reste d'étudier sérieusement cette question. Il serait pourvu aux frais de la prochaine exposition par la demande d'un crédit spécial. 46

While the Commission du Budget was "studying" the question of the annual Salon, the Salon of 1850 was neither scheduled nor funded. Further, by twisting the sentiments of the Commission des Beaux-Arts, which had recommended a permanent fine-arts exhibition combined with a biennial Salon, it pronounced that, in the interests of the dignity of art, both commissions wished to replace the annual Salon with one held at longer intervals.[47] In the battle that

followed, L'Artiste blasted the Commission in a two-page editorial, stating that it might comprise the highest notables of finance, but when it dealt with questions of art it was, in a word, incompetent.[48] As a compromise, the Salon was scheduled for November 1850, to continue into 1851 and thus serve for two years, with the next scheduled for 1852. The final report of the Commission du Budget stated:

> Mais dût-on, dans l'avenir, pour donner à ces expositions un caractère plus solennel et un plus haut degré d'intérêt, ne les renouveler qu'à des intervalles moins rapprochés: tout le monde est d'accord, quant à présent, après les souffrances qu'ont endurées les artistes depuis deux ans qu'on ne saurait leur refuser une occasion de faire connaître leurs oeuvres et une chance d'en obtenir le prix. [49]

The annual Salon, considered by artists their principal victory of the 1830 Revolution, would, with the exception of 1852-53, henceforth be biennial; only after the Salon des refusés of 1863 would it be returned to its annual status.[50]

The Government's desire to reduce costs by eliminating the annual Salon found allies in an unexpected quarter: the Académie des beaux-arts which had been condemning the Salon ever since it had lost its control during the 1789 Revolution. Ingres, for example, as all conservative critics and Academicians, repeatedly referred to the Salon as a bazaar. Henriquel-Dupont quoted Ingres as saying:

> Monsieur, le Salon est la perte de l'art; il faut fermer le Salon.... On croit encourager la peinture avec le Salon: on lui ouvre une voie misérable. Cette quantité de portraits, ces tableaux sans pensée, sans plan, sans but, ne sont là que pour faire du commerce....C'est à la décoration des églises, des palais publics, des temples de la justice que l'art doit se consacrer; c'est là son véritable, son unique but. Le Salon, l'en détourne en fournissant à tant de barbouilleurs l'occasion d'exposer leurs pauvretés ou de fausser le goût public par le spectacle bête des trompe-l'oeil. Oui, pour arrêter la décadence, pour régénérer l'art, il faut fermer le Salon. 51

Their motives were entirely logical, for the Salon offered non-Academicians access to the public, a chance to become known and sell their works; it provided a market for easel paintings rather than the large "machines" so beloved of Academicians; it offered a challenge to the Academy's control of the art market and artists' careers. Most important, this rhetoric provided the excuse for the businessmen of the Second Republic to make the Salon biennial, for it would never do to admit that it was done to save money.

Paid admission was to defray the costs of even a biennial Salon. In 1852, the Ministre de l'Intérieur set admission at one franc the first week, with two paid days a week thereafter, one at five francs, the other at one franc; the remaining days were free.[52] The Palais de l'Industrie was also announced that Spring; the prospect of paid admission for all events held there as well was not greeted with pleasure:

> Mais il paraît que la méthode anglaise, qui consiste à faire de tout une spéculation particulière et à se rembourser de ses dépenses par le payement des entrées, n'a pas de chance de succès chez nous; cela répugne à nos institutions,, à nos habitudes. La France s'est toujours montrée généreuse et splendide quand il s'agit d'exhiber aux yeux des curieux étrangers ou indigènes les richesses nationales. L'admission dans nos musées, dans nos palais, dans nos bibliothèques, etc., a toujours été gratuite, et l'exemple des Anglais ne saurait changer nos moeurs. 53

The decision stood, however. Mercey wrote that at the 1853 Saint-Cloud meeting, it was immediately decided to institute paid admission at the Universal Exposition of Art as well.[54] Prince Napoléon was later to claim that this was done only because the Government had been forced to advance the capital to build the Palais des Beaux-Arts, but this could not have been anticipated in 1853.[55] The struggle between old Aristocratic and new Capitalist values can be seen in one Government memorandum which pleaded for a retention of free admission for Art if not for Industry:

> Il y aurait un point bien capital et bien populaire à obtenir, ce serait la gratuité complète d'entrée à l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. Ce point la distinguerait essentiellement et très noblement de l'Exposition de l'Industrie, et rappellerait aux étrangers cette belle coutume si exclusivement française d'ouvrir gratuitement nos édifices publics et nos musées à la curiosité des voyageurs de tous pays. 56

Not only was "this lovely custom" ended, but it seemed that the Compagnie had lost all perspective in its lust for profits: it decided that <u>everyone</u> would be required to pay,

including judges, exhibitors, journalists, critics and members of the Imperial Commission. The outcry grew so loud that Prince Napoléon was obliged to step in and, by decree, set entrance fees and exemptions, and even allow one free day, paid for by the Emperor.[57]

Nor was Art to be distinguished from Industry. The same fees were adopted for each: five francs during May and one day a week thereafter. Mérimée said no one attended on the five franc days but "quelques lorettes et cinq ou six lords ou ladies."[58] As a result, the price was dropped to two francs in August; regular admission was one franc, and on Sundays, twenty centimes. Everyone went on Sundays, even the well-to-do, for, as was pointed out in the press, all understood that if the experiment succeeded, the "English system" would become a standard--and unwelcome--feature of French life (Figure 21).[59] Mercey's statistics showed that on five franc days there were rarely more than 150 visitors, but on Sundays, often 20,000; from this he concluded:

> Le résultat a prouvé que, tandis qu'en Angleterre le public ouvrait sa bourse avec un certain enthousiasme, en France, il ne se résignait qu'assez difficilement à payer, et encore à payer le moins possible.... On voit, d'après ces résultats, qu'en France, une exposition rétribuée n'a de chances de succès qu'en abaissant, autant que possible, le droit d'entrée à payer. 60

In contrast, Prince Napoléon wrote in his Rapport that the

receipts showed that the public had readily accepted this new innovation.[61] What the receipts did show was that the public was less willing to pay to see an exhibition of Art than one of Industry: there were 4,180,117 visitors at the Palais de l'Industrie, 935,601 at the Palais des Beaux-Arts. A report in the Archives explained somewhat tactfully "cette innovation a dû contribuer à ralentir la curiosité du public."[62]

A Show of Artists or a Show of Works?

The first major task of the Imperial Commission was to define the scope of the Universal Exposition, in the form of the Règlement général, signed by Napoléon III on 6 April 1854.[63] The Règlement specified two major divisions, Industry and Art, with all the productivity of the human race then subdivided into eight groups, of which Art was the last.[64] This study is mainly concerned with Drawing and Painting, for these were the areas to which the administration, the critics and the public devoted most of their attention, and whose anticipated success was to establish the superiority of France.

What kind of exhibition would it be? That it would be retrospective was established at the Saint-Cloud meeting, for its purpose was to manifest the glory of the French School, not to show the latest developments in art as in industry. At the opening of the Exposition, Prince

Napoléon recounted the essential problem:

> Dans les beaux-arts, deux systèmes se présentaient: fallait-il faire une exposition pour les oeuvres, sans se préoccuper de savoir si les artistes étaient morts ou vivants, ou pour les artistes, en n'admettant que les oeuvres des vivants?
>
> La première idée a été soutenue; elle repondait peut-être mieux au programme qui voulait un concours de l'art au XIXe siècle; elle n'a cependant pas été adoptée, à cause des difficultés d'exécution qu'elle soulevait. 65

This facile explanation concealed the major issues underlying the decision, probably the most hotly contested and far-reaching in consequences of the entire show. A Government memorandum was more candid:

> De quels ouvrages se composera l'Exposition Universelle? L'Exposition de 1855 étant la première de ce genre, il est impossible de se la figurer autrement que comme Exposition retrospective des chefs d'oeuvre de toutes les Ecoles contemporaines de Peinture, Sculpture, Gravure et Architecture.
>
> Si on force nos artistes Français à n'y faire paraître que des ouvrages non encore exposés, c'est leur donner un désavantage par trop injuste et par trop écrasant dans leur lutte contre les artistes étrangers qui ne manqueront pas d'apporter à cette Exposition des ouvrages éprouvés par une longue popularité dans leur pays.
>
> Si on ne fixe pas une date à l'oeuvre, c'est appeler à un concours destiné à établir l'état actuel des arts dans les différents pays du monde, des ouvrages qui n'ont plus rien de commun avec le courant actuel des divers Ecoles, et par exemple en France, c'est ouvrir l'Exposition à un grand nombre d'oeuvres de l'Ecole de David, laquelle, en réalité, n'a plus en ce moment aucun véritable représentant dans notre Ecole vivante.
>
> Reculer la date de dix ans seulement, c'est

pour la France exclure de la lice les trois plus illustres représentants de notre peinture vivante: Ingres, Delacroix, Delaroche. Depuis dix ans on ne sait s'ils ont produit puisque le public n'a plus rien vu d'eux; ou bien leur grand talent a été appliqué à des travaux de décoration monumentale qui ne leur ont pas laissé le loisir de produire ces peintures sur toiles qui seules malheureusement peuvent paraître dans l'Exposition universelle.

Il semble qu'en calculant bien le moment où de tels hommes, chefs et maîtres de presque toute la jeune Ecole, étaient encore dans leur plus active fécondité, et en calculant aussi l'époque où ont pris naissance les talents mûrs qui font aujourd'hui l'orgueil de nos Expositions, on doive décréter que toute oeuvre exposée ne remontera pas à plus de vingt années de date et aura été produite de 1835 à 1855. 66

In the battle over the definition of the show, Prince Napoléon opposed this proposal, and took a position identical with Pastoret and the Academy:

J'avais proposé d'admettre toutes les oeuvres produites depuis l'année 1800 par les artistes les plus célèbres. Ma pensée était d'offrir un ensemble complet de l'art au XIXe siècle, ensemble que les oeuvres des artistes vivants ne pouvaient présenter que d'une manière imparfaite. Ce système souleva de nombreuses objections. On prétendit qu'on n'aurait jamais un local suffisant pour une Exposition aussi étendue. 'Ce serait, disait-on, un déménagement partiel de nos musées. D'ailleurs, ce qui se ferait pour la France devrait se faire également pour l'étranger. L'agglomération deviendrait énorme et l'Exposition des Beaux-Arts aurait ainsi des proportions gigantesques.' Les adversaires du projet allèrent dans leurs réserves jusqu'à proposer de circonscrire l'Exposition dans une période de vingt années. Mais cette restriction, qui aurait enlevé à cette solennité toute signification et toute portée, ne prévalut point. Il fut décidé que l'Exposition des Beaux-Arts serait ouverte aux productions des artistes français et étrangers, vivant au 22 juin 1853, date du décret constitutif du cette Exposition. 67

On 24 March 1854, Delacroix wrote in his Journal:

> A deux heures et demie, séance à la commission de l'Industrie. Discussion sur le règlement concernant l'exposition des ouvrages faites depuis le commencement du siècle. J'ai combattu avec succès, aidé de Mérimée, cette proposition, qui a été écartée. Ingres a été pitoyable; c'est un cervelle toute de travers; il ne voit qu'un point. 68

Delacroix had been quick to realize that a general retrospective of nineteenth century art would strengthen the past at the expense of the present and would reinforce the contemporary position of the School of David, Ingres and his followers. Limiting the exposition to living artists, on the other hand, would demonstrate the diversity and vitality of art at mid-century: the Romantics, the Realists, the painters of Barbizon and genre, all would bear witness that the classical tradition was no longer the exclusive representative of the French School. While it is surprising that Ingres, Pastoret and Prince Napoléon lost this battle to narrowly define the French School, it was probably because Delacroix had a more important ally than Mérimée: the comte de Morny, eclectic though he was in his aesthetic tastes, had one notable hiatus in his collection--no paintings by the School of David.[69]

It would be Morny's eclecticism and not Prince Napoléon's classicism which would characterize the Exposition. The most important evidence of Morny's

influence is the Imperial Commission's decision to arrange special retrospective exhibitions for the most prominent French artists, each representing a different direction in art. Ingres, Delacroix, Vernet and Decamps were among artists mentioned as beneficiaries of this policy.[70] The decision was to be far-reaching in its implications for, unlike previous regimes, that of the Second Empire no longer wished to set the direction of art, but would be content merely to ratify existing popular choices. Provided that the principal artists rallied to the Empire, the Government was willing to endorse them and include them all in the definition of the French School. All styles were thus considered implicitly neutral and interchangeable, their differences being reduced to questions of taste and popularity.[71]

The Government policy in art was, in fact, merely an extension of the system it used sucessfully in politics. Taxile Delord noted in his history of the Second Empire that "the dictatorship" had found it advantageous to allow one newspaper to each of the major political factions, despite its overall policy of strict censorship.[72] In its choice of official candidates for the elections, the Government looked for men "who will represent best the natural sympathies of the districts, while at the same time giving the Government the guarantees of sincere adhesion and devotion which it had a right to demand."[73] If this

system worked so well in politics, why shouldn't it be equally successful in art?

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. See Prince Napoléon's Rapport, 3.

2. The exact profit was L186,000; see Gibbs-Smith, 3-5.

3. "Discours prononcé par S.A.I. le Prince Napoléon, Président de la Commission Impériale, à la séance d'inauguration de l'Exposition Universelle, le 15 mai 1855," Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 399-403.

4. On Pastoret, see Soubies, 1816-1852, 162-65, and Taxile Delord, Histoire du second Empire, 1848-1869, 6 vols., Paris, 1869-75, II:118-24.

5. Institut de France, Archives de l'Académie des beaux-arts, Procès-verbaux 1851-1855, 1, 8 mars 1851.

6. See Lord Pilgrim, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 1 août 1851, 16. The exposition lasted from 15 August to 31 October 1851.

7. See the catalogues of the New York 1853 Exhibition of Industry of All Nations and the 1853 Dublin Great Industrial Exhibition; also see William H. Gerdts, "Art and the Crystal Palace," paper presented at the symposium "Crystal Palace/42 Street/1853-54," C.U.N.Y. Graduate Center, 1974.

8. AN ADXI-67.

9. AN F12 3182; the decree was published in Le Moniteur Universel, 30 mars 1852, 517. Also see Pierre de La Gorce, Histoire du second Empire, 7 vols., Paris, 1894-1905, 1:57.

10. See A. Audigenne, "L'Exposition Universelle de 1855 et les préparatifs de l'industrie française," Le Moniteur Universel, 11 septembre 1853, in AN F12 3183.

11. See, for example, Hte. Lucas, "Palais National," Mercure Français, mars 1852, in AN F12 3183; also Siegfried Giedion, Space, Time and Architecture, Cambridge, Mass., 1944, 190-94.

12. L'Artiste, 1 avril 1852, 95. As L'Artiste was an official publication receiving a Government subsidy (see 15 juillet 1850, 64), this should be understood as tacit criticism of the Government.

13. On the Palais de 1'Industrie, see AN F21 519, F12 2895, F12 3182, F12 3183, F12 70619-5. Contracts between Achille Fould, Ministre d'Etat and M. de Rouville, Directeur de la Compagnie du Palais de 1'Industrie are in F21 519, F12 2895. Also see Convention and Cahiers des charges relatif à la concession du Palais de 1'Industrie, 29 août 1852, signed by MM. Ardoin et Compagnie and P. Magne, Ministre de 1'Intérieur, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 164-69. Plans and descriptions were published in Alexis Barrault and G. Bridel, Le Palais de 1'Industrie, Paris, 1857; for a short account of its subsequent history, see E. Maglin, "Le Palais de 1'Industrie," La Nature, 1897, II:183-86. It was repurchased by the Government in 1857 at 3₣39 per 100₣ share; see Loi relative au rachat par 1'Etat du Palais de 1'Industrie du 6 juin 1857, Bulletin des lois de 1'Empire Français, XIe Série, 9 (janvier-juin 1857): 1021-32.

14. See my article "The Eiffel Tower and the English Lighthouse," Arts Magazine 54 (March 1980) 141-44.

15. Eugène Delacroix, Journal, 1822-1863, André Joubin, ed., Paris, 1980, 10 mai 1854.

16. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 49.

17. My discussion is taken from the following sources: Henry de Saint-Didier, "Mosaïque," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 67-68; Paul Andral, "Chronique Judiciaire," La Propriété littéraire et artistique I (1855): 178, 265-80, 372-73.

18. Décret instituant une Exposition Universelle de 1'Industrie, 8 mars 1853, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 170.

19. The account of Frédéric de Mercey, who was Commissaire général de 1'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, is generally reliable; see his "L'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts en 1855," Revue contemporaine 31 (1857): 466-94.

20. On Eugénie's role, see Mercey, "Exposition," 468-69, and "Discours prononcé par S.A.I. le Prince Napoléon, Président de la Commission Impériale, à 1'ouverture de la session du Jury d'Admission et d'Examen des oeuvres d'art, 20 mars 1855," in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 398.

21. Delord, Histoire, II:118-24.

22. Mercey, "Exposition," 466; the meeting took place 16 May 1853.

23. Décret instituant une Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, 22 juin 1853, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 171-72.

24. Discours prononcé par S.A.I. le Prince Napoléon, Président de la Commission Impériale à l'ouverture des travaux de cette Commission, 29 décembre 1853, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 396-97.

25. The decree of 22 June 1853 cancelled the Salons at the same time as it announced the Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts.

26. Décret instituant la Commission Impériale, chargée de diriger l'Exposition Universelle de l'Industrie et des Beaux-Arts, 24 décembre 1853 in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 172-75. Visconti died in December 1853 and was replaced by Léon Vaudoyer; Henriquel-Dupont resigned 7 March 1854 and was not replaced; see AN F21 519.

27. See Viel-Castel, Mémoires, II: 27 décembre 1853, and Chennevières, Part II: 103.

28. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 12.

29. See the decree of 24 December 1853, establishing and defining the Imperial Commission; Ibid., 172-75.

30. Prince Napoléon's 1853 speech was published in Le Moniteur Universel, 27 juillet 1853 and included in the catalogue for the 1855 Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, Explication des ouvrages...., XLIV-XLVIII.

31. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts,", Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855. The memorandum was neither signed nor dated but as it discussed various issues settled by the Règlement of 6 April 1854, it was probably anterior to that date.

32. The contracts between Achille Fould, Ministre d'Etat and M. de Rouville, Directeur de la Compagnie du Palais de l'Industrie are in AN F21 519; see those of 10 décembre 1853, 17 juillet 1854, 26 octobre 1854; also see AN F12 2895, F12 70619-5 and Bulletin des lois de l'Empire Français, XIe Série 4 (juillet-décembre 1854): No. 1973: 404-405.

33. Prince Napoléon, "Discours...15 mai 1855," Rapport, 402; Mercey, "Exposition," 475.

34. Chemin-Dupontes, Journal des Débats, 19 avril 1854, in AN F12 3184.

35. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 15.

36. Ibid., 42-49; also see AN F21 519 for the treaty of 17 juillet 1854 annulling that of 10 décembre 1853 and returning the exposition to the Louvre. L'Artiste announced in "Mouvement des Arts," 15 août 1854, 30, that the show would be in the Louvre.

37. See AN F21 519, treaty of 26 octobre 1854, for the construction of the Palais des Beaux-Arts; also see AN F12 2895 and F12 70619-5; Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 42-49; Mercey, "Exposition," 475-76.

38. Lord Pilgrim, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 15 novembre 1854, 124.

39. "Discours...15 mai 1855," Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 402.

40. Ibid., 81-82.

41. Le Tableau des Sabines, exposé publiquement au palais national des sciences et des arts, salle de la ci-devant académie d'architecture par le Citoyen David, Paris, an VIII (1799).

42. See the announcement in the Gazette Nationale, 5e jour complémentaire, an IX (22 September 1801), 1506.

43. Luckhurst's discussion of English exhibitions is detailed and reliable; see 15-62.

44. AN F21 560, Budget de 1850, Question No. 10.

45. AN F21 599. For both 1848 and 1849, the credit assigned for the beaux-arts was not actually spent; see Budget de 1848, Budget de 1849, Exercise 1849. Also see AN F21 519, Statistique, and Mercey, 485.

46. AN F21 560, Budget de 1850, Question No. 10.

47. On 17 January 1850, by a notice inserted in Le Moniteur Universel, the Direction des Beaux-Arts affirmed that there would be an annual Salon in 1850. Salons were traditionally held in the Spring, and when by 1 March, the National Assembly had not yet scheduled it, L'Artiste published two angry editorials; see 1 mars 1850, 41, and "Mouvement des Arts," 15 mars 1850, 156-57.

48. Ibid., 15 mars 1850.

49. Ibid., 15 avril 1850, 190-91.

50. Ibid., for artists' attitude towards the annual Salon. L'Artiste was made an official journal in July 1850, after which such attacks on the Government ceased.

51. Henri Delaborde, Ingres, sa vie, ses travaux, sa doctrine, Paris, 1870, 372-73, Note 1; also see Ingres' notes, "Le Salon," 370-72: "un magasin de tableaux à vendre, un bazar."

52. L'Artiste, 1 avril 1852, 79.

53. Hte. Lucas, "Palais National," Mercure Français, mars 1852, in AN F12 3183.

54. Mercey, "Exposition," 469.

55. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 42. Mercey, apparently forgetting that he had attributed the idea to the Saint-Cloud meeting, offered this explanation several pages later; see his "Exposition," 485.

56. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts," Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855.

57. For a discussion of the entrance fees, see Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 49, 82-85; also AN F21 519, Organisation Générale. The free day was 17 May 1855, paid for by the Liste Civile. Also see "Mélanges," Revue des Beaux-Arts, 1 avril 1855, 136.

58. Mérimée to Madame de Boigne, 8 juillet 1855, in Prosper Mérimée, Correspondance Générale, Maurice Parturier, ed., 2e Série 1 (1853-1855): No. 2272(N).

59. Ch. Mouton, "Bulletin de l'Exposition Universelle," La Gazette Pittoresque de l'Exposition Universelle, de l'industrie, des lettres et des arts, 14 juin 1855, 5.

60. Mercey, "Exposition," 485.

61. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 81.

62. Statistics were published by Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 483. The apology for such poor attendence was given in AN F21 519, "Note pour Monsieur de Mercey. Nombre de Visiteurs à l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts."

63. Règlement général de l'Exposition universelle de 1855, 6 avril 1854, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 176-94. There were eight Groupes comprising thirty Classes, further broken down into Sections; A XXXIe Classe. L'Economie domestique was later added. The structure represents a

typical nineteenth century world view; the Groupes comprised: I. Industries ayant pour objet principal l'extraction ou la production des matières brutes; II. Industries ayant spécialement pour objet l'emploi des forces mécaniques; III. Industries spécialement fondées sur l'emploi des agents physiques et chimiques, ou se rattachant aux sciences et à l'enseignement; IV. Industries se rattachant spécialement aux professions savantes; V. Manufactures de produits minéraux; VI. Manufactures de tissus; VII. Ameublement et décoration, modes, dessin industriel, imprimerie, musique; VIII. Beaux-Arts. The Beaux-Arts were subdivided into three Classes: XXVIII. Peinture, gravure et lithographie; XXIX. Sculpture et gravure en médailles; XXX. Architecture. Photography was included with the decorative arts in the VIIe Groupe.

64. See Système de Classification des produits de l'industrie et des oeuvres d'art établi conformément à l'article 16 du règlement général. Août 1854, Ibid., 249-348.

65. "Discours...15 mai 1855," Ibid., 401.

66. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts," Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855. The fear of the remnants of the School of David refers less to Ingres than to the "Old Guard," Heim, Abel de Pujol, Picot--a well-organized clique of mediocrities within the Academy.

67. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 13.

68. Delacroix, Journal, 24 mars 1854.

69. On Morny's collection, see my Chapter IV, Note 11.

70. AN F21 519, Jurys d'Admission; see the handwritten memorandum from the Imperial Commission "Placement definitif."

71. Albert Boime has recently advanced the theory that the Government attempted to impose Realism as the official style of the Second Empire. I do not believe that a thorough examination of the evidence supports this, as will be shown in the following chapters; see Boime, "The Second Empire's Official Realism."

72. Delord, History, II:174.

73. Zeldin, Political System, 14.

CHAPTER VI

FOUR HEROES AND A SELF-MADE MAN

Napoléon III attempted to legitimize his Government by encouraging powerful individuals and groups, who had supported previous regimes, to rally to the Second Empire. A mixture of flattery and material incentives, secret deals and possibly a threat or two ended up bringing him Legitimists and Orleanists, Republicans and Bonapartists, Socialists and, above all, the Church.[1] This was the secret of the Second Empire's survival, but also the seed of its undoing for, when everything is promised to everyone, there are bound to be more than a few disappointed. So it happened also in art. Although surviving evidence is scanty, it appears that the Government actively courted the artists it wished to show off to the world.

Ingres

From the Government point of view, Ingres was the most important artist alive, for he had worked for and been honored by every regime of the nineteenth century. He was most closely identified with the July Monarchy, and most of his friends were Orleanists, a group which Napoléon III was courting second only to the Church.[2] How clever, then, to

give Ingres in 1852 a commission to paint the ceiling of the Hôtel de Ville; the subject: L'Apothéose de Napoléon Ier (Figure 22). Ingres accepted. According to his enemies, his political philosophy was "il ne faut jamais se moquer des vaincus, parce qu'ils peuvent revenir; ni des vainqueurs, parce qu'ils sont les plus forts."[3]

His participation in the 1855 Universal Exposition was of the utmost importance, for he was internationally known and respected. He had not, however, exhibited in the Salon since 1834, when his Saint-Symphorien had been badly received. He had to be convinced to rally. First he was appointed to the Imperial Commission in December 1853. Then his ceiling was lavishly praised by Achille Fould, Ministre d'Etat. On 1 February 1854, Ingres wrote to his friend Marcotte:

> Le Ministre d'Etat m'a dit plusieurs fois que l'Empereur désirait voir mon ouvrage; mais je n'y compte pas. Toute sa famille y est venue et ils en ont été on ne peut plus satisfaits. Tout le monde dit que c'est dommage que cette si belle oeuvre soit destinée à un plafond, et le ministre désire en faire faire une copie, et que l'original soit le diamant de l'Exposition universelle de 1855. [4]

Napoléon III and Eugénie did come in person, and Ingres explained to them the symbolism of his painting. Neither the Emperor nor his officers liked the horses but, as Charles Blanc explained, they were "men who lacked a certain familiarity with aesthetic issues."[5] Fortunately,

it was Prince Napoléon who was charged with Ingres ralliement, and he was a cultivated man. Expressing his profound admiration for Ingres' painting, which he esteemed above all modern art, Prince Napoléon then invited Ingres to reunite all his works at the Universal Exposition. Ingres asked for time to consider the proposal.[6] His friend Charles Blanc recounted the artist's misgivings:

> Envoyer tous ses ouvrages à l'Exposition universelle! Affronter le jugement de l'Europe entière, se livrer aux caprices d'une multitude de spectateurs, dans laquelle se trouveraient des rivaux, des jaloux, des ignorants aveugles et des juges aveuglés!....
>
> Pour vaincre ses répugnances, on promit à Ingres de lui réserver un salon à part, où il arrangerait son exhibition lui-même tout à son aise, et dont il aurait la clef jusqu'au jour de l'ouverture. Cette concession, d'ailleurs si flatteuse, le décida. [7]

This is not exactly the way it happened. Sometime in late 1854, Ingres wrote to Mercey driving a very hard bargain in return for his participation:

> J'aurai l'honneur de faire remarquer que je me suis éloigné des expositions publiques depuis plus de vingt ans et que, plus que jamais, je désirais m'en abstenir; cependant mes amis m'ayant fait pressentir la bienveillance dont l'administration de l'exposition universelle de 1855 voudrait bien m'honorer et aussi le désir qu'on avait bien voulu leur témoigner de voir mes ouvrages figurer à cette exposition solennelle, je me déciderois à y paraître de mon mieux, si l'administration consentait à m'accorder les privilèges que j'ai l'honneur de lui soumettre.
>
> 1. Je demande en premier lieu, de vouloir bien m'accorder une salle particulière, ou un fond de galerie séparée d'une manière quelconque suivant les dispositions générales du local.

2. Qu'on me laisse le droit de faire placer et disposer mes tableaux moi-même et qu'une fois maître de local, avant l'exposition, je puisse y faire disposer, ou restaurer mes tableaux, s'il y a lieu et n'y recevoir personne, jusqu'au moment où le jury me fera l'honneur d'y entrer.

3. Je désire également faire concourir à cette exposition quelques-uns de mes tableaux d'histoire, les plus importants, entre autres le saint Symphorien, qui est à la cathédrale d'Autun, et le Voeu de Louis XIII à la cathédrale de Montauban; mais je désirerois que l'administration se chargeat des demandes, transports, frais et responsabilités que pourroient entraîner ces déplacements.

4. Quant aux plafonds soit celui d'Homère au Louvre, ou celui de Napoléon à l'Hôtel de Ville, je tiens beaucoup à ce que ces ouvrages ne soient pas déplacés; cela ne pourrait que nuire à leur effet, ayant été compris et exécutés pour la place qu'ils occupent.

5. Quant au nombre des ouvrages, je ne puis comprendre une telle exposition qu'en la rendant aussi complette que possible, car l'artiste doit paraître là, avec toutes ses armes, je ne puis m'astreindre à un nombre limité au-dessous d'une trentaine de tableaux grands ou petits. 8

Ingres was given everything he wanted and more. In January 1855 he wrote again to Mercey, asking that his fee be raised for Jeanne d'Arc, commissioned in 1851 for Reims. Mercey promptly recommended an increase of 5000 francs, for, he stated, in his dealings with the administration, Ingres had always demonstrated sincerity and unselfishness.[9] Ingres eventually relented and allowed his two ceiling paintings to appear in the Exposition, where the Apothéose de Napoléon Ier was accompanied by this text: "Il est conduit, sur un char, au temple de la Gloire et de

et de l'Immortalité; la Renommée le couronne et la Victoire dirige les chevaux; la France le regrette; Némésis, déesse des vengeances, terrasse l'Anarchie."[10] By the time the Exposition opened, Ingres and the Government were well pleased with each other.

Delacroix

Delacroix apparently had no qualms at all about exhibiting; his Journal and Correspondance of 1854-1855 are full of references to his forthcoming exhibition.[11] The only artist appointed to the Imperial Commission who was not an Academician, Delacroix enjoyed amicable relationships with Prince Napoléon, Morny and Mercey, and had been in on the planning of the art exhibition right from the beginning: he noted in his Journal on 1 July 1853, six months before the Commission was even appointed, that he had attended a meeting with Achille Fould to plan the event.

In March 1854, Mercey gave him a commission for 12,000 francs for a painting to be done specifically for the Universal Exposition. His subject: La Chasse aux Lions, an appropriate image for the Government's efforts.[12] On 27 April 1854, Delacroix noted in his Journal that he was working away on his Chasse aux Lions (Figure 23) and (in the same sentence) that he was planning another painting to be titled Génie arrivant à la gloire. He was expecting

great things from the Exposition.

One year later, 24 March 1855, his mood had shifted. He wrote in his Journal: "Très chagrin du peu d'affection que je trouve chez les gens de cette exposition.... Je me sens très isolé et cette situation m'inquiète encore davantage pour l'avenir." The same day he wrote to a friend "Le jury est presque entièrement composé des membres de l'Institut auprès desquels mes recommandations n'auraient, je crois, nul effet."[13] To make matters worse, a wall panel promised to him for his exposition had been taken away and given to Ingres, and his complaints to Chennevières were without result. Properly annoyed, he wrote to Mercey:

> Je désirerais bien vivement que vous eussiez la bonté de m'assigner le plus prochainement qu'il vous sera possible un moment où il sera dans vos convenances de vous rendre à l'Exposition. Je m'y rendrais de mon côté afin d'obtenir de vous-même un espace convenable pour mes tableaux. On m'avait flatté de la possibilité d'avoir une place dans les salles qui sont attribuées tout entières à MM Ingres et Vernet. L'âge et le talent ont des privilèges que je suis loin de contester. Mais je ne suis pas moi-même un jeune homme, ni un inconnu. Je ne pourrais avoir tiré des provinces, avec beaucoup d'ennui et de frais, de grands tableaux pour les exposer ici dans un jour peu favorable. En outre, je désirerais que les amateurs qui tous ont eu la bonté de mettre à ma disposition leurs tableaux, malgré la longueur de l'Exposition et les risques du lieu, les vissent placés avec quelque honneur. 14

Chennevières, who was at this time a low-ranking member of the art administration, was, however, a protégé

of Nieuwerkerke, and Delacroix had his problems with both master and man. Nieuwerkerke, in charge of museums, would not cooperate with Delacroix' request to remove Liberté guidant le peuple (Figure 24) from storage, where it had been confined since June 1848, in order to include it in his show. In exasperation, Delacroix finally wrote to Prince Napoléon:

> Monseigneur, J'ose solliciter de Votre Altesse Impériale Sa haute intervention afin d'obtenir la faculté de placer à l'Exposition Universelle mon tableau représentant le 28 juillet 1830.
>
> Cet ouvrage qui est la représentation d'un fait appartenant à l'histoire n'avait pas paru à l'Ancien Gouvernement devoir être mis sous les yeux d'une génération qui est loin d'avoir répudié les conséquences de cet événement. Il m'a semblé que sous un gouvernement puissant, issu lui-même d'une grande manifestation nationale, ce tableau pouvait être tiré d'oubli. Et ce qui m'entraînait à en faire la demande à Votre Altesse Impériale dont l'active et patriotique sollicitude s'étend à tout ce qui peut augmenter l'éclat de l'Exposition, c'est l'accueil favorable dont cet ouvrage fut l'objet au moment de son apparition. En daignant m'aider à le remettre sous les yeux du public Votre Altesse Impériale me donnerait un moyen de plus de concourir dans la mesure de mes forces à l'intérêt qui va s'attacher à l'Exposition Universelle.
>
> Le tableau fait partie de la collection du Louvre et se trouve actuellement dans les magasins qui en dépendent. 15

The letter was signed "E. Delacroix, Membre de la Commission Impériale pour l'Exposition Universelle." Prince Napoléon requested an explanation from Nieuwerkerke who wrote to Varcollier, the Prince's secretary:

J'espère que vous avez bien voulu transmettre à S.A.I. les hautes raisons qui, à mon point de vue, s'opposent à l'exposition d'un tableau représentant La Liberté en bonnet rouge au sommet d'une barricade, et des soldats français foulés aux pieds de l'émeute.

Si j'ai demandé à l'Empereur de vouloir bien décider la question, j'espère que S.A.I. ne verra dans ma démarche rien qui ressemble à une opposition quelconque de ma part à l'exécution d'un ordre émanent d'elle, mais bien réellement l'obligation dans laquelle je me trouve de ne disposer de rien de ce qui appartient à l'Empereur sans en avoir préalablement obtenu l'autorisation de S.M. elle-même.

J'ai fait porter le tableau aux Tuileries, ce soir je verrai l'Empereur; il me donnera ses ordres.

Si la decision est en faveur du désir de M.E. Delacroix, demain matin le tableau sera déposé à l'Exposition, mais ma responsabilité sera à couvert. 16

Alexandre Dumas (who was certainly not there) wrote a succinct account of the subsequent interview between Napoléon III and Nieuwerkerke: "Le tableau est-il bon? demanda-t-il. Sire, M. Delacroix l'estime un de ses meilleurs. Qu'on l'expose avec les autres, alors!" [17] Albeit the reality was more prosaic than that, in any case it was due to the personal intervention of Napoléon III that Liberté guidant le peuple reappeared in 1855. And, no doubt, it was due to Mercey's intervention that Delacroix' exhibition ended up so well installed, that, although he was not given a separate gallery, as were Ingres and Horace Vernet, he pronounced himself well satisfied. Shortly after the Exposition opened, he wrote to Baudelaire: "Je

vous avouerai que je n'en suis pas mécontent, et quelque chose de moi-même m'a gagné plus qu'à l'ordinaire en voyant la réunion de ces tableaux" (Figure 25).[18]

Decamps

Poor Decamps. He had nothing but wealth and popularity. He was never elected to the Académie des beaux-arts, never given a Government commission, never considered a painter in the Grand Tradition of the French School.[19] On the other hand, he was a favorite of bourgeois collectors (and not a few aristocrats if the truth be known). His small jewel-like paintings with their rich color and texture had a certain elegance without the disturbing angst of Delacroix (Figure 26). Neither he nor his patrons (among them Morny) could be ignored, but he was not courted and flattered as were Ingres and Delacroix. In a sulk, he decided not to participate.

On 22 February 1855, his friend Jadin wrote to Nieuwerkerke from Fontainebleau:

> Decamps est ici depuis quelques temps et je le pousse à exposer cette année une demi-douzaine de tableaux n'ayant pas encore parus aux expositions. Il y en a chez diverses amateurs, et des plus beaux, on aurait qu'à choisir, et il semble que ce serait un bon appui pour représenter l'école française. Mais il est tellement triste et abattu qu'il n'a coeur à rien, lui déjà si negligent de tous temps pour ses soins.
>
> Je crois qu'une lettre de vous pourrait le stimuler et le décider. 20

Nieuwerkerke wrote to Decamps several days later:

> J'ai entendu dire que vous n'avez pas l'intention d'envoyer de vos ouvrages à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855, et je serais charmé que la démarche que je fais auprès de vous, vous décidât à ne pas persister dans votre résolution. Vous êtes un de nos éminens artistes dont l'abstentation serait le plus vivement ressentie, et il vous serait si facile de réunir quelques-uns de vos chefs-d'oeuvre, en vous adressant à leurs heureux propriétaires que vous ne voudrez pas, je l'espère, nous causer ces regrets. 21

The mixture of flattery and menace proved effective, for on 1 April, Decamps wrote to Nieuwerkerke:

> Je regrette bien vivement de n'avoir pas causé un moment avec vous lors de mon dernier passage à Paris. Je le ferrai si je suis plus heureux mercredi prochain ou jeudi au plus tard. Vous recevrez comme il est convenu la notice de mon envoi pour le 5 courant. Quant aux ouvrages qui ne sont plus ma propriété, je ne puis obtenir des amateurs qu'ils veuillent bien s'en dessaisir qu'à la condition de les soustraire aux dangers souvent inséparables d'un grand encombrement. Au reste, plein de bonne volonté de mon côté, ma décision en definitive est un peu subordonné à celle des amateurs puisque malheureusement je suis réduit à recourir à eux. 22

In the margin, Nieuwerkerke wrote "lui dire que je regrette de n'avoir pas été chez moi quand il est venu et que je compte sur son envoi." And so Decamps received the following note:

> Je regrette infiniment de ne m'être pas trouvé chez moi, quand vous avez pris la peine de venir. En attendant que je sois plus heureux, je m'empresse de vous dire que je compte sur votre envoi, et vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de mes sentimens les plus distingués. 23

This time Nieuwerkerke signed it "Président du jury d'examen et d'admission des oeuvres d'art envoyées à l'Exposition Universelle."

Vernet

Perhaps the reason why there is so little surviving evidence of the administration's courtship of Horace Vernet is that it would have been superfluous. He was already their man. After all, he, the most famous battle painter in the world (Figure 27), had already spent several months of 1854 travelling with the French Army during the Crimean War, making notes and sketches for the series of paintings in which he intended to immortalize the inevitable victories of Napoléon III's Imperial Army.[24]

On 14 March 1855 he was given his first major commission of the Second Empire, Napoléon Ier entouré des Maréchaux et Généraux morts sur le champ de bataille, an enormous painting of 9.48 by 5.06 meters, at an equally enormous price of 50,000 francs.[25] No wonder he could write smugly to a friend:

> X*** vient d'avoir un coup de sang. Il a manqué mourir, tant il est inquiet de son exposition. Que ces pauvres gens sont à plaindre avec leur orgueil! Que gagnent-ils à leur charlatanisme? De se faire mettre des sinapismes et des petites bêtes je ne sais où. Pour moi, je ne suis pas si malin, et je puis m'asseoir sans douleur à la place que m'a été faite.... [26]

Courbet

Separating fact from fiction when it comes to Courbet is not easy. Both he and subsequent historians have dramatized his plight in 1855, and he emerges as somewhat of a martyr, persecuted by a blind administration and hostile critics. And yet, placed in context, a different picture emerges. The crucial information is that Courbet was 36 years old in 1855, Ingres 75, Vernet 66, Delacroix 57 and Decamps 52. In the gerontocracy of French culture, he was a very young man indeed and would have to wait his turn to be recognized. But Courbet did not want to wait. He was determined to seize the occasion of the Universal Exposition to present a major retrospective of his work, such as had been officially given to these older artists. And yet he would not rally to the Empire as they had done.

There is evidence that the Government attempted to gain his loyalty in the same way as it had approached Delacroix, through the offer of a painting commissioned expressly for the Exposition. To this end, Nieuwerkerke invited him to luncheon sometime in 1854, and Courbet immortalized the interchange in a letter to his friend and patron Alfred Bruyas:

> Avant que je ne quitte Paris, M. de Nieuwerkerke, directeur des beaux-arts, m'a fait inviter à déjeuner au nom du gouvernement et, de crainte que je ne refuse son invitation, il avait pris pour ambassadeurs MM. Chenavard et Français, deux <u>satisfaits</u> et <u>décorés</u>. Je dois dire à leur

honte qu'ils remplissaient un rôle gouvernemental vis-à-vis de moi; ils préparaient mon esprit à la bienveillance et secondaient les vues de M. le directeur; d'autre part, ils auraient été contents que je me vendisse comme eux. Après qu'ils m'eurent bien conjuré d'être ce qu'ils appelaient bon enfant, nous nous rendîmes au déjeuner chez Douix, au Palais-Royal, où M. de Nieuwerkerke nous attendait. Aussitôt qu'il m'aperçut, il s'élança sur moi, en me pressant les mains, en s'écriant qu'il était enchanté de mon acceptation, qu'il voulait agir franchement avec moi, et qu'il ne me le dissimulait pas, qu'il venait pour me convertir! (Les deux autres échangèrent un coup d'oeil qui voulait dire: quelle maladresse, il vient de tout gâter!) Je répondis que j'étais tout converti, que pourtant s'il pouvait me faire changer de manière de voir, je ne demandais pas mieux que m'instruire. Il continua en me disant que le gouvernement était désolé de me voir aller seul, qu'il fallait modifier mes idées, mettre de l'eau dans mon vin, qu'on était tout porté pour moi, que je ne devais pas faire la mauvaise tête, etc.: toutes sortes de sottises de ce genre; puis il termina le discours d'entrée en me disant que le gouvernement désirait que je fasse un tableau dans toute ma puissance pour l'Exposition de 1855, que je pouvais compter sur sa parole, et qu'il mettait pour conditions que je présente une esquisse et que, le tableau fait, il serait soumis à un comité d'artistes que je choisirais et à un comité qu'il choisirait de son côté. Je vous laisse à penser dans quelle fureur je suis entré après une pareille ouverture; je répondis immédiatement que je ne comprenais absolument rien à tout ce qu'il venait de me dire, d'abord parce qu'il m'affirmait qu'il était un gouvernement et que je ne me sentais nullement compris dans ce gouvernement, que moi aussi j'étais un gouvernement, et que je défiais le sien de faire quoi que ce soit pour le mien, que je puisse accepter. Je continuai en lui disant que je considérais son gouvernement comme un simple particulier, que lorsque mes tableaux lui plairaient, il était libre de me les acheter, et que je ne lui demandais qu'une seule chose, c'est qu'il laisse l'art libre dans son exposition et qu'il ne soutienne pas avec un budget de 300 000 Fr 3000 artistes contre moi. Je continuai en lui disant que j'étais seul juge de ma peinture; que j'étais non seulement un peintre, mais encore un homme; que j'avais fait de la peinture non pour

faire de l'art pour l'art, mais bien pour conquérir ma liberté intellectuelle, et que j'étais arrivé par l'étude de la tradition à m'en affranchir, que moi seul de tous les artistes français mes contemporains, avais la puissance de rendre et traduire d'une façon originale et ma personnalité et ma société. Ce à quoi il me répondit: "Monsieur Courbet vous êtes bien fier!"--"Je m'étonne, lui dis-je, que vous vous en aperceviez seulement. Monsieur, je suis l'homme le plus orgueilleux de France." Cet homme, qui est le plus inepte que j'ai rencontré peut-être de ma vie, me regardait avec des yeux hébétés. Il était d'autant plus stupéfait qu'il avait dû promettre à ses maîtres et aux dames de la cour qu'il allait leur faire voir comment on achetait un homme pour 20 ou 30 000 Fr. Il me demanda encore si je n'enverrais rien à cette exposition. Je répondis que je ne concourais jamais, puisque je n'admettais pas de juges; que pourtant il pourrait se faire que je leur envoie par cynisme mon Enterrement, qui était mon début et mon exposé de principes, qu'ils se démêleraient avec ce tableau comme ils pourraient, mais que j'espérais à moi seul (peut-être), avoir l'honneur de faire une exposition en rivalité de la leur, qui me rapporterait 40 000 Fr, argent que je ne gagnerais certainement pas avec eux. Je lui rappelais aussi qu'il me devait 15 000 Fr pour les droits d'entrée qu'il avait perçus avec mes tableaux dans les expositions antécédentes; que les employés m'avaient assuré qu'individuellement ils conduisaient 200 personnes par jour devant mes Baigneuses, ce à quoi il répondit la bêtise suivante: "Que ces personnes n'allaient pas pour les admirer." Il me fut facile de répondre en récusant son opinion personnelle et en lui disant que la question n'était pas là, que soit pour critique, soit pour admiration, la vérité était qu'ils avaient touché les droits d'entrée, et que la moitié des comptes rendus des journaux portaient sur mes tableaux. Il continua en disant qu'il était bien malheureux qu'il se trouve au monde des gens comme vous, qu'ils étaient nés pour perdre les plus belles organisations et que j'en serais un exemple frappant. Je me suis mis à rire aux larmes, en lui assurant qu'il n'y aurait que lui et les académies qui en souffriraient. Je n'ose vous parler davantage de cet homme, je crains de vous ennuyer par trop. Pour terminer, il finit par quitter la place, et nous laissant en plan dans

> la salle du déjeuner, il allait passer la porte, je lui pris la main et lui dis: "Monsieur je vous prie de croire que nous sommes toujours aussi amis." Puis je me retournais du côté de Chenavard et Français, en les priant aussi de croire qu'ils étaient deux imbéciles; ensuite nous allâmes boire de la bière. Voici encore un mot de M. Nieuwerkerke qui me revient: "J'espère, me disait-il, M. Courbet, que vous n'aurez pas à vous plaindre; le gouvernement fait assez de coquetterie à votre égard, personne ne pourra se flatter d'en avoir reçu autant que vous; remarquez bien que c'est le gouvernement et non pas moi qui vous offre aujourd'hui à déjeuner." Si bien que je suis redevable au gouvernement d'un déjeuner; je voulais le lui rendre, cela a mis en colère Français et Chenavard. 27

Courbet's account was somewhat exaggerated. His Baigneuses, for example, was shown in 1853 when there were only two, poorly attended, paid admission days per week at the Salon; his claim for fifteen thousand francs was thus absurd. Nor did he inform Bruyas that the requirement of a preliminary sketch was a standard feature of Government commissions, omitted only for well-established and "dependable" artists; Courbet was neither. Nonetheless, his account of the luncheon with Nieuwerkerke was corroborated by Français, who recalled that Courbet instantly began discussing politics, vociferously condemned the 1852 coup d'état and in conclusion accused the Government of trying to corrupt artists. [28]

Courbet was determined to have his own show and had already begun grooming Bruyas to pay for it. Despite the exchange with Nieuwerkerke, in the fall of 1854 he sent the Imperial Commission a list of works he would like to

exhibit; at the same time he wrote to Bruyas: "Quel dommage que nous n'ayons pu faire cette exposition pour notre compte, c'eût été d'un esprit large et nouveau, en dehors de toutes les vieilles idées du passé."[29] When he wrote to him in March to tell him that he had obtained an extension on the deadline for submitting his works, he added: "S'il m'arrive des désagréments avec le gouvernement, nous pourrions tenter le grand coup, l'exposition entière de la galerie, adjointe à mes tableaux."[30] When three of Courbet's fourteen paintings, including his Atelier (Figure 28) were refused by the Jury, he wrote again to Bruyas:

> Je suis aux cent coups. Il m'arrive des choses terribles, on vient de me refuser mon Enterrement et mon dernier tableau l'Atelier avec le portrait de Champfleury. Ils ont déclaré qu'il fallait à tout prix arrêter mes tendances en art, qui étaient désastreuses pour l'art français. J'ai 11 tableaux de reçus, la Rencontre est reçue avec peine, on trouve cela trop personnel et trop prétentieux. Chacun me pousse à faire une exposition particulière. J'y ai cédé. Je vais faire une autre exposition de 27 tableaux nouveaux et anciens de moi, en disant que je profite de l'avantage que le gouvernement me fait en me recevant 11 tableaux à son exposition. Pour faire une exposition des tableaux de mon atelier, cela me coûtera 10 ou 12 mille. J'ai déjà le terrain pour une location de 2000 pour 6 mois. La construction me coûtera 6 ou 8 mille. Ce qu'il y a de curieux, cet emplacement est enclavé dans le bâtiment même de leur exposition. Je fais une démarche près du préfet de police pour remplir les formalités. [31]

He added: "Paris est exaspéré de ce qu'on m'a refusé," and for once he was not exaggerating, only the exasperation was general at the severity of the Jury, of which he had become

the symbol.

Had Courbet's two major paintings been accepted, he would have had a private retrospective exhibition equal to that of the four major painters; this was, of course, exactly what he wanted. He proceeded to set it up anyway, and that he conceived of it as theatre as much as art, relishing the gesture and the official outrage, is apparent in the letter he sent Bruyas after the latter agreed to foot the bill:

> Nous allons donc dresser nos batteries et procéder à ce grand enterrement. Avouez que le rôle de fossoyeur est un beau rôle, et que de déblayer la terre de tout ce fatras des bric-à-brac n'est pas sans charmes. --40 000ℱ c'est un rêve, nous voilà obligés de louer un terrain à la ville de Paris vis-à-vis leur grande exposition, je vois déjà d'ici une tente énorme avec une seule colonne au milieu, pour murailles des charpentes recouvertes de toiles peintes, le tout monté sur une estrade, puis des municipaux de louage, un homme en habit noir tenant le bureau, vis-à-vis les cannes et parapluies, puis deux ou trois garçons de salle. --Je crois que nous les gagnerons, ces 40 000, quand même nous ne spéculerions que sur la haine et l'envie, sauf erreur, voici le titre: Exposition de la peinture de maître Courbet, et de la galerie Bruyas. Il y a vraiment de quoi faire danser Paris sur la tête, ce sera sans contredit la plus forte comédie qui aura été jouée de notre temps; il y a des gens qui en tomberont malades, c'est sûr. 32

Across the letter, like an icon of its import, Courbet drew a carnival structure with a pennant flying in the breeze.

Courbet's request to the Préfet de Police gave the rue Amélot, far from the Exposition, as the site of his show.

When the Préfet wrote to the Ministre d'Etat on 21 April 1855, asking for advice, he received a response from Mercey saying that there would be no objection.[33] Courbet then proposed the Avenue d'Antin or the Faubourg Montmartre; these sites were also approved. Then, on 1 May, he announced that actually he wanted to have his exhibition somewhere near the Champs-Elysées, but had not settled on a location.[34] This brought a letter from Achille Fould himself to the Préfet de Police:

> Je m'empresse de vous informer, Monsieur le Préfet, que cette modification ne change rien à ma décision, je dois ajouter cependant qu'il ne serait pas convenable que l'exhibition dont il s'agit fût très rapprochée de l'Exposition universelle des Beaux-Arts et pour ainsi dire à la porte même de cette Exposition, comme c'est je crois, l'intention de M. Courbet, et vous devez faire des réserves à ce sujet dans votre autorisation. Mais si M. Courbet veut établir son exhibition dans l'avenue des Champs-Elysées, je n'y vois, pour ce qui me concerne, aucun inconvénient. [35]

Of course Courbet intended all along to do exactly what Fould feared, having written to Bruyas in early April saying that he had already arranged the site "enclosed among the very buildings of their Exposition."[36] But the Government had no desire to martyrize Courbet, despite the merry paper chase he had led, and so in the end he was given permission to put his show right where he wanted it, on the avenue Montaigne, opposite the Palais des Beaux-Arts "at the very entrance to the Exposition" as Fould had predicted. Even he had to admit that he had been given

extraordinary freedom in organizing his exhibition.[37]

And so, without Government interference, he built his pavilion opposite the Palais des Beaux-Arts, installed his show, published his manifesto "Du Réalisme," plastered Paris with advertising posters (one franc admission), and waited for the 40,000 francs to begin rolling in.[38]

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. For a thorough explication of Napoléon III's system, see Zeldin, Political System.

2. On Ingres' political milieu, see Charles Blanc, Ingres, sa vie et ses ouvrages, Paris, 1870, 174-75, and Henry Lapauze, Ingres, sa vie et son oeuvre, 1780-1867, Paris, 1911, 465-73.

3. See Laurent-Jan, "M. Ingres, Peintre et Martyr," a satirical biography published in Le Figaro in 1843, reprinted 30 décembre 1855, 2-7.

4. Ingres to Marcotte, 1 février 1854; the letter was published in Blanc, Ingres, 175-76.

5. Ibid., 176.

6. Ibid., 177. On 13 August 1854, he wrote to Marcotte that he still had not reached a decision; Ibid., 177.

7. Ibid., 177.

8. Ingres to Frédéric de Mercey, n.d.; the letter was published by Paul Leroi in "Le Musée de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique," L'Art LIX (1894-1900), 2e Série IV, 904.

9. Frédéric de Mercey to M. le Ministre d'Etat, 12 janvier 1855; AN F21 88: Ingres.

10. See the catalogue for the 1855 Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, Explication des ouvrages...., Ingres, N° 3343, Apothéose de l'Empereur Napoléon Ier.

11. All subsequent citations are from these editions: Eugène Delacroix, Journal, 1822-1863, André Joubin, ed., Paris, 1980; Correspondance Générale d'Eugène Delacroix, André Joubin, ed., 5 vols., Paris 1926-38.

12. On Delacroix' commission for La Chasse aux Lions, see AN F21 74: Delacroix; also his Journal of 20 mars 1854.

13. Delacroix to Mademoiselle Mazuyer, 24 mars 1855; Correspondance, III:249-50.

14. Delacroix to Frédéric de Mercey, 26 mars 1855; Ibid., III: 250; also see his Journal, 24 mars 1855.

15. Delacroix to Prince Napoléon, 11 avril 1855;

Archives du Louvre P30: Delacroix. The original letter is in the Archives de la Seine 6A 2855, pièce 34; I am grateful to Jack Spector for this reference.

16. Le comte de Nieuwerkerke to Varcollier, 11 avril 1855, Archives du Louvre P30: Delacroix.

17. Alexandre Dumas, "Exposition Universelle de 1855," Le Mousquetaire, 10 juin 1855, 360.

18. Delacroix to Charles Baudelaire, 10 juin 1855; Correspondance, III: 266. Also see Delacroix to Philippe de Chennevières, 1 septembre 1855, in which, after hearing that Chennevières intended to rehang the painting exhibition, Delacroix wrote to express his satisfaction with his installation as it was, and to request that it be left unchanged.

19. Decamps wrote an autobiography full of self-pity describing his situation; see Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, "Notice Biographique écrite par lui-même," in the form of a letter to his patron Véron, dated 20 octobre-15 novembre 1854. It was first published in La Revue de Paris (which Véron founded) and reprinted in Dr. Louis-Désiré Véron, Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris, 6 vols., Paris, 1853-55, VI: 264-74. On Decamps, also see Dewey F. Mosby, Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps 1803-1860, 2 vols., NY/London, 1977.

20. Jadin to le comte de Nieuwerkerke, 22 février 1855; Archives du Louvre P30: Decamps (Alexandre), Dossier relatif à l'exposition des tableaux et dessins, 1855. The following correspondence is all contained in this dossier.

21. Nieuwerkerke to Decamps, 27 février 1855; Ibid.

22. Decamps to Nieuwerkerke, 1 avril 1855; Ibid.

23. Nieuwerkerke to Decamps, 4 avril 1855; Ibid.

24. See Amédée Durande, Joseph, Carle et Horace Vernet, Correspondance et biographies, Paris, 1863, 310. On Vernet, also see the exhibition catalogue Horace Vernet: 1789-1863, Ecole nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1980.

25. On Vernet's commission for Napoléon Ier entouré des Maréchaux et Généraux morts sur le champ de bataille, see AN F21 111: Horace Vernet; the painting was destined for the Tuileries but was never finished.

26. Durande published the letter but unfortunately didn't identify "X***"; 301.

27. Gustave Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, published in a collection of Courbet letters "Lettres inédites," L'Olivier, Revue de Nice 8 (septembre-octobre 1913): 485-90. The date is given as December 1854 but this must be an error because Courbet did in fact submit a list of paintings before the deadline of 30 November. December would have been late to begin discussing a commission for a painting to be completed before the Universel Exposition. It is more likely that this letter was written earlier in the year.

28. See Aimé Gros, François-Louis Français, Causeries et souvenirs par un de ses élèves, Paris, 1902, 195-96.

29. Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, n.d.; BN, Cabinet des estampes, Yb 3 1739(8): Lettres de Gustave Courbet, N° 10. The Avis published in L'Artiste, 15 avril 1854, 94, stated that, between 15 September and 30 November, artists were to send the Imperial Commission a list of paintings they would like to exhibit and an estimate of space required; works themselves were to be submitted to the Jury between 15 January and 15 March 1855. This letter was probably written in the fall as as Courbet stated that he had sent in his list of paintings; it is obviously later than the one describing his luncheon with Nieuwerkerke.

30. Courbet to Bruyas, n.d.; Ibid., N° 8. As the deadline for submitting work was 15 March and Courbet mentioned in the letter that he had obtained a two week extension, it was probably written in late February or early March.

31. Courbet to Bruyas, n.d.; Ibid., N° 7; probably written in early April when the Jury decisions became known.

32. Courbet to Bruyas, n.d.; Ibid., N° 10; probably written in late April when Courbet was arranging his show.

33. Le Préfet de Police to the Ministre d'Etat, 21 avril 1855; AN F21 5218, dossier: Correspondance avec des artistes. Courbet's request has not been preserved.

34. Préfet de Police to the Ministre d'Etat, 1 mai 1855; Ibid; It was the Préfet who informed the Ministre that Courbet claimed the rue Amélot address was an error. There is another letter, undated, granting Courbet permission to have his show on the Avenue d'Antin or the Faubourg Montmartre.

35. Le Ministre d'Etat to the Préfet de Police, n.d., Ibid.

36. Courbet to Bruyas, n.d.; see Note 31.

37. Courbet to Bruyas, n.d.; L'Olivier, 479-81. The letter was probably written around 15 May as he complained about the installation of his paintings at the Palais des Beaux-Arts; the exhibition there opened on that date. The contract with Legros for the construction of his pavilion was dated 15-16 mai 1855; see the first of seven boxes of Courbet papers in the BN, Cabinet des estampes, Yb 3 1739.

38. See the exhibition catalogue Exhibition et vente de 40 tableaux et 4 dessins de l'oeuvre de M. Gustave Courbet, avenue Montaigne, 7, Champs-Elysées, Paris, 1855.

CHAPTER VII

CHOOSING THE ARMS OF FRANCE: THE JURY

> La tâche d'un jury d'admission est difficile et ingrate, surtout dans une Exposition universelle, où les principes des Expositions ordinaires n'étaient plus applicables, et où le jury avait à choisir les armes de la France dans cette lutte qui s'agrandissait.
> --Prince Napoléon, at the opening of the Universal Exposition, 15 May 1855 [1]

Who controlled the Jury defined the show. Various proposals have survived, all revelatory of the power struggles over the composition of the Jury for painting, for, by general consensus, the French School would be defined here.

One proposal, on the stationery of the Direction générale des musées impériaux (Nieuwerkerke's bureau), suggested that all the Juries be composed half of Academicians, half of "enlightened amateurs and eminent artists."[2] It also suggested that Nieuwerkerke be named President of all the Juries, an idea which, Princess Matilde's preferences notwithstanding, would have occurred to no one but Nieuwerkerke. But the main problem with this proposal was that the Academy, which could be expected to vote as a block, would command 50% of the vote, while the

other half, artists and amateurs, would be divided. Nieuwerkerke had gotten himself elected Académicien libre in November of 1853, a gesture which even the faithful Chennevières considered somewhat dubious for a Government administrator, causing a conflict of interest.[3] "Nieuwerkerke croit à l'étoile de son ambition," wrote Viel-Castel; he experienced no conflict in following it.[4]

A second proposal, on a blank page and impossible to assign, suggested fourteen painters for the Jury, half Academicians, half chosen among artists who received the most votes for elected Juries in the three previous Salons, that is, the seven most popular independent artists.[5] The author listed as choices, the Academicians Ingres, Delaroche, Picot, Horace Vernet, Léon Cogniet, Robert-Fleury, and Abel de Pujol, a fair and representative choice among the major figures. The non-Academicians suggested included Delacroix, Flandrin, Français, Decamps, Dauzats, Théodore Rousseau, Corot, again a very liberal choice, avoiding those who would merely echo the Academic point of view. As Hippolyte Flandrin was elected to the Academy in August 1853, this proposal was probably one of the earliest and in its liberality seems to bear the stamp of Frédéric de Mercey.

The third proposal was the one more or less adopted: fourteen Academicians, fourteen independent artists, and

fourteen amateurs.[6] Contained in a memorandum preserved in the Louvre archives, it probably was the work of Nieuwerkerke as it also suggested that both artists and amateurs--two-thirds of the Jury--be named by the Directeur général des musées impériaux.

In the midst of the Administration's courtship of artists, and the behind-closed-doors struggles over the composition of the Jury, a suspicion arose. Clément de Ris, a proponent of artists' rights, wrote in L'Artiste that he wasn't certain that the principle of an elected Jury was going to be upheld.[7] Although he didn't dare say it in a Government subsidized journal, the criticism was obvious, for Napoléon III's regime was supposedly based on universal manhood suffrage. Nonetheless, the Exposition was much too important politically to be trusted to the vagaries of democracy and, in the end, all the Juries were appointed by the Imperial Commission, either by its section on agriculture and industry, or, as in this case, its section on art.

The composition of the Jury d'admission et d'examen des oeuvres d'art was announced on 20 January 1855.[8] The Jury of the XXVIIIe Classe (Painting, Drawing, Engraving, Lithography) included twelve Academicians: Abel de Pujol, Jean Alaux, Jacques-Raymond Brascassat, Léon Cogniet, Louis-Charles-Auguste Couder, Hippolyte Flandrin,

François-Joseph Heim, Louis Hersent, François-Edouard Picot, Robert-Fleury and the engravers Auguste-Gaspard Louis Boucher Desnoyers and François Forster. Ingres and Horace Vernet were also appointed but resigned. The only missing painters of the Academy were Jean-Victor Schnetz, who was Director of the French Academy in Rome, and Paul Delaroche, who had withdrawn from public life.

The independent artists were, in comparison, less powerful as a group, for they comprised eleven, of whom Adolphe Mouilleron and Léon Noel were lithographers. There were the history painters Thomas Couture, Eugène Delacroix, Charles Müller and Henri Lehmann, the landscapists François Français, Troyon, and Théodore Rousseau. When Ingres resigned, he was replaced by Ernest Meissonier, who, with Adrien Dauzats, represented genre painting. In comparison with the proposal, it was a conservative choice, for Corot and Decamps had been dropped, replaced by the arch-conservatives and future Academicians Müller and Lehmann.

The most numerous group on the Jury were the nineteen "amateurs," for the most part friends of the regime or its hauts fonctionnaires, whose support could be counted upon. The imbalance was caused by the addition of eight members of the Imperial Commission (Ingres and Delacroix among them) after the Jury had been appointed; in this way were

included Prince Napoléon, Achille Fould, the comte de Morny, the marquis de Pastoret, Frédéric de Mercey and the comte Adolphe-Narcisse Thibaudeau, a railway magnate. Other "amateurs" included the vicomte de Lezay-Marnézia, who had rallied to every regime since the Restoration, De Tromelin, a member of the Corps Législatif, the marquis Maison, whose family had even a longer history of ralliement, having begun under Napoléon I, and the duc de Cambacérès, whose loyalty was such that he was among the first batch of Sénateurs created after the coup d'état of 2 December 1851.

There were several others whose credentials as amateurs were more impressive: the celebrated lawyer Chaix d'Est-Ange, the curators of the Louvre, Frédéric Reiset and Frédéric Villot, the diplomat and archeologist Victor Place, the amateur painter and littérateur vicomte Adalbert de Beaumont, and Edmond Du Sommerard, the curator-administrator of the Musée des Thermes and Hôtel de Cluny, whose collections had been formed by his father. There were even three real amateurs: François-Marie Delessert, a rich banker, who had formed a celebrated collection with his brother Gabriel, Adolphe Moreau (the father of Moreau-Nélaton) and Louis Lacaze; the collections of the latter two are now in the Louvre. In the end, Nieuwerkerke was named President of the Jury d'Admission, probably due in equal parts to the influence of Mathilde

and the long-standing tradition which assigned this position to the Directeur général des musées impériaux.

On the basis of numbers alone, the regime had arranged to guard the decision-making power for itself, while at the same time giving a veneer--a very thin veneer--of democracy. Thus did the political system of Napoléon III work in art as in politics.[9]

And The Results

George Sand was one of the few visitors willing to pay five francs to see the Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts as soon as it opened. She wrote to her son Maurice "Les artistes sont entrés les uns par faveur, les autres par hasard."[10] The ones "par faveur" took up the lion's share of the space. As we have seen, promises, offers, commissions and threats had been used to ensure the cooperation of artists whose participation was deemed advantageous to the Government. As none of their paintings were refused, it is unlikely that their works were really subject to Jury decisions.[11] Nor is it likely that the artists on the Jury themselves really had to submit their works for judgment. As evidence, one might cite the malice and glee shown by the Revue des Beaux-Arts in reporting the consternation produced among Jury members when a work by Couture unexpectedly received two negative votes.[12]

Moreover, the lack of limitation on the number of works meant that the "invited" artists would take up a disproportionate share of the space available. Delacroix, for example, who showed thirty-five works, wrote to a friend "Tout ce que j'ai pu ramasser de nouveau ou d'ancien figure à 1'Exposition de Paris."[13] Ingres showed forty-one works, Decamps forty-nine, Vernet twenty-two. And so, when Prince Napoléon told the Jury d'Admission at its installation ceremonies that it must show "une juste sévérité," he was really saying that there was a shortage of space.[14] Mercey attempted to put a better face on it: "Cependant, grâce à la juste sévérité des comités étrangers et du jury français, et à 1'heureuse disposition du locale, cet obstacle fut écarté."[15]

That's not the way the artists saw it. La Revue des Beaux-Arts pointed out that, as artists had been solicited from the beginning, they thought the Jury would be indulgent, especially as they sent their best known works, exhibited at previous Salons. Instead they found "un tribunal d'Eaque et de Rhadamante," the two judges of Hell; this might have been a reference to Lehmann and Müller who, their ambitions set on the Academy, were reputedly the most severe members of the Jury.[16] L'Artiste, an official journal, had to be more careful, and so limited itself to reporting who had been refused.[17] Charivari, an opposition paper, could be more forthright; Taxile Delord wrote that

artists had originally been pleased to see so many of their colleagues on the Jury and were thus convinced "L'ère des refus est à jamais passée, l'âge des expositions va commencer." Then came the results. "Qu'est devenue toute cette allégresse? Elle s'est changée en amertume, en douleur, en maladie, en désespoir, en rage."[18] Illustrating this was Daumier's cartoon Refusé (Figure 29), showing two dejected artists, captioned "Vue prise dans un atelier, quelques jours avant l'ouverture de l'exposition."[19]

The dimensions of the debacle kept growing: Le Journal des Arts, des Sciences et des Lettres de l'Exposition Universelle, 1855, announced that 7,000 works had been submitted to the Exposition. La Revue des Beaux-Arts put the figure at 8,000 to 10,000, and La Revue Universelle des Arts stated that 13,000 paintings had been submitted by French artists alone, and eight out of ten had been refused. Although the official records are incomplete, it seems that about 8,100 works were submitted to the Jury, three-quarters of which were refused.[20] As the outcry mounted, Delacroix wrote to Adolphe Moreau "On dit que vous allez avoir une révision des travaux du jury, cela me paraît bien conidérable, à moins qu'elle ne porte que sur des objets que l'on a remarqués."[21] And a month later Le Journal des Arts stated: "Il paraît que l'Empereur a exprimé ses regrets de ces monstreuses exclusions; il avait été même question d'une révision; mais nous croyons qu'elle

n'aura pas lieu."[22] It is possible that Napoléon III, alarmed by the complaints he was receiving, may well have thought of a revision--eight years before the Salon des refusés--for his regime was built on the continuing support of all special interest groups. But there was simply not enough space to mount both a series of retrospectives by major artists and, at the same time, to adequately represent all the artists considered minor. Universal suffrage notwithstanding, democracy in this context was impractical. Some artists, Courbet among them, seem to have benefited from a partial revision, however; La Rencontre and Une Dame Espagnole were both accepted on a second viewing after having previously been refused.[23]

In the end, 699 French painters exhibited 1872 works.[24] Many of the refused artists went away angry or depressed. Courbet, however, was already making plans to challenge the hegemony of the official art world by mounting his own show. He wrote, and for once he was telling the truth: "Je conquiers la liberté, je sauve l'indépendance de l'art."[25]

The Installation

Who was it on the Imperial Commission who first had the idea of grouping major artists' work into individual retrospective exhibitions? In the annual Salons, no attempt was made to group each artist's work, and in the

studio exhibitions that artists held from time to time, they made no attempt to show their own development. Mercey wrote:

> La Commission Impériale, voulant donner satisfaction aux réclamations adressées par quelques-uns de nos artistes les plus éminents, avait décidé que les ouvrages de chaque maître seraient réunis dans un même local ou sur un même panneau, de façon à présenter comme une sorte de résumé des travaux de toute leur carrière. Le même système fut, autant que possible, appliqué aux autres exposants. 26

Ingres had writtten demanding his own show, and Delacroix may have expressed a similar desire. But in the context of the Universal Exposition, the idea of a simple grouping was subsumed into the omnipresent ideal of "Progress." As Prince Napoléon stated: "Souvent leurs productions furent réunies, afin qu'on pût mieux juger de leur mérite ou de leurs progrès par leurs oeuvres successives." 27 The memo "Placement définitif" of the Imperial Commission simply stated:

> Il était juste que les ouvrages des principaux maîtres fussent rassemblées et offrissent pour ainsi dire par leur réunion un ensemble chronologique des travaux de toute leur vie. Ce classement a été adopté particulièrement pour MM. Ingres, H. Vernet, E. Delacroix, Decamps, Vernet, et Gudin, Lehmann etc.....
>
> Ce mode de placement a été du reste très apprécié des peintres qui ont vivement réclamé lorsque leurs oeuvres ont été éloignées les unes des autres. 28

And so this idea of the retrospective exposition, which would be one of the major innovations of the

Universal Exposition, slipped in virtually unnoticed. Swept along in a tide of "Progress," it seemed perfectly natural that artists too should be required to show that their development followed the same immutable laws as industry, their latest productions indubitably superior to the preceding ones.

George Sand described the results: "Les gros bonnets ont pris beaucoup de place, c'était leur droit vis-à-vis du public. Gudin, Ingres, Vernet ont des salles entières. Delacroix, Decamps et Meissonier ont des coins ou des panneaux."[29] Mercey set forth the system followed--in principle.[30] The Grand Central Salon (Figure 30) and the largest galleries in the Palais des Beaux-Arts were to be reserved for history paintings (an unpublished memorandum added "and important paintings").[31] The smaller rooms had their walls divided into three zones. Just above the picture rail were to be placed the best of the smallest works; above them, medium-sized works such as portraits and landscapes (the memorandum, however, specified "large paintings, portraits, etc."); near the ceiling, were to be placed both very large paintings and those considered of secondary importance (the memorandum stated bluntly "The third line, the least favorable, has been reserved for paintings of lesser merit.") As can be seen, the guidelines were unclear right from the beginning.

Artists were already suspicious of the Jury members who had shown such a "juste sévérité" to everyone but themselves. An editorial in Revue des Beaux-Arts stated:

> Il était jusqu'à un certain point permis de craindre que les membres du Jury chargés du placement, ne s'acquittassent pas de cette mission, quelles que fussent d'ailleurs leurs connaissances et leur bon vouloir, avec toute la spontanéité, toute l'indépendance désirables, puisqu'en certain cas, ils auraient eu à se distribuer à eux-mêmes la lumière et l'espace.[32]

Although no less than Achille Fould had given assurance that there would be a special installation committee, Mercey later wrote: "L'arrangement fut laissé à l'administration, qui toutefois, dans la distribution des places, eut égard aux appréciations des membres du jury de reception des ouvrages, et tint grand compte des recommandations spéciales de ce jury."[33]

This was exactly what artists feared. There had been so many secret deals and private promises, and these promises had been so often disregarded in the exigencies of the moment as the Administration attempted always to grease the wheel that squeaked the loudest, that the installation turned into something of a free-for-all. Delacroix was unaware that separate galleries had been promised to Ingres and Vernet. Vernet saw his enormous Smalah unceremoniously moved to a less desirable location during the show, Decamps found his works scattered despite Administration promises

to the contrary, and Théodore Rousseau threatened to withdraw completely from the exhibition, complaining:

> Je m'y suis vu accroché des derniers l'avant-veille de l'exposition, mais j'avais mes tableaux à peu-près tous ensemble suivant la donnée générale...cet ordre a été complètement changé et l'a été pour moi seul parmi les membres du Jury. 34

If this was the fate of the most sought-after artists, one can imagine how the others were treated.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. "Discours...15 mai 1855," Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 401.

2. AN F21 519; the proposal is undated and unsigned.

3. Chennevières, "Nieuwerkerke," Souvenirs, Part II: 99.

4. Viel-Castel, II: 22 août 1853.

5. AN F21 519.

6. Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, memorandum "Exposition universelle des Beaux-Arts."

7. Comte L. Clément de Ris, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 17 décembre 1854, 152.

8. Décrets instituant le jury d'admission et d'examen des oeuvres d'art, 20 janvier 1855, Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 215-19.

9. Although Zeldin discussed only electoral politics in his Political System, the tactics were similar.

10. George Sand to Maurice Dudevant-Sand, 23 mai 1855; see George Sand, Correspondance, Georges Lubin, ed., 15 vols., Paris, 1964-79, XIII: N° 6658.

11. The registers, though incomplete, have been preserved in AN F21* 2793.

12. George Guénot, "Le Jury des Beaux-Arts de l'Exposition Universelle. Envois et Refus," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 139.

13. Delacroix to Adrien Dauzats, 17 juillet 1855; Delacroix, Correspondance, III: 277.

14. "Discours...20 mars 1855," Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 398. Later, Prince Napoléon claimed that the severity of the jury had been necessitated by the shortage of space; Ibid., 51.

15. Mercey, "Exposition," 488.

16. Guénot, RBA 6 (1855): 137. Guénot did not cite Lehmann and Müller by name, but from the description it was obvious who was meant.

17. Edouard Houssaye, "Le Monde Parisien," L'Artiste, 15 avril 1855, 221.

18. Taxile Delord, "Le Jury de Peinture," Charivari, 17 avril 1855. Delord was later the author of the six volume Histoire du second Empire, 1848-1869.

19. Ibid., 4 mai 1855.

20. For the statistics, see "Beaux-Arts," Le Journal des Arts, des Sciences et des Lettres et de l'Exposition Universelle, 1855 (janvier-février 1855): 6; Guénot, RBA 6 (1855): 137; "Chronique," Revue Universelle des Arts (1855: I): 70. The register is in AN F21 *2793.

21. Delacroix to Adolphe Moreau, 5 avril 1855; Delacroix, Correspondance, V: 196.

22. "Beaux-Arts," Le Journal des Arts, 11 mai 1855, 33.

23. AN F21 *2793; in the Procès-Verbaux du Jury d'Admission, sessions of 7 and 9 avril 1855, these paintings are marked "R" for "Refused", then "Rev." for "Revision," then "Ad." for "Admitted."

24. See the catalogue for the 1855 Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts, Explication des ouvrages....

25. Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, n.d., in Lettres de Gustave Courbet à Alfred Bruyas, Pierre Borel, ed., Geneva, 1951, 85-89. The letter was obviously written in April as Courbet had already learned of his refusal by the Jury and was in the process of setting up his own show.

26. Mercey, "Exposition," 479.

27. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 61-62.

28. AN F21 519, memorandum "Placement définitif."

29. George Sand to Maurice Dudevant-Sand, 23 mai 1855; Sand, Correspondance, XIII: N° 6658.

30. Mercey, "Exhibition," 479.

31. AN F21 519, "Placement définitif."

32. Guénot, RBA 6 (1855): 142.

33. Mercey, "Exhibition," 479.

34. Delacroix to Mercey, 26 mars 1855, Correspondance, III:250; on Vernet, see P. Leroi, 905; Decamps to Nieuwerkerke, 9 avril 1855, Archives du Louvre P30: Decamps (Alexandre), Dossier rélatif à l'exposition des tableaux et dessins, 1855; Théodore Rousseau to the comte de Morny, n.d., Cabinet des dessins, Musée du Louvre.

CHAPTER VIII

CRITICAL THEORIES: THE APOTHEOSIS OF ECLECTICISM

> La peinture et la sculpture viennent, en quelque sorte, donner une révélation de leur avenir par l'exhibition de leur passé, et tel maître dont les dernières oeuvres suffisaient seules à immortaliser son nom, ne sera cependant bien connu que depuis cette histoire complète de son talent que lui aura faite l'Exposition de 1855. Dans les arts, comme dans toutes les manifestations de l'intelligence et du progrès, il est utile, à certaines époques, de revenir sur ses pas, de mesurer l'espace parcouru, de comparer le présent au passé, afin de savoir d'où vient et où l'on va, et de poser plus sûrement les jalons de l'avenir.
>
> --Prince Napoléon [1]

On 15 May 1855, the Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts opened. It is difficult today to imagine what it must have been like to see the contemporary art of the whole world gathered together for the first time. Foreign art had hitherto been known in France only through engravings or the occasional painting or sculpture that found its way into the Salon, or, like Constable's Haywain, into picture shops. As the French rarely visited other countries, they had little first-hand experience, and thus were dependent on the evaluations of critics who travelled.[2] Now, for the first time, they would be able to see and compare the art, to form their own opinions. As Théophile Gautier remarked, the visitor to the Palais des

Beaux-Arts would be able to learn more in four hours than he had in fifteen years of travelling.[3]

But, in fact, the critic became even more important than ever, for, alone and unprepared, the visitor would be unable to make sense out of this enormous display. Despite the fact that most of the French art had already been exhibited and discussed, it was now presented in a context which rendered previous critical approaches inadequate, for the Universal Exposition of Art was both international and retrospective. As it encompassed the art of twenty-eight countries, it produced in France a new aesthetic nationalism: for the first time French art could be experienced as a whole, internecine quarrels being put aside in the interest of meeting the challenge of the foreign Schools. The Government dictum of eclecticism, honoring each of the major artists, established the precedent of attempting to see the validity of each style both at home and abroad, and the individual retrospective shows provoked the novel perception that each artist had a separate history to be written of the growth and development of his individual style. All these new factors invited broad evaluations of the direction contemporary art was taking.

In attempting to assess the import of the exhibition, the principal evidence is the writing of critics and

artists (although the latter is scanty), changes in artists' work or careers, or subsequent changes in the administrative structure of the fine arts. It is to the critics that one looks first, for the official guides to the Exposition are merely lists.

Virtually every Parisian journal and revue published a series of articles, often more than twenty, designed to lead the public gently through the exhibition. As every shade of political and aesthetic opinion was represented in the press, albeit muffled to escape censorship, the average French citizen, whether Legitimist, Clerical, Orleanist, Liberal, Republican or Socialist, could receive, along with the political news, the appropriate aesthetic opinion. An amusing commentary on this custom was related by the critic Louis Auvray, who recalled being summoned by the editor of an opposition journal after having been commissioned to review the Salon. The editor complained:

> Je vous avais recommandé de ne parler d'aucun acte, ni d'aucun functionnaire de l'Etat, et voilà que vous faites l'éloge du portrait de l'impératrice et que vous adressez des compliments à l'administration. Je sais bien que ce portrait est joli et que les réformes sont justes et libérales, mais ce n'est pas à nous de répandre ces choses-là, il fallait les passer sous silence. 4

Several critics, notably the Goncourts, did not align themselves with journals, but published their reviews independently as books. The most influential critics

published first in journals, then reissued their essays as books which thus became the first histories of contemporary art. Among them one might cite (from left to right) the radical Republican Maxime DuCamp, whose articles first appeared in La Revue de Paris, soon after suppressed. Théophile Gautier, the only major art critic who had rallied to the Empire, wrote, appropriately enough, for the Government journal Le Moniteur Universel; he was thus the official spokesman for the Exposition, and his articles formed the basis for the subsequent Visites et études de S.A.I. le Prince Napoléon au Palais des beaux-arts. The conservative E.J. Delécluze assured the readers of the Orleanist Journal des Débats that art had been better in the past, but he was a red radical compared to the Legitimist Claudius Lavergne who wrote for the Ultramontane L'Univers and saw disorder, decadence and godlessness everywhere.[5] Thus did each shade of political opinion have, not only its own journal, but also its own version of contemporary art.

The criticism published in 1855 can be analyzed to show the varied reactions to each artist's work, or to show the relation between each critic's judgment and his overall aesthetic theory; one might even relate the critic's judgments to the politics of his journal. A more important analysis, however, and the one which will be followed here, would be to discover, not where they differed, but where

they agreed, and thus to uncover the broad dimensions of the issues which formed the field of critical discourse in 1855.

The main problem of the critics was to find a structure, a theory, which could encompass in a coherent fashion the varied art of twenty-eight countries. The Government had already shown the way: eclecticism.

Eclecticism in this sense refers less to the ancient Alexandrian philosophy than to its nineteenth century French variant, formulated and popularized by Victor Cousin, the most influential philosopher in the first half of the century. "L'éclectisme est la philosophie nécessaire du siècle," he wrote in 1828.[6] Its enemies pointed out that it was born of the compromise between the ancien régime and the 1789 Revolution, and Cousin's own account of its origins was frankly political:

> C'est vers 1816 et 1817 que, tourmentant en tout sens la conscience pour l'épuiser et l'embrasser dans toute son étendue, j'arrivai à ce résultat, qu'il y a dans la conscience bien plus de phénomènes qu'on ne l'avait pensé jusque-là; qu'à la vérité tous ces phénomènes étaient opposés, les uns aux autres, mais qu'en ayant l'air de s'exclure, ils avaient tous cependant leur place dans la conscience.[7]

Applied to politics, eclecticism promised Utopia:

> Mais, grâce à Dieu, tout annonce que le temps dans sa marche irrésistible réunira peu à peu tous les esprits et tous les coeurs dans l'intelligence et l'amour de cette constitution qui contient à la fois le trône et le pays, la

> monarchie et la démocratie, l'ordre et la liberté, l'aristocratie et l'égalité, tous les éléments de l'histoire, de la pensée et des choses. 8

Unfortunately, neither Charles XII nor Louis-Philippe could make it work. Now it was the turn of Napoléon III to attempt to reconcile the contradictions of post-Revolutionary France. It is well known that he attempted to do this in the broad arena of politics by encouraging notables of all political persuasions to rally to the empire. In the field of art, he hoped to accomplish the same thing.

Eclecticism in art had two meanings during this period, as Adolphe Thiers explained: "L'éclectisme est une direction de goût qui consiste à réunir les qualités d'écoles différentes pour en former un ensemble harmonieux. C'est aussi, pour la critique, savoir apprécier et louer les qualités particulières et opposées de ces écoles."[9] In the first sense, the art of the juste milieu was created; in the second, the 1855 Universal Exposition of Art. The harmonious whole that the Government was trying to create was not an individual work of art, but an exhibition which would encompass all the various French schools. Until 1855 warring and considered mutually exclusive, they were to be reconciled into a strong united front which would meet and vanquish the foreign schools on the peaceable battleground of the fine arts exposition.

Cousin himself had provided the philosophical apology for this when he wrote in his widely reprinted study of aesthetics Du Vrai, du beau et du bien: "Il n'y a pas une de ces écoles qui ne représente à sa manière quelque côté du beau, et nous sommes bien d'avis de les embrasser toutes dans une étude impartiale et bienveillante. Nous sommes éclectiques dans les arts aussi bien qu'en métaphysique."[10]

Théophile Gautier set this forth as the official Government line when he wrote of France: "Elle possède dans son art tous les climats et tous les tempéraments. Elle peut opposer Ingres à Delacroix, Decamps à Meissonier, Flandrin à Couture, Aligny à Rousseau, réunissant tous les contrastes, conciliant les originalités les plus diverses."[11] What had previously been the lament of critics, the fragmentation of the French School, has here become its greatest strength, eclecticism. Thus was eclecticism established as the national character, even the Genius, of France and, for the 1855 Universal Exposition of Art, a species of democratic sentiment was decreed which would replace the hierarchical ranking of categories typical of the classical system. Virtually every critic repeated the Government dictum on eclecticism; the only holdouts were, as might be expected, the Legitimists who, true to their politics, saw eclecticism as compromise and the Government's pluralism as anarchy and confusion.[12]

Eclecticism at home had international benefits as well. Cousin had written: "Il y a dans une époque différents peuples, parce que dans une époque il y a différentes idées. Chaque peuple représente une idée et non pas une autre."[13] Gautier established this as the framework for evaluating the different national styles:

> Dès les premières visites, l'Exposition se divise en quatre zones bien tranchées: l'Angleterre, la Belgique, l'Allemagne et la France. L'Angleterre, c'est l'individualité; la Belgique, le savoir-faire; l'Allemagne, l'idée, et la France, l'éclectisme. [14]

This was taken up by all the critics, who explained at length that eclecticism led to universality, and universality led to superiority.[15] France, encompassing the styles of all countries, was thus the artistic capital of the world.

A public unfamiliar with contemporary foreign art went to see the Italian painting at the Palais des Beaux-Arts looking for the heirs of Raphael, Titian and Michelangelo; at the Belgian exhibit they looked for Rubens.[16] As a glorious past often led to an abysmal present--an eternal possibility in France as well--the public anxiously awaited an explanation. To provide it, the critics added to the Government sponsored theory of eclecticism, a cyclical theory of art which they derived from Universal History. As this theory, with its concepts of progress and decadence, informed all the critiques writen in 1855, it is important

to understand both its genesis and its political significance.

The nineteenth century French interest in Universal History (sometimes called Social Palingenesis) has been related to the discovery of the Orient in the previous century, but a more plausible explanation was provided by Victor Cousin:

> Il fallait bien du temps à l'humanité pour soupçonner un plan dans la mobilité des événements de ce monde. Il fallait qu'elle eût vu paraître et disparaître bien des empires, bien des religions, bien des systèmes pour songer à les comparer, et pour s'élever aux lois générales qui les engendrent et qui les dominent. Il fallait qu'elle eût survécu à bien des révolutions, à bien des désordres apparents, pour comprendre que tous ces désordres ne sont en effet qu'apparents, et qu'au-dessus est un ordre invariable et bien faisant. 17

Like eclecticism, Universal History had a special meaning and application to the generations following the Revolutionary period. Its major sources in France were the eighteenth century philosophers Giambattista Vico and Johann Gottfried Herder, both popularized in France by Cousin's 1828 lectures on the subject.[18] Cousin summarized Vico's theory in one sentence: "Chaque peuple a son point de départ, son milieu, sa fin; chaque peuple a son progrès, son histoire."[19] Essentially aristocratic and pessimistic, Vico saw humanity condemned to an endless repetition of a cycle of three stages. For each society, there was an Age of Gods in which religion dominates, then an Age of Heroes

and Kings, and last an Age of Men in which democracy leads to decadence and civilization dies out; the cycle then recommences somewhere else: both Delacroix's murals in the Palais Bourbon and Chenavard's cartoons for the Panthéon were influenced by this theory (Figure 31).[20] Herder was more optimistic; Cousin called his work "le premier grand monument élevé à l'idée du progrès perpétuel de l'humanité en tout sens et dans toutes les directions."[21] It is obvious that these two versions of Universal History could have opposite political applications: Vico for those who saw 1789 as the beginning of the Age of Decadence brought on by unbridled democracy, Herder for those who saw it as the commencement of the Age of Progress, with mankind evolving regardless of minor vicissitudes.

Herder claimed credit for the metaphor of the ages of civilization being like the ages of man, for, he said, he had developed this concept in a short treatise written in 1774:

> Cet essai, qui fournit à quelques emprunts, finit par être oublié; pourtant il faut dire qu'en employant quelques expressions figurées, telles que l'enfance, la jeunesse, l'age mûr et la vieillesse de notre espèce, et en appliquant ces termes seulement à quelques nations auxquelles ils sont réellement applicables, il n'était jamais entré dans mon esprit de vouloir tracer une méthode générale pour apprécier, sans crainte d'erreur, l'histoire de la culture, et moins encore la philosophie de l'histoire entière de l'humanité. 22

Whether Herder liked it or not, such terms entered popular

culture through a variety of channels. Perhaps the most direct was provided by Lucien Anatole Prévost-Paradol in his Revue de l'Histoire Universelle, a textbook for female lycée students first published in 1854.[23] Written in simple language, the book presented Herder's theory of history as the guiding principle behind every civilization from the beginnings in Asia to the rule of the Bourgeoisie in contemporary France. Perhaps because of its simple language, the book became astonishingly successful with a general audience, even being lavishly praised in L'Artiste.[24] Eclecticism had enforced at least a veneer of acceptance of all styles, but cyclical history allowed each critic to decide for himself whether a given style was a symptom of progress or decadence, or, as it was sometimes put, youth, maturity or senility.

Herder's metaphor was very much in evidence in 1855, from Prince Napoléon who wrote "Les races vieillissent comme les individus," to Gautier who wrote "Selon les circonstances, l'art se développe, grandit, s'élève, s'abaisse ou se déplace."[25] But for the most brilliant application of the theories of eclecticism and cyclical history to contemporary art, one must look to the most brilliant critic of the period, albeit one not usually associated with such concepts--Baudelaire:

> La prospérité actuelle n'est garantie que pour un temps, hélas! bien court. L'aurore fut jadis à l'orient, la lumière a marché vers le

> sud, et maintenant elle jaillit de l'occident. La France, il est vrai, par sa situation centrale dans le monde civilisé, semble être appelée à recueillir toutes les notions et toutes les poésies environnantes, et à les rendre aux autres peuples merveilleusement ouvrées et façonnées. Mais il ne faut jamais oublier que les nations, vastes êtres collectifs, sont soumises aux mêmes lois que les individus. Comme l'enfance, elles vagissent, balbutient, grossissent, grandissent. Comme la jeunesse et la maturité, elles produisent des oeuvres sages et hardies. Comme la vieillesse, elle s'endorment sur une richesse acquise. Souvent il arrive que c'est le principe même qui a fait leur force et leur développement qui amène leur décadence, surtout quand ce principe, vivifié jadis par une ardeur conquérante, est devenu pour la majorité une espèce de routine. Alors, comme je le faisais entrevoir tout à l'heure, la vitalité se déplace, elle va visiter d'autres territoires et d'autres races; et il ne faut pas croire que les nouveaux venus héritent intégralement des anciens, et q'ils reçoivent d'eux une doctrine toute faite. Il arrive souvent (cela est arrivé au moyen âge) que, tout étant perdu, tout est à refaire. 26

This metaphorical language was by no means neutral in its political significance. Just as eclecticism was rejected by Legitimists, who felt that, being already in possession of Truth, pluralism could only mean compromise, cyclical history with its concepts of progress and decadence was equally charged. Throughout the nineteenth century, the concept of decadence was used politically to criticize a detested regime--usually the one in power.[27] In its most sophisticated sense, of course, it proceeded from the theories of Vico and Herder, but in a general vulgarized sense, it meant simply that the path of Truth had been abandoned for a quick downward slide to disaster.

In the world of art, the 1789 Revolution marked the temporary suppression of the Academy and the permanent loss of the Salon as a closed exhibition for its members. This, coupled with the subsequent rise of the Bourgeoisie with its own taste in art, small easel pictures replacing the grand "machines" of the neoclassical period, could be seen either as the beinning of decadence--or the revitalization of art. It was politically important to distinguish which, for, as Achille Fould pointed out, "En France, la prospérité des arts est un bonheur public; leur décadence semblerait un pas rétrograde dans la marche de la civilisation."[28]

Of the 935,601 visitors to the Palais des Beaux-Arts, it is unlikely that many were cultivated amateurs. And yet, judging by the passionate art criticism emanating from every camp, the public possessed quite definite aesthetic preferences. How were these opinions formed? Even a cursory examination of the art criticism of 1855 shows that artists were praised or damned for qualities which have become invisible to the modern viewer. Eugène Loudun explained:

> A ce point de vue la critique s'élève et prend une importance philosophique; en notre temps plus que jamais, les oeuvres d'art reflètent les idées du siècle; elles représentent des doctrines, et, comme les règles qui dirigent les arts et les lettres sont corrélatives aux principes sociaux, on est obligé en les jugeant, de prendre parti, d'être exclusif. 29

In addition, in an era of press censorship, one could often say obliquely what could not be said directly. Art and artists themselves became symbols for politics they may not even have shared. No matter. Although public images do not always reflect private realities, the public arena, with its myths and symbols, often reflects a larger and more powerful reality, the aspirations of a culture.

In the following analysis of how each artist was "seen" in 1855, it will be shown that each was considered symbolic of a segment of the population necessary to the survival of the Second Empire. Thus the Apotheosis of Eclecticism, as the Government of Napoléon III attempted to make Victor Cousin's program work, to harness to the regime the forces of King and Country, Monarchy and Democracy, Order and Liberty, Aristocracy and Equality.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. See the 1855 Commission Impériale, Visites et études de S.A.I. le prince Napoléon au Palais des beaux-arts, Paris, 1856, 55-56. The articles appeared in Le Moniteur Universel as the work of Adrien Pascal, Chef du service de la publicité près de la Commission Impériale; they were compiled from statements made by Prince Napoléon during his visits.

2. This was mentioned by many of the critics; see, for example, Charles Perrier, "L'Art à 1'Exposition Universelle," L'Artiste, 13 mai 1855, 15-16.

3. Théophile Gautier, Les Beaux-Arts en Europe, 1855, 2 vols., Paris, 1855-56, I: 2.

4. Louis Auvray, Le Salon de 1868 suivi d'une réfutation de la brochure de M. Hip. Lazerges, Paris, 1868, 53-54.

5. Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, La Peinture à 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855, Paris, 1855; Maxime DuCamp, Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855, Paris, 1855; Théophile Gautier, Les Beaux-Arts en Europe, 2 vols., Paris, 1855-56; E.J. Delécluze, Les Beaux-Arts dans les deux mondes en 1855, Paris, 1856; Claudius Lavergne, Exposition Universelle de 1855. Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1855. According to Taxile Delord, the only influential men of letters who rallied to the Empire were Sainte-Beuve, Alfred de Musset, Prosper Mérimée, Emile Augier and Théophile Gautier; see his Histoire, II: 272. Prince Napoléon's Visites et études is largely made up of long quotations from Gautier--with some notable differences.

6. Victor Cousin, Oeuvres de Victor Cousin, 3 vols., Bruxelles, 1840-41, I: Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie (1828), 129.

7. Ibid., I: 102.

8. Ibid., I: 108.

9. La Grande Encyclopédie, Paris, 1886-1902, s.v. "Eclectisme" by Adolphe Thiers.

10. Victor Cousin, Du Vrai, du beau et du bien, 2e ed. augmentée d'un appendice sur l'art français, Paris, 1854; first published in 1853, there were eighteen editions in the nineteenth century. Cousin's aesthetic ideas were first put forth in his "Du Beau Réel et du Beau Idéal" of

1816 in his Premiers Essais de Philosophie; for a thorough discussion, see Frederic Will, Flumen Historicum. Victor Cousin's Aesthetic and Its Sources, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1965.

11. Gautier, 1855, I: 5.

12. See Alphonse de Calonne, "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts," Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 108, and Lavergne, 4.

13. Oeuvres de Victor Cousin, I: 70.

14. Gautier, 1855, I: 9.

15. See, for example, Charles Perrier, L'Artiste, 4 novembre 1855, 127; A.J. DuPays, "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle," L'Illustration, 2 juin 1855, 350.

16. This appears to have been a widespread phenomenon, mentioned by critics as diverse as, for example, Charles Baudelaire, "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts," Le Pays, Journal de l'Empire, 26 mai 1855, and Prince Napoléon, Visites et études, 59.

17. Oeuvres de Victor Cousin, I: 83-90; the eleventh lesson is on Universal History. Another influential philosopher of the period was P.S. Ballanche, Essais de palingénésie sociale, Paris, 1830. For a cultural rather than political explanation of nineteenth century French interest in Universal History, see Joseph C. Sloane, Paul Marc Joseph Chenavard, Artist of 1848, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1962.

18. Oeuvres de Victor Cousin, I: Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie (1828). In addition, Vico was translated by Jules Michelet and Herder by Edgar Quinet; Cousin claimed that he encouraged them to do so; I: 89.

19. Ibid., I: 87.

20. G.L. Hersey, "Delacroix's Imagery in the Palais Bourbon Library," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes XXXI (1968): 383-403; Sloane, Chenavard, 84-117.

21. Oeuvres de Victor Cousin, I: 87.

22. Johann Gottfried Herder, Idées sur la philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité, Edgar Quinet, trans. and ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1827-28, I: i-ii. In his preface, Herder stated that these ideas were developed in his treatise Encore une philosophie de l'histoire pour l'éducation du genre humain of 1774; in his Idées sur la philosophie

(first published in 1784) he substituted the metaphor of a flower which buds, blooms and dies.

23. Lucien Anatole Prévost-Paradol, Revue de l'Histoire Universelle, Paris, 1854; it was subsequently republished as Essai sur l'Histoire Universelle, and was used by French lycées into the twentieth century. On Prévost-Paradol, see Pierre Guiral, Prévost-Paradol 1829-1870. Pensée et action d'un libéral sous le second empire, Paris, 1955.

24. Paul d'Ambly, "Critique," L'Artiste, 1 juin 1854, 138.

25. Prince Napoléon, Visites et études, 171; Gautier, 1855, I: 3.

26. Baudelaire, Le Pays, 26 mai 1855.

27. For my discussion of the concept of decadence, I am indebted to Koenraad W. Swart, The Sense of Decadence in Nineteenth Century France, The Hague, 1964.

28. Fould spoke at the awards ceremony of the 1853 Salon to encourage artists to participate in the 1855 Universal Exposition; the speech was published in the 1855 catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., XLV.

29. Eugène Loudun, Le Salon de 1855, Paris, 1855, 203.

CHAPTER IX

LOOKING AT FRENCH ART: ECLECTICISM IN PRACTICE

Charivari published a humorous monologue "M. Prudhomme à l'Exposition" which shows how philosophical and political eclecticism was understood by the average viewer:

> Je débute par faire ma profession de foi:
> M. Delacroix et M. Ingres, M. Ingres et M. Delacroix.
> M. Delacroix n'est pas M. Ingres, mais en revanche M. Ingres n'est pas M. Delacroix. Est-ce clair!
> Ah! si M. Delacroix pouvait être M. Ingres, si M. Ingres pouvait être M. Delacroix!
> Mais M. Delacroix n'est pas M. Ingres et M. Ingres n'est pas M. Delacroix. 1

On a more exalted, and certainly more verbose plane, the critics said the same thing, crowning Ingres "chef de l'école de la ligne" and Delacroix "chef de l'école de la couleur."[2]

As for the others... George Sand described the reaction:

> On y passe pour se dire: que de tableaux! et chacun prie un autre de le mener devant les maîtres, afin de ne pas perdre le temps à regarder le reste.... Ainsi c'est la foule sur quelques points, et la solitude dans des salles immenses ou bien des promeneurs qui parlent de leurs affaires sans lever la tête, parce qu'il y a trop à voir.... C'est bon pour les maîtres, cela les complète et les met en vue. Mais tout ce qui commence est perdu dans la foule, sans espoir d'y rencontrer un oeil tourné vers lui. 3

Nonetheless critics and, we may assume, at least part of the general public did view the rest of the exhibition; the major artists were discussed in individual articles, the others were grouped together under broad categories, often more than twenty at a time, meriting--if they were lucky--a sentence apiece.

The Government's choice of artists to receive special exhibitions, Ingres, Delacroix, Decamps and Vernet, was, for the most part, ratified by the critics who, regardless of personal preferences, agreed that these were the major artists. The Government's inclusion in this category of Théodore Gudin, a hack painter of seascapes and favorite of Louis-Philippe, was ignored; he was hardly discussed at all.[4]

Ingres

There was nothing new in the precedence that Ingres enjoyed over other artists. Prince Napoléon visited his exhibition before all others and called him "une des pages nationales de la France au XIXe siècle."[5] Ingres was not only an artist, he was an institution, and the new regime, in rendering him homage, placed itself in line with its more legitimate predecessors. Ingres, in accepting, returned the compliment, and the match was sealed with a freshly painted grisaille portrait of Prince Napoléon,

added to his show during the last few weeks (Figure 22).[6] Gautier picked up the cue and announced that all Salon reviews had to begin with Ingres because "it is impossible not to situate him at the summit of art."[7]

Ingres, more than any other painter, was known and admired throughout Europe, and, regardless of the internal disputes of the Academy, he was internationally hailed as the heir of David, the leader of the French School. In France, however, it was more complicated than that. Certainly Ingres was seen as the embodiment of the Academy and Tradition, but also of the Church and public morality--in a word of Throne and Altar. His exhibition of over forty paintings included most of his masterpieces in a variety of categories such as history, religion, literature and portraiture, but the first seven listed in the catalogue were religious paintings, beginning with Saint-Symphorien (Autun Cathedral) and Le Voeu de Louis XIII (Montauban Cathedral). Scarcely a critic, friend or foe, neglected the seemingly obligatory statement "Seul, il représente maintenant les hautes traditions de l'histoire, de l'idéal, et du style."[8] And this was stated whether they thought those traditions were dead (Nadar), dying (Maxime DuCamp) or alive and well (Delécluze).[9] It is even more striking how often religious terminology was used in descriptions of his work, which Maxime DuCamp, a fervent Republican, characterized as "catholico-aristocratique."[10]

For Gautier, his style was "pur, austère, fervent, méditant."[11] Nadar called him "un évèque."[12] His criticism in Le Figaro was so harsh that it provoked a scandal, for he had written:

> Devant cette peinture antique et non solennelle, mes narines ont été envahies des bouffées de cet air tiède, aigrelet et écoeurant qui sort des cellules de Sainte-Perrine ou de l'hôpital des Petits-Ménages. Je regrette de le dire, pour les lecteurs délicats, mais c'était comme un goût de mouchoir d'invalide.[13]

Hippolyte de Villemessant, Figaro's editor, joined in the fray and announced of the Ingrists "Ils ont pensé en outre qu'à notre feuille appartenait l'initiative d'une attaque qu'ils ont taxée de sacrilège et de blasphématoire."[14] In revenge he reprinted an article by Laurent-Jan, originally published in 1843, entitled "M. Ingres, Peintre et Martyr," written in mock heroic style.[15] Alphonse de Calonne and Louis Enault, both admirers of Ingres, used much the same language without satire. Calonne wrote that in front of Ingres' works "je ployais le genou," and saw him, metaphorically, as Jesus sitting at the right hand of God the Father.[16] Enault titled an article "La Chapelle de M. Ingres" and was the first to publish the famous anecdote of Delacroix' visit to Ingres' "chapel" at the Palais des Beaux-Arts:

> Un jour, M. Delacroix, qui d'aventure passait par-là, vit le rideau flottant et le sanctuaire abandonné; il entra, --regarda, --admira. M. Ingres revient, aperçoit le confrère, jette un coup-d'oeil sur ses tableaux

> d'abord, puis sur lui, puis sur ses tableaux encore. --M. Delacroix sort, un demi-sourire sur ses lèvres minces... "Comme on sent le soufre ici!" dit le vieil artiste au garçon de salle qui lui apportait un clou. 17

Like most representatives of morality, Ingres was not really popular--and he was the first to admit it. "Il se figurait sa peinture comme une sonate de Haydn qu'il faudrait jouer pour les oreilles délicates, à côté d'un orchestre en plein vent," wrote his friend Charles Blanc.[18] To be populaire in nineteenth century France was by no means a compliment in politically conservative circles, for it carried overtones of mobs, riots and revolution. A cartoon (Figure 32) shows how a formal quality, Ingres' color, was differently received by representatives of the upper and lower classes, for even formal qualities were politicized during this period. Several critics commented that one visited Ingres' Salon out of a sense of duty, but without real pleasure; thus one went to Church.[19]

The numerous references to the "timeless and eternal" qualities of Ingres' art also must be understood politically. Conceptually there were two directions in which time could move during this period: forward, in the sense of "progress," or backward, in the sense of "decadence." "Timeless and eternal," in the sense of non-time, was a quality invariably invoked by Monarchists when referring to the aristocratic and "God-given" verities of the ancien régime. Ernest Gebaüer, for example, wrote:

> Ce n'est pas à dire que M. Ingres soit populaire. Il ne l'a jamais été. Il ne saurait l'être. N'obéissant qu'à l'inspiration et cherchant le sujet de ses compositions dans un passé historique ou glorieux, peu lui importe un présent quelquefois mesquin!
>
> M. Ingres, on l'a dit et je le répète, est peut-être le seul artiste en qui le même faire, la même manière et les mêmes idées puissent être constatées du début au déclin de sa carrière. 'Chez lui, écrit M. de Lomenie, il n'y a jamais eu à vrai dire commencement ni fin, ni progrès, ni décadence; à vingt ans il était aussi complètement lui qu'à soixante. 20

Gautier was no Monarchist, but, upholding the principles of eclecticism, he wrote:

> Seul, il représente maintenant les hautes traditions de l'histoire, de l'idéal et du style; à cause de cela, on lui a reproché de ne pas s'inspirer de l'esprit moderne, de ne pas voir ce qui se passait autour de lui, de n'être pas de son temps, enfin. Jamais accusation ne fut plus juste. Non, il n'est pas de son temps, mais il est éternel. 21

On the other hand, Baudelaire turned this same quality of "eternal" into condemnation by writing: "En somme, ce qu'il est, il le fut dès le principe; grâce à cette énergie qui est en lui, il restera tel jusqu'à la fin. Comme il n'a pas progressé, il ne vieillira pas."[22] Despite Baudelaire's much-vaunted contempt for the concept of "Progress," here, translated into the aesthetic concept of "Development," he implicitly accepted it.

L'Apothéose de Napoléon Ier proved a particularly inviting target for all the partisans of Romanticism and

Liberty. Baudelaire's language was so politically provocative that it is difficult to believe his attack was ingenuous:

> De l'empereur Napoléon j'aurais bien envie de dire que je n'ai point retrouvé en lui cette beauté épique et destinale dont le dotent généralement ses contemporains et ses historiens.... Le caractère principal d'une apothéose doit être le sentiment surnaturel, la puissance d'ascension vers les régions supérieures; un entraînement, un vol irrésistible vers le ciel, but de toutes les aspirations humaines et habitacle classique de tous les grands hommes. Or, cette apothéose ou plutôt cet attelage tombe, tombe avec une vitesse proportionnée à sa pesanteur. Les chevaux entraînent le char vers la terre. Le tout, comme un ballon sans gaz, qui aurait gardé tout son lest, va inévitablement se briser sur la surface de la planète. 23

Le Pays, which had commissioned this as one of a series of articles by Baudelaire on the Universal Exposition of Art, not only refused to print it, but sacked him as well. Baudelaire had forgotten that Le Pays, having rallied, had added to its title Journal de l'Empire: it is easy to imagine with what horror this article was received. "Depuis dimanche, je suis remercié par Le Pays," wrote Baudelaire to François Buloz, the editor of the Revue des Deux-Mondes, "Me voilà débarrassé de mon insupportable Salon; me voilà libre, mais sans le sol."[24] Eventually he did manage to publish it in the little review Le Portefeuille, but he could not obtain a job on any of the other journals as regular critic. In a year in which virtually every art critic in Paris managed to sign onto a

journal for a lucrative six month stint of weekly reviews of the Exposition, Baudelaire, the most brilliant critic of the period, found himself excluded and unemployable. No wonder, then, that others were more discreet.[25]

It proved impossible to separate Ingres the artist from Ingres the political symbol. Love of antiquity carried overtones of love of the ancien régime; praise of his portraits of contemporaries in modern dress (his only paintings appreciated by political progressives) implied a preference for the new order of things. Conservatives and reactionaries praised the eternal and longed for its return; progressives, such as Paul Mantz, wrote "rien n'est éternel dans ce monde."[26] It was impossible to see Ingres outside this frame of reference.

The Old Guard

The artists of the School of David that the Louvre memorandum seemed so intent on excluding did, in fact, participate in the Exposition. Edmond About discussed them together under the title "La Vieille Garde."[27] Its members included Picot, Heim, Schnetz, Abel de Pujol, all Academicians, all born under the ancien régime. Ingres and his followers (notably Hippolyte Flandrin and Amaury-Duval) formed a rival camp. Ever since 1834 when Ingres' Saint-Symphorien had been badly received at the Salon, there had been antagonism between the two factions.[28] This

distinction was clear to conservative critics, less so to progressives who tended to lump all Academicians together with Ingres into what Nadar called "sa détestable école."[29]

In conservative circles, however, the Old Guard was seen as the victim of Romanticism. Alphonse de Calonne wrote:

> Chassés de ces concours publics où le goût de la foule se forme et où celui des artistes se châtie, chassés par le grand bruit qui s'était élevé tout à coup autour de renommées nouvelles auxquelles l'esprit d'antagonisme accordait tout ce qu'il déniait à l'Ecole, ils reviennent aujourd'hui, après s'être laissé tondre pendant vingt ans comme des moutons, et ils nous apparaissent comme des lions. [30]

While there were not too many critics who would have called them lions, Heim, who was considered the best of the Old Guard, was praised (Figure 33). He had received the Prix de Rome in 1807 and had shown in the Salon regularly until 1827 when his Femmes Cimbres was badly received. After that he no longer exhibited; by 1855 he was virtually forgotten, except by his students at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, who called him "Père Heim."

The conservatives did not forget him, and he continued to receive commissions for Church decorations; Delécluze and Calonne considered him the equal of Ingres.[31] Even more important, Prince Napoléon, true to his classical taste, seems to have sincerely liked his work, and stated "Heim avant l'exposition de 1855, était peu connu, ou plutôt

était méconnu.... La résurrection a été complète, et l'exposition de 1855 a replacé Heim au rang qu'il doit occuper dans notre pléiade artistique."[32] Appreciation of Heim was related to the question of religious painting in general. Although the Goncourts stated flatly "La peinture religieuse n'est plus,"[33] conservatives never tired of saying that it wasn't seen in the Salons because all of it was in the Churches. Even Prince Napoléon felt the necessity to repeat this rationale for its absence in 1855, for the Church was one of the main supports of the Empire.[34] Whether the great era of religious painting was actually over was another question; in the meantime, there was Heim.

Heim, however, was 68 years old in 1855; when the critics looked for a continuation of his School, the most insightful of them were frankly worried. Delécluze (himself 74) wrote: "Les compositions de haut style et où le nu domine, assez peu nombreuses, sont dues à des artistes dont les plus jeunes ont dépassé cinquante ans."[35] There was one hope, however: the young Gérôme. He had been given a Government commission for Le Siècle d'Auguste: Naissance de N.S. Jésus Christ (Figure 34), and his painting, based on a text by Bossuet, was seen as the Imperial answer to Couture's Les Romains de la décadence.[36] Gautier's praise sounds almost like an offer to the young artist:

> Le Siècle d'Auguste restera un des beaux morceaux de l'Exposition de 1855. --Ce n'est pas une gloire médiocre pour un jeune artiste de venir immédiatement après les maîtres, soutenus par tout leur passé; et chaque année, nous l'esperons, s'il persiste dans cette voie austère, l'intervalle qui le sépare encore d'eux diminuera. [37]

Couture's version of history, although painted under the July Monarchy, was still disturbing enough in 1855 to merit a personal attack by Prince Napoléon: "Que ceux qui, uniquement préoccupés de venger leur impuissance, s'évertuent à glorifier le passé et à représenter le peuple français comme des Romains de la décadence, en prennent bien leur parti: leurs efforts dans l'avenir seront frappés de stérilité, comme ils l'ont été par le passé." [38]

Of the others, Chenavard's involvement with the Second Republic, from which he had accepted the unfortunate commission for the mural cycle at the Panthéon, had alienated the Clericals and Legitimists who, by now, formed the constituency for La Grande Peinture. Neither he nor the juste milieu painters such as Couture and Chassériau received much attention; they had no clearly defined constituency and, as George Sand noted, there was just too much to see. [39]

Delacroix

If Ingres was considered the representative of Throne, Altar and Academy, Delacroix was seen as the harbinger of

Revolution, Sin and Individuality. At this time, individuality had a negative connotation of egocentricity and selfishness, and was seen as proceeding from the 1789 Revolution, undermining the political and social order.[40] This, of course, was one definition of Romanticism, and Delacroix, as its chef d'école was held responsible. In this there was nothing new; he had been criticized along these lines for several decades. Regarded by Ingres and his followers as "l'apôtre du laid" (Courbet inherited this title from him), he was also labelled "un peintre de décadence" in the sense of being the first in the period of decline ushered in, according to conservatives, by the excess of liberty resulting from the 1789 Revolution.[41] (David-the-regicide by this time had been transformed into David-the-saviour-of-the-French-School; his Revolutionary past forgotten, he had emerged as the hero of conservatives.)

Delacroix' show of thirty-five paintings, like that of Ingres, included most of his masterpieces (Figure 25). Like Ingres he exhibited a large proportion of religious, historic and literary subjects, paintings drawn from Church and State collections.[42] While the discourse around Ingres was conducted in terms of Throne and Altar, what was at issue with Delacroix was the concept of Liberty. The question of how much liberty was enough was the burning question in nineteenth century France. Cousin had written,

and everyone to the right of the staunchest Republican agreed: "Soyez aussi très persuadés qu'en France la démocratie traversera toujours la liberté, qu'elle mène tout droit au désordre, et par le désordre à la dictature. Ne demandez donc qu'une liberté modérée, et attachez-vous-y de toutes les puissances de votre âme."[43] Cousin wrote this, not in a political tract, as one might expect, but in a study of aesthetics; thus were all aesthetic questions politicized during this period. Individuals might deviate from the aesthetic attitudes expected of their political stance, but there was general agreement as to what that attitude should be.[44] Compare, for example, these two views of Delacroix, one by Claudius Lavergne, a Legitimist, writing in L'Univers, the other by the Republican Pierre Petroz, writing in the opposition La Presse. Lavergne wrote:

> On rend justice aux qualités brillantes de M. Delacroix en le désignant comme le chef de l'école romantique, et cependant cela est contradictoire dans les termes, car il n'est pas possible de reconnaître un chef et d'admettre une école, là où le sentiment individuel tient lieu de tout, et où l'autorité, la tradition, et quelquefois même de bon sens, sont regardés comme des lois tyranniques et des entraves du génie.[45]

And Petroz responded, in the context of his discussion of Delacroix:

> Il serait, du reste, injuste de voir dans notre révolution littéraire et artistique un simple renouvellement des moyens d'exécution.

> Elle a une autre signification, une portée plus haute; elle a brisé des règles arbitraires, ébranlé la tyrannique souveraineté des académies, substitué le principe de liberté au principe d'autorité, et c'est surtout par là qu'elle mérite notre reconnaissance et notre admiration. 46

To the general public, Delacroix was a wild-eyed Revolutionary, although his own politics were considerably less radical. Eugène Loudun described his constituency thus:

> Questionnez le public, je ne dis pas le public ignorant, mais le public des hommes instruits et distingués par l'intelligence, et demandez-leur quel jugement ils portent sur l'Exposition française; cela est très frappant. Le peintre qu'ils comprennent le mieux, c'est M.E. Delacroix; pour lui l'enthousiasme et la sympathie, ses qualités leur plaisent, ils les expliquent et les commentent; il est peu de gens, au temps où nous vivons, qui ne soient en quelque point, révolutionnaires; M. Delacroix est leur homme. 47

What is new in 1855 is the way this traditional image of Delacroix was transformed, "laundered" by the Government in recompense for his ralliement. On 15 May, the day the Exposition opened, Revue des Beaux-Arts reported, Napoléon III visited the Palais des Beaux-Arts: "Sa Majesté ayant remarqué M. Eugène Delacroix, s'est approché du célèbre artiste, lui a adressé la parole et lui a serré cordialement la main." [48] Gautier, the official critic, was a particularly good choice to rehabilitate Delacroix because, in fact, he had supported him all along. He began by acknowledging his troubled past: "Autour de son nom il

s'est fait pendant près d'un quart de siècle un tumulte assourdissant d'injures, de diatribes, de railleries, de discussions d'une violence extrême.[49] Then he announced: "L'Exposition universelle de 1855 a posé bien haut M. E. Delacroix; on a revue ces toiles, objets de jugements si divers, et l'on s'est étonné de les trouver si belles, si visiblement marquées au cachet du génie."[50] Delacroix was then eulogized: "Jamais artiste plus fougueux, plus échevelé, plus ardent, ne reproduisit les inquiétudes et les aspirations de son époque: il en a partagé toutes les fièvres, toutes les exaltations et tous les désespoirs; l'esprit du dix-neuvième siècle palpitait en lui et y palpite encore."[51] And finally, he was canonized by Prince Napoléon, who shamelessly stressed the benefits of rallying to the regime:

> Mais les discussions violentes, les critiques passionnées en matière d'art, ne sont plus de notre temps, et, dans M. Delacroix le coloriste, on ne retrouve plus le révolutionnaire ardent qu'une école trop jeune voulut si longtemps opposer à M. Ingres. Chacun aujourd'hui occupe sa place légitime. L'Exposition de 1855, il faut le dire, a d'ailleurs placé bien haut M. Delacroix; ses toiles, objet de jugements si divers, ont été revues, étudiées, admirées comme toutes les oeuvres marquées au coin du génie. 52

And so, by Imperial fiat, Delacroix "le revolutionnaire" has become Delacroix "le coloriste." His work was depoliticized and neutralized and--except for a few diehard extremists--critics and the general public would henceforth see it in formalist terms. Delacroix was

delighted and wrote to Gautier:

> Oui, vous devez éprouver de la satisfaction en voyant que toutes ces folies dont autrefois vous preniez le parti à peu près seul, paraissent aujourd'hui toutes naturelles. Mais cette nouvelle confirmation est d'un grand effet sur les esprits. J'ai rencontré hier soir une femme que je n'avais pas vue depuis dix ans et qui m'a assuré qu'en entendant lire une partie de votre article, elle avait cru que j'étais mort, pensant qu'on ne louait ainsi que les gens morts et enterrés. 53

Delacroix had accurately assessed the import of his canonization, for, with something gained, something was lost as well. Like old soldiers on pension, Delacroix' paintings had been retired from the fray; henceforth they would reside in the realm of the museum and would no longer play an active role in the ideological and political battles of the nineteenth century.

Landscape Painting

Landscape painting in 1855 was considered to come in two varieties: the Poussinesque, espoused by the Academy and represented by painters such as Cabat, Aligny and Paul Flandrin (Figure 35) of whom only the most determinedly conservative critics could say anything nice, and the anti-Academic, which encompassed the Romantics, the Barbizon painters, their heirs and followers, the Realists, and just about everyone else. The major division was, therefore, political. Pierre Petroz sounded the battle cry when he wrote: "Après avoir rompu avec les Jupiter et les

Agamennon, avec les madones traditionnelles et les souvenirs mystiques, après avoir hautement proclamé le principe de liberté, reconnu la légitimité de toutes les inspirations, il fallait trouver pour l'art moderne une direction identique à celle de l'esprit humain au dix-neuvième siècle."[54] Landscape painting thus had a double burden in 1855: its subject matter was considered inconsequential and its execution condemned as sketchy; insofar as it departed from the classical Poussinesque prototype, it was considered a direct challenge to the Academy. Delacroix may have been suspected of Revolutionary tendencies, but Rousseau, Courbet and Millet were identified as active Revolutionaries; even worse, the first two were outspoken in their politics. Delacroix may have been criticized for the freedom of his brushstrokes, but he painted in the Grand Manner, his subjects similar to Ingres'. Rousseau painted swamps, Courbet, the barren landscape of Doubs, Millet, terrifying peasants. In 1855, their differences were less apparent than their similarities, for according to conservatives like Claudius Lavergne, they were all "les amants de la nature" who had abandoned "des sujets nobles et élevés."[55] To conservatives, Realists only followed the Romantics in their rejection of Le Beau and their glorification of the ugly and disordered; the schism had begun in the 1820s, and the abyss was steadily widening.[56]

At the Palais des Beaux-Arts, one could see the committed followers of Poussin (Gautier commented "le paysage historique se refugia en province, sur les papiers de salle à manger"[57]) next to Corot's dreamy classicism; Barbizon painters such as Théodore Rousseau and Diaz de la Pena next to Independents such as Constance Troyon and Paul Huet; Realists such as Courbet and Millet next to the young Naturalists Daubigny and Jongkind; even Orientalists such as Decamps (Figures 36 to 42). This continuity between the generations was striking: Edmond About commented that the only category in which French painters seemed united into a School was that of landscape painting.[58] Nonetheless, there was nowhere near a consensus of opinion as to who was the chef d'école; landscape painting could almost be seen as litmus paper for revealing a critic's position. Delécluze showed himself a true conservative by choosing Paul Flandrin, followed by Français and Corot, panning Rousseau and Huet.[59] Gustave Planche was more liberal, praising Huet's Inondation à Saint-Cloud (Figure 39), remarking "je vois avec plaisir que M. Paul Huet a compris la nécessité de ne pas s'en tenir à l'ébauche."[60] Paul Mantz, who defended the Romantics, championed Rousseau, and Pierre Petroz, a Republican, announced that Millet had opened "une voie nouvelle à l'art."[61] As Corot's art was--and still is--difficult to classify, he could not ride the crest of a political current; as a result he was called a poet by all,

but provoked no passions.[62]

Everyone had to admit, even if reluctantly, that the landscape school was flourishing; the more daring linked that to the obvious exhaustion of the school of history painting. Whether this was seen as progress or decadence depended on the critic. Pierre Petroz put it in blatantly political terms: "Loin d'être un signe de décadence, cette modification des idées reçues, ce renversement de la hiérarchie, indiquent un progrès, un retour vers la vérité.[63] The Government, however, was not enthusiastic. Prince Napoléon devoted one sentence to Rousseau, and summed up landscape painting thus: "Les paysages, les scènes de la vie rustique, considérés pendant longtemps comme appartenant à un genre secondaire, ont, dans l'école contemporaine, une importance égale à celle de la peinture historique ou religieuse."[64] In terms of Government commissions, however, they had nowhere near equal importance, and one is left with the impression that there was no clearly defined French constituency for landscape painting in 1855.[65] Certainly none was mentioned by the critics, and Alfred Sensier, Rousseau's biographer and friend, stated that the artist was supported by foreigners.[66]

The most prophetic judgment on landscape painting had the smallest voice in 1855, for the critique of the

Goncourts was issued in a privately printed edition of forty copies: "Le paysage est la victoire de l'art moderne. Il est l'honneur du dix-neuvième siècle. Le Printemps, l'Eté, l'Automne, l'Hiver, ont pour servants les plus grands et les plus magnifiques talents, que se prépare à relayer une jeune génération anonyme encore, mais promise à l'avenir et digne de ses espoirs."[67]

Decamps

Decamps was the dark horse among the major artists, the least favored by the Government, the most favored by collectors. As Edmond About wrote: "Personne n'a jamais attaqué M. Decamps, tout le monde l'a loué. Tous ses ouvrages se sont bien vendus et en bon lieu; ils sont logés dans les plus grandes maisons et les plus belles galeries de Paris, le Luxembourg excepté."[68] Among the major artists in 1855, he was the least solicited by the Government, receiving neither a special commission for the Exposition, nor appointed to any of the Commissions or Juries. In his autobiography, he recounted his sorrow over never having been judged worthy of receiving a Government commission; by his own account, he loathed the small genre scenes that had made his fortune and reputation.[69] At the 1855 Exposition, he received no special gallery, as did Ingres and Vernet, and, to make matters worse, his works were not displayed together.[70] And yet, despite its all-too-obvious lack of

enthusiasm, the Government was apparently compelled to reckon with him. Julien de la Rochenoire described his constituency:

> L'immense succès de M. Decamps s'est entretenu en dehors des expositions; sa réputation est surtout l'oeuvre des amateurs et des ventes publiques; c'est le lion artistique du billet de banque. Dans toutes les galeries d'amateur plus ou moins riches; chez tous les marchands de tableaux, et même chez les plus modestes, vous rencontrerez un Decamps. Le prix seul variera de 50 francs à 50 000 francs, de l'esquisse à l'ecole Turque, vous n'aurez qu'à choisir. 71

While Louis Enault mentioned "un marchand de suif" as a typical Decamps collector, his exhibition also included three paintings each from the comte de Morny and the docteur Véron, co-owners of Le Constitutionnel, the major Imperialist journal.[72] The commercial quality of Decamps' work was stressed repeatedly by the critics, at least partially as a veiled atack on the Bourgeoisie that patronized him; even Morny was known as a speculator who amassed collections only to sell them at auction. Decamps' small pleasant genre scenes were easily comprehensible to those who lacked a classical education, and their richly encrusted surfaces, often compared to jewels, bespoke a conspicuous consumption; indeed, he did a brisk business at the Exposition, selling his pictures right off the walls.[73]

It would be a mistake, however, to attribute Decamps' appeal only to commercial interests; many quite sincerely

preferred him to Ingres or Delacroix, and the Goncourts pronounced him the grteatest painter of the century, "le maître moderne."[74] Claude Vignon described his appeal:

> On reste dans la salle de M. Ingres par devoir, par respect et par entêtement. On va dans celle de M. Delacroix, qui par passion, qui par conscience: ceux qui ne le comprennent pas veulent essayer d'ouvrir leur intelligence et de se former une conviction à son égard. On va chez M. Horace Vernet, parce qu'on est Français, quoique son exposition soit surtout visitée par les étrangers. Mais on refait dix fois le tour de la salle où sont disséminés les Decamps, parce que toutes les fibres de l'artiste, du poète et de l'amateur sont remuées par le maître puissant, qui sait à la fois vous séduire par les yeux et par l'âme. 75

Despite a brief period as student of Abel de Pujol, Decamps was considered to have had no master, to be self-taught and, according to Planche (who was properly horrified), to be anti-intellectual: "Les idées générales ne sont guère de son goût, il se moque volontiers de ceux qui s'en nourrissent et les appelle mangeurs de viande creuse."[76] His paintings of monkeys were widely interpreted as satires on academics, and did little to endear him in those quarters. And yet, with all of this, or perhaps because of it, he was the leading genre painter of the period:

> Pour les esprits sérieux, ce fut terrible; ses succès obtenus sans avoir étudié, sans avoir appris, nous valurent cette armée formidable de peintres amateurs qui veulent gagner de l'argent, des honneurs, avec leur ignorante peinture, où l'emploi de la pâte, du mortier, du mastic, des glacis, menacent d'empoisonner le monde entier, si la gendarmerie ne vient pas s'en mêler. 77

Antoine Etex was only half joking when he wrote this. Prince Napoléon, however, clearly detested his painting, for he wrote:

> Pour beaucoup de connaisseurs, M. Decamps est un maître à la hauteur des plus illustres, et le prix dont se paient ses tableaux justifie cette appréciation.... Il est vrai que cette exécution nerveuses ne se rencontre que là, et que M. Decamps, qui n'a pour ainsi dire pas eu de maître, n'a pas eu non plus d'élève ou d'imitateur: c'est le génie de l'individualité à sa plus haute expression. 78

It was untrue, however, that he had no followers; in reality, he had more followers than Ingres and Delacroix put together, for, as Etex had predicted, the whole horde of nineteenth century genre painters resulted from his demonstration that one could become rich and famous without elevated subject matter and without support from Government or Academy.

Genre Painting

If the progressive critics had difficulty distinguishing between Ingres and the Old Guard, the conservatives considered as a single movement Romanticism and Realism, genre and landscape painting, for all were seen as deviations, on the downward path of decadence from the one true French School, namely the School of David. But it was for genre painting that they reserved their worst scorn. Despite the masterpieces of Chardin, Greuze and the

brothers Le Nain, it was considered a foreign style, an invasion from Northern Protestant countries, unsuitable for France with its Catholic and classical heritage.[79] What remained to be explained was why it was enormously popular in France, "pratiquée comme un gagne-pain par tous les talents de notre temps," according to the Goncourts.[80] Even the austere Ingres had turned out a morsel now and then, such as his Tintoret et Arétin or Henri IV jouant avec ses enfants, showing intimate moments in the lives of Great Men.

Although also purchased by the Aristocracy, genre painting was known to be the favorite style of the Bourgeoisie; both style and class could therefore be attacked together. Antoine Etex wrote: "Chez nous, en France, il n'y a plus d'amateurs d'art: on ne peut appeler ainsi ce groupe de joueurs de bourse qui n'encouragent, qui n'achètent que de la petite peinture, que des petits tableaux dignes d'orner le boudoir de leurs lorettes, et qui, en les achetant, espèrent encore gagner dessus en les revendant plus tard à des étrangers."[81] On the other hand, a Republican such as Maxime DuCamp took a more dispassionate view: "La peinture de genre tend chaque jour à remplacer la peinture d'histoire; la division des fortunes, l'exiguité des logements, la démocratisation heureusement croissante des moeurs, ne tarderont pas à lui donner le premier rang parmi les arts appropriés à notre

civilisation."[82] Pierre Petroz, who shared both DuCamp's politics and his aesthetic judgment, divided the contemporary French School into three main trends, that of Ingres, that of Delacroix, and that of landscape and genre, the School of Nature: "La nature, l'activité humaine, telle qu'elle se produit dans la vie humaine. L'un a simplifié, ennobli, animé les choses matérielles; il a profondément senti la souveraine beauté de la nature; l'autre a donné une saissante signification morale aux actes les plus ordinaires de la vie sociale."[83]

Genre painting was widely considered to appeal to the common people who liked to look at it, as well as to the Bourgeoisie, who bought it. As a result, it was judged anti-intellectual. And yet, for those who were not locked into the classical tradition, it had its charms, which had to be acknowledged. Perrier wrote: "Son essence est basée sur les émotions intimes que chaque homme est à même de ressentir et qu'il est heureux de retrouver dans toute leur simplicité naïve. Les scènes d'intérieur ont le mérite de s'adresser à tout le monde, à toutes les intelligences, à tous les coeurs."[84]

Had it not been for the intervention of Prince Albert in French art history, genre painting probably would have remained the province of Decamps, as far as the Government was concerned. But, in a much publicized incident, while

Prince Albert and Queen Victoria were visiting the Palais des Beaux-Arts, the Prince stopped to admire Meissonier's Une Rixe (Figure 43), whereupon Napoléon III promptly purchased it and presented it to him.[85] The gesture and the price of 25,000 francs both served to raise esteem for genre painting to new heights, and to elevate Meissonier to the status previously held by Decamps alone.

The handwriting was on the wall; in the face of this new challenge, conservatives even began to look with nostalgia on the Romantics. Delécluze wrote: "En 1824, c'était le laid que l'on avait à combattre; aujourd'hui c'est le joli, ennemi peut-être plus redoubtable encore."[86]

Horace Vernet

Ingres and Delacroix may have been acknowledged by the critics as the two major artists of 1855, but Prince Napoléon began his official visits with Ingres and Vernet, and only these two artists were given special galleries.[87] Obviously Vernet had an important constituency; just as obviously it was not the intellectuals or the critics who discussed him only grudgingly and with condescension, if at all. Edmond About wrote: "Hors de Paris, on ne connaît ni M. Ingres, ni M. Delacroix, ni M. Troyon, ni M. Th. Rousseau, ni M. Corot, ni M. Hamon; M. Horace Vernet est admiré jusque dans l'Ardèche."[88] In a word, Vernet was populaire, adored by la masse who, if they could not afford

to buy a picture, had, at least, one of the omnipresent engravings of his paintings.[89] The appeal, as Vignon wrote, "s'attache à la passion collective qui est toujours vivante en France: au patriotisme."[90] Patriotism is always important to Governments, especially when there is a war going on. The Crimean War, however, was not popular with Republicans, who, like Maxime DuCamp, saw Horace Vernet in another light: "M. Vernet est la plus pure expression du chauvinisme français; aussi sa gloire artistique est-elle la seule qui soit incontestablement populaire. La masse composée de gens naïfs et impressionnables, aime en lui le peintre de toutes nos épopées militaires."[91]

Conservative critics had trouble evaluating Vernet because, regardless of their personal opinions, he was a member of the Academy which had reluctantly accepted contemporary military painting as a hedge against Romanticism.[92] They did, however, refuse to accord him the title of Peintre d'histoire, referring to him instead as a Peintre du genre historique or Peintre historien, along the lines of the Government newspaper Le Moniteur Universel rather than the great classical epics.[93] Academician he may have been, intellectual he was not: "Il ne déroute jamais la foule naîve par la profondeur de ses compositions; il ne recherche ni le symbole, ni l'allusion, ni l'allégorie," Louis Enault wrote.[94] His Barrière de Clichy (Figure 27) was said to be one of the most popular paintings in the

Exposition.[95]

It is evident that Gautier did not really like the paintings of Vernet, and yet, as official critic, he had to praise them. He wrote: "Sans doute, M. Horace Vernet ne saurait être comparé, pour le style ou le coloris, aux grands maîtres d'Italie, de Flandre ou d'Espagne; mais il est original, spirituel, moderne et français."[96] Prince Napoléon, with his classical taste, no doubt detested the painting of Vernet; his citation was made completely along political lines:

> M. Horace Vernet est, dans l'acceptation la plus vivante du mot, le peintre d'histoire par excellence. Depuis quarante ans, pas une de nos annales militaires n'a pu se passer de son pinceau facile et brillant; pas une de nos victoires n'a rayonné dans le monde sans que Horace Vernet ne l'ait fixée sur la toile. Personne ne comprend une bataille et ne pose le soldat français comme ce vaillant artiste, le plus connu, à coup sûr, entre tous les peintres vivants.[97]

Courbet

On reading through the response to Courbet in 1855, one is struck by how little relation it bears to Courbet's own version of the events, which history has by and large accepted. Who, for example, would have thought this could have been written in 1855:

> M. Courbet, maltraité par le jury de l'Exposition Universelle, a ouvert, à la fin de juin, dans un local des Champs-Elysées, une exposition particulière où l'on peut voir une quarantaine de ses tableaux. M. Courbet est un

> peintre vigoureux et original, qui a conquis une personnalité parmi les vrais artistes de Paris. Ses ouvrages eussent été certainement très-remarqués à l'Exposition Universelle; mais il doit se consoler de subir à son tour le sort qui, il n'y a pas bien longtemps, était celui d'Eugène Delacroix, de Decamps, de Théodore Rousseau, de Diaz, et des autres grands peintres, unanimement célébres aujourd'hui. 98

The author is anonymous, the publication, La Revue Universelle des Arts, one of several professional French art journals, all of whom defended Courbet. Revue des Beaux-Arts, for example, sympathetically reported the refusal of L'Enterrement and L'Atelier (Figure 27), and later, when he opened his own exhibition, published his manifesto "Du Réalisme."[99] Journal des Arts also reported Courbet's partial rejection with sympathy, noting however, that Bonjour M. Courbet had been accepted; it later printed a critique of his show which was not at all negative.[100] The most influential art journal, L'Artiste, despite its government subsidy, listed Courbet's accepted and rejected works in an article by its editor Edouard Houssaye. He concluded: "Si M. Courbet a été malmené pour plus d'une oeuvre, il se console en pensant à tant de tableaux admis, pour le plus grand désespoir des adorateurs de Corrége et de Racine, qui n' aiment pas M. Courbet et M. Champfleury."[101] L'Artiste then published Champfleury's famous "Du Réalisme. Lettre à Madame Sand," the longest defense of Courbet yet written.[102] When its regular critic for the Exposition, the conservative Charles Perrier,

responded with "Du Réalisme. Lettre à M. le Directeur de L'Artiste," attacking Courbet as "l'apôtre du laid," (and thereby demonstrating admirable perspicacity in choosing the heir to Delacroix) the journal was, of course, obliged to print it.[103] It was not obliged, however, to publish still another defense, "Du Réalisme," by Fernand Desnoyers, which appeared several weeks later.[104]

This is not to say that Courbet was universally acclaimed as a major artist in 1855. To be sure, there was negative criticism, the worst of it almost as violent as that launched by progressives against Ingres and conservatives against Delacroix. Nadar had, after all, compared Ingres' painting to the taste of a snotty hanky, while Lavergne wrote of Delacroix' works "elle soulèvent une répulsion instantanée."[105] All the major artists encountered diatribes as hostile as those directed against Courbet; such was the free-swinging style of nineteenth century art criticism. It is only when taken out of context that Courbet seems more victimized and less understood than the others.

The harshest criticism of Courbet in 1855 came from Augustin-Joseph DuPays, the literary critic (art critic for the occasion) for L'Illustration with its rich and conservative readership. DuPays devoted an entire article to Realism, and used Courbet to attack the Bourgeoisie, his

real enemy. Because Courbet had often depicted the rural Bourgeoisie, DuPays (and many others) identified him with this hated class "une race de parvenus prétentieux et endimanchés" as he called them: "La bourgeoisie, qui s'est élevée avec la monarchie, qui l'a renversée, qui a eu à son tour un règne éphémère, occupe une place importante dans l'histoire. Mais pour l'art les bourgeois ne sont que des vilains. L'art est aristocrate: habitué à frayer avec les dieux et les héros, il ne se commet pas en mauvaise compagnie."[106]

L'Illustration also published--and this has became iconic of Courbet's treatment in 1855--an entire page of caricatures by Quillenbois of all his major paintings.[107] And yet, two even more gifted draughtsmen, Nadar and Daumier, published cartoons which were a good deal more sympathetic; Daumier's "Nobody's that Ugly" (Figure 44) might even be construed as a defense.[108] In truth, the most common attitude towards Courbet in 1855 was that he was ignored; his ambition was such that he preferred to be attacked, even martyrized, rather than ignored, as Nadar knew (Figure 45). Of the major critics, those who refused to discuss him included the conservatives Claudius Lavergne, Alphonse de Calonne, E.J. Delécluze, Eugène Loudun, but also the moderate Louis Enault; Maxime DuCamp, despite his Republican sympathies, dismissed Courbet as "not serious."[109] Nor was he mentioned by Prince Napoléon,

but, considering Courbet's comportment towards the Government, this was a not unreasonable response.

The reaction to Courbet in 1855 was twofold: to Courbet's gesture of mounting his own show in defiance of that of the Government, and to Courbet's art itself. Few critics then, as now, could see past the gesture to the art. Champfleury, in his "Du Réalisme," acknowledged the political context of Courbet's gesture when he wrote:

> C'est une audace incroyable, c'est le renversement de toutes institutions par la voie du jury, c'est l'appel direct au public, c'est la liberté, disent les uns.
>
> C'est un scandale, c'est l'anarchie, c'est l'art traîné dans la boue, ce sont les tréteaux de la foire disent les autres. 110

Nor was it coincidental that the discussion was in terms of liberty vs order, exactly the same issues at the root of the Delacroix-Ingres debate. In general, Courbet's gesture of setting up his own show was applauded by the constituency favoring artists' rights, such as the art journals, and the critics of the Left Opposition who also favored Delacroix. He was condemned or ignored by the adherents of the ancien régime and the Academy, who supported Ingres. The Liberals were, as usual, caught in the middle, and sometimes, like Gustave Planche in the Orleanist Revue des Deux-Mondes, came up with a compromise: to support the gesture but dislike the art:

> M. Courbet aurait voulu exposer au Palais

> des Beaux-Arts ce qu'il appelle son oeuvre; le jury ne l'a pas permis, et je n'hésite pas à déclarer qu'il a eu tort. Il eût été bon et salutaire de soumettre au jugement public l'ensemble des tableaux créés par cet autre novateur. En refusant une partie de ses ouvrages, dont plusieurs avaient déjà été exposées, le jury fait à l'auteur une position de persécuté, de génie méconnu qui n'est point sans danger pour le goût. 111

It has already been shown that the discourse around Ingres was conducted in religious terminology, and that Ingres himself encouraged this; around Courbet it was the language of pure theatre. He himself had envisioned his exposition as taking place in a carnival tent, and, according to critics, he plastered the walls of Paris with posters advertising the event at one franc admission.[112] Academicians had been stating metaphorically since the beginning of the century that the Salons had turned into bazaars and fairs; with Courbet, they actually saw it happen. When Le Figaro announced that Courbet's circus tent next to the Palais des Beaux-Arts was like "le théâtre de Guignol à côté de la Scala de Milan," it had exactly comprehended Courbet's intention: to contrast popular and high art culture.[113] Taxile Delord, in Charivari, was equally perceptive when he portrayed Courbet as a carnival barker shouting: "J'ouvre l'ère de l'art individuel. Un pied sur l'Exposition officielle, l'autre sur mon annexe, je suis le colosse de Rhodes de l'art; je domine le passé, et le vaisseau de l'avenir passe entre mes jambes.... Du haut de ces planches, je crie aux artistes: Suivez mon

exemple, faites bâtir une annexe...."[114]

Let us for the moment, pass by the responses to Realism in general, and Courbet's painting in particular, as "vulgar" and "ugly." There was nothing new in this; he had been so criticized for decades, just as Delacroix was still being called "disordered" and "decadent." What is more important is to see the stress caused by the new directive of eclecticism, now applied to Courbet. Ernest Gebaüer, for example, wrote:

> Le bruit qui se fait depuis quelques années autour du nom de M. Courbet, nous force à nous occuper longuement de cet artiste. Fidèle aux principes qui nous ont guidés jusqu'ici, admettant, comme nous l'avons dit, toutes les manières de comprendre la nature, tous les procédés propres à exprimer la pensée de l'auteur, pourvu toutefois que la tendance artistique soit manifeste dans les productions soumises à notre jugement, nous n'affecterons point pour M. Courbet le même dédain que certains critiques. [115]

Despite this heroic effort, Gebaüer couldn't really be enthusiastic over Courbet's paintings: Auguste de Belloy, true to the fusionist politics of his journal L'Assemblée Nationale, was more successful, praising his landscapes (Figure 40):

> Si on veut oublier la réputation d'agitateur qu'ambitionne M. Courbet, et ne chercher dans ces ouvrages, dans les derniers surtout, que des aspects d'une campagne particulière et peu étudiée jusqu'ici, rendus avec un sentiment très-intime et très-juste, on sera, je croix, fort aise de les avoir vus, et on pardonnera bien vite à l'auteur quelques enfantillages de mise en scène dont le public s'est rendu complice, en

leur donnant une importance exagérée. [116]

Paul Mantz, who had praised Delacroix, was equally enthusiastic for Courbet.[117] Delacroix himself wrote at length of Courbet's show in his Journal, stating of L'Atelier "On a refusé là un des ouvrages les plus singuliers de ce temps;" he noted that Frédéric de Mercey shared his high esteem for the artist.[118] Perhaps the most insightful criticism of Courbet came from Pierre Petroz, who, as a staunch Republican writing in La Presse, would be expected to be sympathetic. So he was--to a point. After quoting from Courbet's "Du Réalism," he explained to his readers:

> Ce n'est donc ni la beauté de la forme ni la richesse de la couleur que cherche M. Courbet, mais la représentation exacte de la vie moderne, telle qu'elle lui apparaît. Il faut pour cela, et c'est beaucoup, voir juste, observer finement, trouver la véritable signification des choses. .... La Rencontre, par exemple, doit vouloir dire que la bourgeoisie actuelle respecte profondement les beaux-arts et leur rend hommage quand elle les rencontre sous la forme d'un peintre voyageur. Or, on ne voit guère aujourd'hui de bourgeois humblement inclinés devant le génie artistique. [119]

Petroz has indicated exactly the gap between Courbet's theory and practice, the same disjuncture that proved so troubling to Champfleury in his discussion of L'Atelier.[120]

Courbet succeeded in being discussed at greater length than all except the four chosen artists; much of the writing was intelligent and sympathetic; very little was

overtly hostile. The Government encountered much more hostility in instituting paid admission at the Palais des Beaux-Arts. If Courbet had to lower his entrance fee, so did the Government; if his exhibition did not draw the crowds he had hoped for, neither did theirs.[121] All in all, he was well satisfied when he wrote to Bruyas: "Mon exposition est allée parfaitement et m'a donné une importance énorme: ça va bien."[122]

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. Arnould Fremy, "M. Prudhomme à 1'Exposition. La Peinture Française," Charivari, 25 octobre 1855.

2. See, for example, Claude Vignon, Exposition Universelle de 1855. Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1855, 183-84.

3. George Sand to Maurice Dudevant-Sand, 23 mai 1855; see George Sand, Correspondance, Georges Lubin, ed., 15 vols., Paris, 1964-79, XIII: N° 6658.

4. Théodore Gudin (1802-1880) showed twenty-five seascapes in the Exposition; see the 1855 catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., N° 3220-44.

5. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 110.

6. Ibid.; the portrait was not listed in the catalogue, but its last minute inclusion was explained by Prince Napoléon, and it is visible in the photograph of Ingres' exhibition. For the identification of the paintings shown in Figure 22, see Frank Anderson Trapp, "The Universal Exhibition of 1855," The Burlington Magazine CVII (June 1965): 300-305.

7. Gautier, 1855, I: 142.

8. Ibid., I: 143.

9. Nadar (Gaspard-Félix Tournachon) reviewed the art exhibition for Le Figaro; see his articles, "Salon de 1855," 19 août and 16 septembre 1855. Also see DuCamp, 1855, 23, who suggested repeatedly throughout his study that history painting could be revived only if placed in modern settings, railway stations rather than churches. Delécluze referred repeatedly to the crisis weathered by the Classicists in their battle (which he saw as successful) against the Romantics; 1855, 2, 308.

10. DuCamp, 1855, 417; he was describing Ingres and his followers.

11. Gautier, 1855, I: 143.

12. Nadar, Le Figaro, 23 septembre 1855.

13. Ibid., 16 septembre 1855.

14. Hippolyte de Villemessant, "Feuilleton du Figaro," Le Figaro, 30 décembre 1855, 2.

15. Ibid., 2-7; the author was identified as "L.J."

16. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 109, 112.

17. Louis Enault, "La Chapelle de M. Ingres," Le Figaro, 3 juin 1855; the anecdote was published in his "Exposition Universelle," 6 mai 1855.

18. Blanc, Ingres, 178.

19. See Edmond About, Voyage à travers l'exposition des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1855, 116, and Vignon, 214-15.

20. Ernest Gebaüer, Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855, Paris, 1855, 143.

21. Gautier, 1855, I: 143.

22. Charles Baudelaire, "Beaux-Arts. Ingres," Le Portefeuille, Revue critique, historique et littéraire, 12 août 1855, 131.

23. Ibid; also see Julien de la Rochenoire, Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. Le Salon de 1855 apprécié à sa juste valeur pour UN franc, Paris, 1855, 41; Paul Mantz, "Salon de 1855," La Revue Française II (1855): 226; Pierre Petroz, "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Art," La Presse, 7 mai 1855.

24. Charles Baudelaire to François Buloz, 13 juin 1855; also see Baudelaire to Auguste Vitu, 9 juin 1855, in which he complained, "le père Ingres m'a donné un mal de chien;" Baudelaire to Philoxène Boyer, ca. 20 juin 1855, in which he announced that he had found another review for his Ingres article; Baudelaire to the President of the Société des Gens de Lettres, 29 juin 1855, in which he asked for a loan because he had been fired by his journal; Charles Baudelaire, Correspondance, Claude Pichois and Jean Ziegler, eds., 2 vols., Paris, 1973, I: 313-316.

25. Nonetheless, some of the most memorable, albeit unflattering bons mots, were written at Ingres' expense: Delacroix wrote in his Journal, 15 mai 1855, "C'est l'expression complète d'une incomplète intelligence," and the Goncourts wrote that Ingres' ambition was to be "le Memling d'un bras de fauteuil;" see their Exposition Universelle, 34.

26. Paul Mantz, "Salon de 1855," La Revue Française II (1855): 177.

27. About, 1855, 208.

28. For a discussion of the divisions within the Academy, see Rosenthal, 238-44.

29. Nadar, Le Figaro, 16 septembre 1855, 4. On the other hand, Calonne showed himself aware of all the nuances of politics within the Academy; see Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 113.

30. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 108; also see Delécluze, 1855, 308 and Horace de Viel-Castel, "L'Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts," L'Athenaeum Français, 21 juin 1855, 464-65.

31. On Heim, see Soubies, Les Membres de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, 2e Série: 1816-1852, 50-51; Delécluze, 1855. 308; Calonne, Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 118; also see M. de Saint-Santin (Philippe de Chennevières), "M. Heim," GBA, 1 janvier 1867, 40-62.

32. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 124-25.

33. Goncourt, Exposition Universelle, 12.

34. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 134-35; also see Gautier, 1855, I: 283-84.

35. Delécluze, 1855, 7.

36. On Gérôme's commission for Le Siècle d'Auguste: Naissance de N.S. Jésus Christ, see AN F21 83: Jean Léon Gérôme. The commission was given in 1852 for 20,000 francs.

37. Gautier, 1855, I: 229.

38. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 407.

39. Several major artists abstained, such as Gleyre, Delaroche and Ary Scheffer among the painters, David d'Angers, Préault among the sculptors; Barye showed with industry. All the abstentions were mentioned and regretted by the critics.

40. See Koenraad W. Swart, "'Individualism' in the Mid-Nineteenth Century (1826-1860)," Journal of the History of Ideas XXIII (January-March 1962): 77-90.

41. On "l'apôtre du laid," see Henry Lapauze, Ingres, sa vie et son oeuvre, 1780-1867, Paris, 1911, 500, and Delécluze, 1855, 214; on "un peintre de décadence," see Calonne, Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 128.

42. See the 1855 catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., N° 2908-42.

43. Cousin, Du Vrai, VI.

44. In a recent article, Francis Haskell has attempted to use the exceptions to disprove the rule; that is, he has cited critics whose politics and aesthetic positions were incongruent, as well as collectors whose tastes differed from the expected norm. This only demonstrates that history is a social science; regardless of individual variants, the generalization stands; see Haskell, "Enemies of Modern Art."

45. Lavergne, 71; Calonne expressed a similar position in Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 109.

46. Petroz, La Presse, 2 mai 1855.

47. Loudun, 1855, 13-14. Loudun's articles were originally published in the Legitimist L'Union; his description of Delacroix as a Revolutionary was not intended as praise.

48. "Mélange," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (15 mai 1855): 200.

49. Gautier, 1855, I: 167.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., I: 170.

52. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 118-119; either a typographicial error or an Ingrist typesetter has caused 1855 to be written as 1851 in the text.

53. Delacroix to Théophile Gautier, 22 juillet 1855, Delacroix, Correspondance, III: 279-80.

54. Petroz, La Presse, 19 juin 1855.

55. Lavergne, 87-88.

56. Delécluze, for example, dated the schism at 1824, the beginning of the Romantic attack on Classicism; 214, 241-45.

57. Gautier, 1855, II: 126.

58. About, 1855, 214.

59. Delécluze, 1855, 285-89.

60. Planche, RDM, 15 septembre 1855, 1156.

61. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 459; Petroz, La Presse, 19 juin 1855.

62. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 458; La Rochenoire, 40.

63. Petroz, La Presse, 19 juin 1855; also see Gebaüer, 141.

64. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 141; also see Gautier, 1855, II: 125, Loudun, 1855, 156.

65. During the 1850s, 56% of the Government art budget was spent for history and religious paintings, 11.8% for landscapes; see Angrand, GBA, mai-juin 1968, 344.

66. Alfred Sensier, Souvenirs sur Th. Rousseau, Paris, 1872, 229.

67. Goncourt, Exposition Universelle, 18.

68. About, 1855, 70.

69. Decamps, in Véron, Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris, VI: 264-74.

70. Decamps threatened to withdraw but did not; see Alexandre Decamps to le comte de Nieuwerkerke, 9 avril 1855, and Nieuwerkerke to Decamps, 11 avril 1855; Archives du Louvre P 30: Decamps. About was quite witty on the subject; see 1855, 130.

71. La Rochenoire, 51-52.

72. Enault, Le Figaro, 17 juin 1855, 6. Enault considered Decamps the greatest genre painter of the period and used the example of the tallow merchant to criticize the French museums which hadn't a single example of his work.

73. "Mosaïque," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 353.

74. Goncourt, Exposition Universelle, 18.

75. Vignon, 214-15.

76. Planche, RDM, 15 septembre 1855, 1150; also see Petroz, La Presse, 11 juin 1855.

77. Antoine Etex, Essai d'une revue synthétique sur

1'Exposition Universelle de 1855, Paris, 1856, 37.

78. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 120-23.

79. See for example, Delécluze, 1855, 12, 261 and A.J. DuPays, L'Illustration, 18 août 1855, 115-18.

80. Goncourt, Exposition Universelle, 17; also see Delécluze, 5, and Loudun, 1855, 12.

81. Etex, 56, Note 1; also see Planche, RDM 15 octobre 1855, 408-12.

82. DuCamp, 1855, 218.

83. Petroz, La Presse, 17 septembre 1855.

84. Perrier, L'Artiste, 8 juillet 1855, 130.

85. "Mosaïque," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 352-53; Georges Guénot, "Le Monde Artistique, 17 septembre," Ibid., 377-78; Gautier, 1855, II: 65-66; Viel-Castel, Mémoires, III: 28 août 1855. Also see AN F21 519 for the list of purchases.

86. Delécluze, 1855, 241.

87. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 110, 118.

88. About, 1855, 135.

89. Gautier (1855, II: 12) and Vignon (219) mentioned that engraving had popularized the work of Vernet. Virtually everyone mentioned his popularity; see, for example, Gebauer, 57, Loudun, 1855, 123, Enault, Le Figaro, 10 juin 1855, 4.

90. Vignon, 220.

91. DuCamp, 1855, 205; he was not even discussed by Petroz.

92. Rosenthal, 202, 217, 228.

93. Vignon, 220; Delécluze, 1855, 232; Perrier, L'Artiste, 17 juin 1855, 86.

94. Enault, Le Figaro, 10 juin 1855, 4-5.

95. DuPays, L'Illustration, 7 juillet 1855, 13.

96. Gautier, 1855, II: 12.

97. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 116.

98. Revue Universelle des Arts, 1855, I: 308.

99. Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 138, 254.

100. "Beaux-Arts," Journal des Arts, des Sciences et des Lettres et de l'Exposition Universelle, 1855, 11 mai 1855, 33, and Guyot de Fère, "Beaux-Arts," Ibid., juillet 1855, 82.

101. Edouard Houssaye, "Le Monde Parisien," L'Artiste, 15 avril 1855, 221.

102. Champfleury, "Du Réalisme. Lettre à Madame Sand," L'Artiste, 2 septembre 1855, 1-5.

103. Charles Perrier, "Du Réalisme. Lettre à M. le Directeur de L'Artiste," L'Artiste, 14 octobre 1855, 85-90.

104. Fernand Desnoyers, "Du Réalisme," L'Artiste, 9 décembre 1855, 197-200.

105. Nadar, Le Figaro, 16 septembre 1855, 4; Lavergne, 85.

106. DuPays, L'Illustration, 28 juillet 1855, 71-73.

107. Quillenbois, "La Peinture réaliste de M. Courbet," L'Illustration, 21 juillet 1855, 52.

108. See Daumier's cartoon in Charivari (Figure 44), 8 juin 1855, and Nadar's cartoon (Figure 45) in Le Journal Pour Rire, 13 octobre 1855.

109. DuCamp, 1855, 236.

110. Champfleury, L'Artiste, 2 septembre 1855, 1.

111. Planche, RDM, 15 septembre 1855, 1151.

112. Perrier, L'Artiste, 14 octobre 1855, 87.

113. Auguste Villemot, "Chronique Parisien," Le Figaro, 8 juillet 1855, 2.

114. Taxile Delord, "Exposition des Beaux-Arts. L'Annexe Courbet," Charivari, 4 juillet 1855.

115. Gebaüer, 127.

116. Auguste de Belloy, "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle," L'Assemblée Nationale, 7 septembre 1855; also

see Gautier, 1855, II: 155-56.

117. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 364.

118. Delacroix, Journal, 3 août 1855.

119. Petroz, La Presse, 27 août 1855; on the question of Courbet's "realism," see my article "Gustave Courbet's Second Scandal: Les Demoiselles de Village," Arts Magazine 53 (January 1979): 95-109.

120. Champfleury discussed this in relation to L'Atelier in his "Du Réalisme," L'Artiste, 2 septembre 1855, 1-5; Gautier also mentioned it in relation to La Rencontre; 1855, II: 156.

121. Delacroix noted that Courbet had lowered the entrance fee to ten centimes; see his Journal, 3 août 1855.

122. Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, 9 décembre 1855; see Courbet, L'Olivier, 485.

CHAPTER X

LOOKING AT FOREIGN ART: REFLECTIONS IN A FRENCH MIRROR

In truth, no one in France liked any of the foreign art exhibited in 1855. While this could be ascribed to chauvinism, the fact remains that the best contemporary artists were French. Who was there to equal Ingres and Delacroix?

Most of the art shown by the twenty-seven other countries was unknown in France. Clément de Ris, Secrétaire adjoint to the Jury des Récompenses, said of the French public, "il vit dans une indifférence profonde à l'égard du mouvement des autres pays."[1] But if the French approached foreign art with a mixture of arrogance and ignorance, this did not at all prevent them from pressing it into service in the cause of political battles at home. Pierre Petroz was, to be sure, one of most politically outspoken critics, and yet he spoke for all when he wrote: "Partout, en Europe, la marche de l'art est expliquée et justifiée par le caractère national, par les tendances sociales. Son développement est toujours en rapport avec l'état de la science, de l'industrie, de la politique."[2] In practice, it was less the art that was being judged than this "national

character" which, insofar as it reflected similar tendencies at home, was either praised or damned by the French critics. French art had, of course been similarly politicized during this period, the difference being that, whereas France's "national character" had been judged eclectic, the foreign nations were condemned--by the French--to have but a single, often overly simplified, national characteristic.

Twenty-four of the national exhibitions were lumped together by the critics into what Alphonse de Calonne called "les petites écoles;" they received little critical attention aside from enumeration and description.[3] Prince Napoléon, for example, dismissed the contemporary art of Spain and Italy as being "dans une décadence artistique complète."[4] The remaining three foreign nations were discussed at length, each in terms of what Gautier had established as its national character in art: Belgium, Facility; Germany, Intellectualism; England, Individuality.[5] An analysis of the response to the foreign art shown in 1855 actually reveals more about France than about the paintings in question.

Belgium

Of all the foreigners, the Belgian artists were the best known in France; many, such as Alfred Stevens (Figure 46),[6] exhibited regularly in the Paris Salon. Their work,

predominantly genre painting, was often indistinguishable from that of their French colleagues. Although little that they did could be considered new, they did it well, for they had been doing the same thing for centuries. Thus did Belgian genre painting escape the wrath of French conservatives: in Belgium such painting was--the magic word--traditional. Eugène Loudun, for example, who refused even to discuss Decamps, could write: "Voilà la Flandre, on y a en honneur les vieux Flamands; ce sont des imitations, mais des imitations des maîtres nationaux; ces peintres là s'inspirent du génie de leur pays et le perpétuent, ils vivent dans leur famille; s'ils ne s'enrichissent pas, ils conservent; c'est encore être riches; les pauvres sont ceux qui empruntent."[7] His political and aesthetic opposite, Paul Mantz, expressed exactly the same sentiments, although the qualities he admired among the Belgian painters had more in common with his favorites Delacroix and Courbet than with Loudun's vision of the perpetuation of an exhausted tradition: "L'école flamande, en cédant instinctivement à la loi mystérieuse de ses origines et de son milieu, se retrouve aujourd'hui fidèle à ses meilleures traditions. La vérité de l'observation et du détail, la largeur du faire, la science du clair-obscur, l'harmonieuse intensité du coloris, éclatent encore chez la plupart de ses peintres."[8] Gautier described savoir-faire as the national characteristic of Belgian artists, and, by this

token, Henri Leys was universally chosen the leading artist. His historical genre paintings, such as Les Trentaines de Bertal de Haze (Figure 47) were minute reconstructions of a national past; it could not be called peinture d'histoire (Delécluze suggested peinture anecdotique), but it was more elevated than most genre painting, similar to that of Paul Delaroche.[9] The similarity to French art caused Petroz to divide the School into two: half, including Leys, remained in Belgium and imitated seventeenth century Flemish and Dutch masters; the other half, such as Stevens, lived in Paris, and imitated the French.[10] In either case, the Belgian School was widely considered a subdivision of that of France.[11]

Perhaps this is why Prince Napoléon stated that Belgium ranked second only to France in the quality of its art.[12] This could be interpreted as extreme chauvinism on his part, or as an astute move to avoid taking sides on the politically loaded question of the art of Germany vs that of Britain, the major foreign protagonists.

Germany

During the first half of the nineteenth century, France's major foreign rivals were England, Russia and Germany (Prussia and Austria); in 1855 France was allied with the first, at war with the second (which, as a result, did not participate in the Universal Exposition) and

enjoyed cordial relations with the third, Germany.

French ideas of Germany were largely based on Mme de Stael's De 1'Allemagne of 1813. Few French travellers had visited there, and even fewer knew the language, but it was widely considered the land of philosophy and culture, the home of intellectuals. Of German politics and nationalism, the French knew nothing.[13] The main artistic tie betyween France and Germany was Rome, the home of the German Nazarenes and the home-away-from-home of the French Academy, where the most promising students of the Ecole des beaux-arts were sent to study the classical past. Rome provided the link between what were considered the highest aspirations of both Schools.

As Germany was not yet unified, work was sent under the sponsorship of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and a host of smaller principalities. No matter, the critics grouped them together under the rubric of "Germany," occasionally adding Austria as well. The best known in France, the Düsseldorf artists and the Nazarenes, sent nothing, and the absence of Overbeck was particularly regretted.[14] Of the artists represented, the most distinguished were Cornelius and Kaulbach, both of whom showed with Prussia. Both sent only cartoons for fresco cycles, Cornelius his Destruction du genre humain par 1'envoi des quatre cavaliers (Apocalypse C.VI), la peste, la famine, la guerre et la

mort (Figure 48), designed for the cemetery of Campo Santo in Berlin, and Kaulbach La Tour de Babel for the Berlin Museum (Figure 49). They were considered the epitome of both the strengths and weaknesses of the German School.

The tradition of La Grande Peinture represented by Cornelius and Kaulbach was not, however, the only kind of painting done in Germany, as the few devotees of German painting were well aware. Calonne, for example, stated that there were three German Schools: the High German School represented by Cornelius, Kaulbach and the Nazarenes, the French German School, inspired by Paul Delaroche, of whom Winterhalter was an example, and the Dutch German School of genre painting represented by Ludwig Knaus (Figure 50).[15] As both Winterhalter and Knaus lived in Paris and showed at the Salon, their work was well known in France. Winterhalter, in fact, managed to show with both France and the German principalities of Bade and Nassau; his portrait of the Empress Eugénie with her ladies-in-waiting (Figure 51) was made the centerpiece of the main French gallery (Figure 30). French conceptions of Germany, however, identified it as the land of elevated thought and so history painting was considered the "true" German School, next to which everything else paled to insignificance.

"Elle ne peint pas, elle écrit l'idée" wrote Gautier

of the German School, thereby stating in one sentence both its weaknesses and its strengths.[16] On its weaknesses, friend and foe were in accord with Louis Peisse (a friend) who wrote "L'aspect en est généralement morne, froid, raide et pesant. Il n'y a dans ces peintures ni la grâce ni le sourire."[17] German artists were universally criticized for leaving the execution of their works to assistants, being satisfied merely to do the cartoon. Peisse quoted Cornelius as having said "L'esprit sait rendre avec peu d'art ce qu'il conçoit. D'après ce principe, je méprise toute habilité de métier."[18] This was even more extreme than the position taken by Ingres, who supposedly said that anything well enough drawn is well enough painted. Cham's cartoon (Figure 52) showed the reaction of the French public, and Gautier explained why:

> Nous autres Français, qui attachons peut-être une importance excessive aux mérites de l'exécution, aux qualités de la pâte, l'adresse de la touche, à l'harmonie de la couleur, aux mille ressources de la palette, nous éprouvons un désappointment ou une impression désagréable devant ces immenses pages où un art impersonnel s'exprime par des mains étrangères et semble éviter le plaisir des yeux comme une concession au vulgaire. 19

Surprisingly enough, none of these were considered fatal flaws by the conservatives; indeed, these traits were thought to be preferable to the even more "dangerous tendencies" menacing the French School. Planche wrote:

> Elle a du moins renoncé à l'imitation prosaïque, telle que la pratiquaient les peintres

> secondaires de l'école flamande. Elle a compris que la reproduction la plus littérale de la nature ne suffit pas à enchaîner l'attention. C'est pourquoi l'Allemagne tient une place à part entre les nations de l'Europe. Tandis qu'on s'empresse de tous côtés à supprimer le côté idéal de la peinture et de la statuaire, elle continue de mettre la pensée au-dessus de la forme. Elle proteste énergiquement contre les doctrines qui voudraient faire de l'ébauchoir et du pinceau les très humbles serviteurs de nos sens.... L'excellence de ses intentions plaide pour l'imperfection de ses oeuvres. 20

Calonne acknowledged the dismal color of the paintings but added "Cette réserve est quelquefois excessive, mais elle nous paraît pourtant préférable aux témérités de certains coloristes."[21] Germany was, if nothing else, an ally to conservative France in upholding classical ideals against the "vulgarities" which were swamping the art of the rest of the world. Delécluze wrote: "L'Allemagne en a été garantie par le goût naturel qui y règne pour les idées élevées, mystiques et philosophiques; et la France a été particulièrement retenue sur la pente par l'institution de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts de Paris et de Rome."[22]

Opponents of German painting and the French Academy pointed to the same formal qualities criticized by the conservatives but, rather than excusing them on the basis of the artists' excellent intentions, held them up as an awful example of the direction towards which all such elevated painting naturally tended. Petroz, for example, wrote of the Germans, as he had written of the French:

> Il faut encore s'adresser à l'esprit avec

> des idées claires, intelligibles, qui surtout ne soient pas en contradiction avec le génie du siècle.... Le réalisme, ou si l'on aime mieux, le scepticisme moderne, ne comprend pas, n'admet pas les choses du monde surnaturel, les mythes que les grands philosophes, les érudits de l'Allemagne ont étudiés, expliqués, percés à jour. [23]

Maxime DuCamp wrote of Cornelius: "Enfin, comme la plupart des peintres de notre époque, il appartient au passé, dédaigne le présent, et semble ne pas se préoccuper de l'avenir."[24] And Paul Mantz closed his discussion with the thunderous imprecation: "Que l'Allemagne, entraînée par Düsseldorf et par Munich dans ces voies stérilement rétrospectives, nous soit à tous un éternel exemple."[25]

Cornelius was Catholic, Kaulbach, Protestant; Cornelius was esteemed as chef d'école of the German School, as austere and uncompromising in his ideals as Ingres, while Kaulbach, his student, seemed more in the juste milieu tradition of Paul Delaroche; neither exhibited paintings. All these facts were known to the critics, who were also aware of the diversity of modes actually practiced in Germany, and currently on display at the Palais des Beaux-Arts. Nonetheless, all this was considered of secondary importance; as reflected in a French mirror, the German School seemed synonymous with the most conservative traditions of the French Academy, and was praised or damned accordingly.

England

England, on the other hand, seen through a French looking-glass, seemed to be the dialectical opposite of Germany. While Germany was judged to exist in the elevated regions of philosophy, timeless and eternal as the classical ideal, England seemed to present the last word in modernity and industry, commerce and political freedom.[26] In a word, it represented Progress, and although a longtime economic rival of France, it was at the moment an ally in the Crimean War. The German School was Catholic, the English Protestant. The Germans painted major decorations for Church and State of religious and historical subjects; the English painted lively little genre pictures for private collectors. The Germans went to Rome to study, as did the French; the English were regarded as woefully ignorant and self-taught, lacking all contact with the Grand Tradition in art. In a word, the Germans were Idealist, the English Materialist.[27] Gautier called the English national characteristic "Individuality;" more conservative critics called it "Eccentricity" or even "Peculiarity."[28]

The British painting exhibition included works by the genre painters Sir Edwin Landseer (Figure 53) a favorite of Queen Victoria, and William Mulready (Figure 54); both artists were already known in France through engravings of

their work.[29] The British section was completed by Pre-Raphaelites such as John Everett Millais (Figure 55) and William Holman Hunt, an occasional history painter such as Sir Charles Eastlake, and a host of lesser known genre and landscape painters. They showed animal paintings, interiors, family scenes, landscapes, portraits--and a few history paintings. Gautier assured his readers that they put a dog in almost every picture.[30] Their paintings were witty, colorful, unpretentious and, previously unknown in France, proved an immediate success with the public (Figure 56). The British exhibition was widely described as the most popular at the Palais des Beaux-Arts.[31] Despite its success, there was critical agreement as to the formal weakness of British painting; although this attitude has been ascribed to French chauvinism, it must be acknowledged that, with both Constable and Turner dead, the British had no artists of the stature of Ingres and Delacroix.[32] Pierre Petroz, who had always admired British painting, summed up what was apparent to all: "Leurs tableaux choquent d'abord par la sécheresse des contours, par l'incorrection du dessin, par une couleur dure, rarement harmonieuse."[33] Despite these flaws--or perhaps because of them--the British School was universally considered the only real rival to France, for it alone had not succumbed to French influence. Charles Perrier wrote "Les Anglais sont parvenus à se créer une école neuve, originale,

indépendante, qui ne precède que d'elle même, ne doit rien à personne."[34] The world of art, like the world of politics and economics, was thus seen as neatly divided into England, on the one side, and France, considered by the French as the leader of the world, on the other. This was considered entirely logical, for, as Claudius Lavergne explained, "L'influence bien accentuée de la réligion, des moeurs et du caractère national, lui donnent un caractère d'originalité."[35] As with German art, French critics looked less <u>at</u> the paintings than <u>through</u> them to discuss their attitudes towards all things English, and, by extension, to comment on similar tendencies at home.

There was a long tradition for this, as French intellectuals had, since the 1789 Revolution, been looking across the Channel in admiration or disgust. Progressives admired England's rapid industrialization, capitalism and--by French standards--liberty; conservatives looked with horror on England as the incarnation of a futuristic nightmare they feared would one day descend on France. The fact that England had preserved its Monarchy and Aristocracy was no comfort, for these classes were judged to have abdicated their responsibility of setting an elevated example, and to have become throroughly Bourgeois in their tastes.[36] Furthermore, in an era of heavy press censorship, English politics and economics could be praised, all the better to tacitly criticize the French

Government. But one had to be careful: Montalembert would spend a month in prison for praising the English Constitution.[37] If we read the 1855 criticism of English painting in this light, we are doing exactly what the critics intended.

Genre painting was detested by conservatives even more than Romanticism and Realism, possibly because, unlike these movements, it was genuinely populaire. Following Herder's methodology, Delécluze endeavored to show that it had arisen in Northern Protestant countries such as England as a result of material conditions, but was unsuitable for France:

> Pour se décider à substituer à la peinture des héros de l'antiquité ou des saints du paradis celle de l'homme en pantoufles, en bonnet de coton et passant ses soirées devant le feu afin d'éviter le vent, la pluie et la neige, il faut être amené là nécessairement par le genre de civilisation matérielle qui résulte de la rigueur du climat, et plus particulièrement encore par la suppression des images dans les temples, comme cela a lieu dans les pays protestants. [38]

He developed this geographical determinism at length: "Au midi, le soleil, le jour, la vie large, sur une terre fertile, qui laisse du loisir à l'homme; au Nord, le froid, les brouillards, un sol ingrat, qui ne produit que quand il a été inondé de la sueur de ses habitants, ce qui rend si doux le coin du feu à la maison, the fireside at home."[39] Most conservatives, however, were uninterested in searching out ultimate causes, such as geography or climate, which

would have little political currency at home. Planche challenged Delécluze' analysis:

> Elle n'a produit ni un peintre ni un statuaire qui se puisse comparer, pour la puissance et l'autorité, à ces trois grands poètes, à Shakespeare, à Milton, à Byron. Comment expliquer cette singularité? Par la nature du climat? La réponse ne serait pas satisfaisante. Il me semble qu'il faut en chercher la cause dans la constitution politique et religieuse de la société anglaise. [40]

This, of course, opened the door for an attack on the real targets: Protestant Religion and the English Constitution: "Deux choses lui manquent pour l'épanouissement complet de ses facultés dans le domaine de la statuaire et de la peinture: une religion poétique et l'intervention de l'état."[41]

Planche's argument, that lack of State and Church direction (Throne and Altar) was reponsible for the absence of La Grande Peinture in England, was repeated by all the conservatives and was actually a thinly veiled atack on the current regime at home, where history painting was also languishing. Such a lack of direction could have only one result: the degradation of taste which would inevitably accompany such a political and economic shift. Lavergne wrote: "Faut-il s'étonner que les talents les plus sérieux soient réduits à traiter des sujets de genre, n'ayant de subvention à attendre que celle des grands seigneurs ou des bourgeois opulents?"[42] He held France's new cult of

Industry equally responsible, but the most magnificent attack on England as the birthplace of Industry and thus the assassin of Art came from Ernest Renan, who, finding that both Ancient Greece and Renaissance Italy were not highly industrialized nations, pronounced the two traits, Art and Industry, to be thus incompatible.[43]

England and everything it stood for seemed to drive conservatives to diatribe, rather than discussion. Alphonse de Calonne wrote several pages such as this:

> Il est manifeste aux yeux les moins clairvoyants que l'Angleterre expie aujourd'hui, par la pauvreté de sa grande peinture, le tort qu'elle a de ne posséder point d'école proprement dite, de n'avoir point d'académie où s'entretiennent et se vivifient les grandes traditions, de n'avoir point ouvert de musées qui font naître les vocations, de n'avoir point d'art religieux qui les développe, point d'expositions ni de récompenses nationales qui les encouragent.... Esclave de la liberté, il ne croyait pas avoir le droit de soutenir et de développer le goût plus qu'il n'avait celui de réglementer les consciences.... La liberté, toujours la liberté, même celle de déchoir dans l'ordre intellectuel, telle était là-bas toute la préoccupation. [44]

In the end, Delécluze articulated the underlying conservative fear: "L'on peut craindre que, dans un temps donné, et si l'art continue à se soumettre aux fantaisies des riches amateurs, nous en venions, comme en Angleterre, à rejeter la peinture de haut style parmi les friperies usées des contes mythologiques."[45]

Among progressives, British painting was praised for

manifesting the same characteristic of British society so detested by conservatives, namely, according to Gautier, "la modernité."[46] Pierre Petroz was quite specific as to what that meant:

> Nos voisins d'outre-mer ont heureusement échappé à la manie d'imitation et de pastiche qui guide la plupart des nations de l'Europe, dont nous ne sommes pas absolument exempts.... Les Anglais, au contraire, apportent dans leur peinture l'esprit d'indépendance qui a donné naissance à leurs institutions, à leur organisation politique, à leurs moeurs sociales. Si leur doctrine esthétique est contestable, si leurs procédés techniques sont insuffisans, ils ne les ont du moins empruntés à personne. Chacun de leurs peintres semble avoir une théorie personnelle, suivre un système particulier, ne reconnaître aucune royauté artistique. 47

Delacroix, as a Romantic, could be expected to espouse this cult of Individuality, and in fact, his sentiments were similar to Petroz':

> Chez eux, il y a une finesse réelle qui domine toutes les intentions de pastiche qui se produisent çà et là, comme dans notre triste école.... Comparez, par exemple, 1'Ordre d'élargissement de Hunt ou de Millais, je ne sais plus lequel, avec nos primitifs, nos byzantins, entêtés de style, qui, les yeux toujours fixés sur des images d'un autre temps, n'en prennent que la raideur, sans y ajouter de qualités propres. 48

Even the fact that British artists were deprived of Government support could be seen as a virtue. Edmond About, after noting that the catalogue showed British works to be in private rather than State collections, wrote: "Nos très-industrieux voisins, nos très-commerçants alliés, nos

amis très-positifs, ont une manière assez originale d'encourager les artistes: ils achètent leurs ouvrages."[49] Just as those in political life discussed the English Constitution in order to comment on French politics, so art critics discussed the English Royal Academy in order to criticize the Académie des beaux-arts. Paul Mantz was the most extreme:

> L'Académie anglaise a une organisation libérale et large; mieux que cela, elle a un esprit intelligent. Pour rester dans le mouvement contemporain, peut-être aussi pour le conduire, elle s'ouvre aux divergences d'écoles, aux nouveautés, aux hérésies; la jeunesse ne lui inspire aucune horreur systématique. Enfin, et c'est là ce qui paraîtra en France d'une haute singularité, --elle est composée d'artistes qui tiennent d'une main virile la brosse et le pinceaux; c'est une ruche active et vivante, et non une triste maison de refuge habitée par des talents invalides et des gloires paralysées. 50

It is evident that amidst these polemics, there was neither the time nor the interest to make a close examination of the works themselves. Generalizations, such as those quoted, were made and applied indiscriminately to genre painters such as Mulready and Landseer and to the younger Pre-Raphaelites. Whatever variety existed within the English School, the truly striking characteristic borne in upon French critics was English art taken as a whole considered in the light of French standards. Gautier had tried to express this feeling when he wrote: "Les caractères distinctifs de l'Angleterre sont une originalité franche, une forte saveur locale.... L'invention, le goût,

le dessin, la couleur, la touche, le sentiment, tout diffère. --On se sent transporté dans un autre monde très-lointain et très-inconnu...."[51] For those whose world-view allowed them to experience a style unsanctified by the classical tradition, Millais' Ophelia (Figure 55) proved the most astonishing painting in the entire Exposition. Nadar brilliantly described its effect:

> Je m'imagine que l'Ophélia de M. Millais a dû produire sur la majorité des Français qui l'ont aperçue l'effet que me produisèrent la Tarte aux groseilles vertes et le Gâteau à la rhubarbe, la première fois que je les trouvai sur la carte d'un restaurant de Douvres. On grince des dents d'abord, et puis quand on a goûté, c'est exquis. Cet étrange tableaux, peint en couleurs crues qui vous donnent des aigreurs aux yeux, ce citron anglais confit dans du vinaigre de bois, m'a irrésistiblement attiré tout d'abord et, chaque fois depuis, m'a retenu de longs instants sous un charme inexprimable. 52

Whether praised or damned, the British exhibition was unforgettable. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert took home with them a genre painting by Meissonier, but left in France an even more important souvenir, the memory of British painting. Maxime DuCamp wrote prophetically:

> L'exposition anglaise...a son importance et doit avoir son utilité pour nous, en nous prouvant, une fois de plus, que le champ de l'art est illimité, car elle a su trouver des effets, quelquefois remarquables, en dehors du domaine où nos artistes se sont renfermés. 53

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1. Cte L. Clément de Ris, "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts," Le Palais de l'Exposition, Revue hebdomaire illustrée, 9 juin 1855, 35.

2. Petroz, La Presse, 17 septembre 1855.

3. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 21 (1855): 108.

4. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 4-6.

5. Gautier,. 1855, I: 9.

6. See Clément de Ris, Le Palais de l'Exposition, 9 juin 1855, 35.

7. Loudun, 1855, 7.

8. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 29.

9. Delécluze, 1855, 20.

10. Petroz, La Presse, 7 août 1855.

11. See, for example, Perrier, L'Artiste, 4 novembre 1855, 128, 19 août 1855, 213; Gebaüer, 221-22; Delécluze, 1855, 194; Calonne, Revue contermporaine 20 (1855): 706-709.

12. Prince Napoléon, Visites, 76.

13. On French knowledge of and attitudes towards Germany, see Koenraad Swart, The Sense of Decadence in Nineteenth Century France, The Hague, 1964, 47, 80-81, 98.

14. Gebaüer stated that the Düsseldorf painters had refused to participate because they weren't allowed to elect their own jury; see XII-XIII.

15. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 512.

16. Gautier, 1855, I: 6.

17. Louis Peisse, "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle," Le Constitutionnel, 17 juin 1855.

18. Ibid., 25 mai 1855; also see Delécluze, 1855, 153-54, 178-79.

19. Gautier, 1855, II: 192; also see Calonne, Revue

contemporaine 20 (1855): 508; Perrier, L'Artiste, 5 août 1855, 189.

20. Planche, RDM, 15 août 1855, 820-21, 798; also see Peisse, Le Constitutionnel, 25 mai and 17 juin 1855.

21. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 509.

22. Delécluze, 1855, 260-62, 7-8.

23. Petroz, La Presse, 13 août 1855.

24. DuCamp, 1855, 373.

25. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 79.

26. On French attitudes towards England, see Swart, Decadence, 55-56, 62.

27. On "la force matérielle," see Loudun, 1855, 2; on English ignorance, Gebaüer, 193.

28. Gautier, 1855, I: 9; Loudun, 1855, 4; Lavergne, 9; the words used were Individualité, Excentricité, Bizarrerie.

29. Their popularity in France through engravings was mentioned by Delécluze, 1855, 109; Perrier, L'Artiste, 26 août 1855, 226; Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 495.

30. Gautier, 1855, I: 72.

31. While Landseer and Mulready were known in France through engravings, neither their, nor the Pre-Raphaelites', actual paintings were known at all; see Delécluze, 1855, 148; Jacques Lethève, "La connaissance des peintres Préraphaelites Anglais en France (1855-1900)," GBA 53 (1959): 315-28, and H.D. Rodee, "France and England: Some mid-Victorian views of one another's painting," GBA, janvier 1978, 39-47. Virtually all the critics commented on the popularity of the English exhibition; see Prince Napoléon, Visites; 100, Lavergne, 2; Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 493-94.

32. For the charge of French chauvinism, see "L'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts at Paris," The Art Journal (1855, I): 229-32. A modern version of this attitude is expressed in Marcia Pointon, "'From the Midst of Warfare and its Incidents to the Peaceful Scenes at Home': The Exposition Universelle of 1855," Journal of European Studies II (December 1981): 233-61. Pointon's article surveys the French reaction to British painting in

1855, but offers as explanation only French chauvinism; her factual information is often incorrect, e.g. her assertion that most of the paintings in Courbet's exhibition had been rejected by the Jury, or that there were no French collectors who bought contemporary art.

33. Petroz, La Presse, 4 juillet 1855; also see Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20: 495.

34. Perrier, L'Artiste, 4 novembre 1855, 127; also see Gebaüer, 221-22; Delécluze, 1855, 2, 194; Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 493; About, 1855, 34; Petroz, La Presse, 4 juillet 1855.

35. Lavergne, 9.

36. Swart, Decadence, 55-56; Ernest Renan, "La Poésie de 1'Exposition," Journal des Débats, 27 novembre 1855, reprinted in Oeuvres complètes de Ernest Renan, Henriette Psichari, ed., 10 vols., Paris, n.d., II: 239-51.

37. See Swawrt, 97; Montalembert's "crime" took place in 1857.

38. Delécluze, 1855, 12.

39. Ibid., 261.

40. Planche, RDM, 1 août 1855, 470.

41. Ibid., 471; also see Perrier, L'Artiste, 26 août 1855, 226; Delécluze, 1855, 8; Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 501-503.

42. Lavergne, 23.

43. Renan, Oeuvres, II: 245. While Renan attacked England as the corruptor of taste, he praised Germany as the home of philosophy; also see Lavergne, 12-15.

44. Calonne, Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 501-502.

45. Delécluze, 1855, 227.

46. Gautier, 1855, I: 8.

47. Petroz, La Presse, 31 juillet 1855.

48. Delacroix, Journal, 17 juin 1855.

49. About, 1855, 2.

50. Mantz, La Revue Française II (1855): 124.

51. Gautier, 1855, I: 7.

52. Nadar, Le Figaro, 26 août 1855, 4. Most of the critics discussed Millais' Ophelia at length; see Gautier, 1855, I: 31-32; Gebaüer, 206; Planche, RDM, 1 août 1855, 479; Horace de Viel-Castel, L'Athenaeum Français, 16 juin 1855, 508.

53. DuCamp, 1855, 320.

CHAPTER XI

CROWNING THE VICTORS

In the autumn, after the public had come and gone, after the critics had had their say, the Jury des récompenses began its deliberations. The salient fact about the Jury for painting was that its President was the comte de Morny; its task was too important to be entrusted to artists or amateurs--the latter category of "art-lovers," made up of collectors and connoisseurs. National representation on the Jury was proportional to participation in the Exposition; as finally constituted it included fifteen French and sixteen foreign members, of whom the largest contingents were from England (four), Belgium (three) and Prussia (two). The manner in which the original French Jury d'admission of fifty-two members was reduced to a fifteen member Jury des récompenses is particularly revealing of Government intentions. Eliminated were the School of David, the most conservative group of the Academy; the two extremes among the Independents, the history painters and the landscapists (Realists had never been represented); and all the collectors and connoisseurs. The six Academicians and four Independents appointed represented, with the exception of

Ingres and Picot, an aesthetic position that could be characterized as liberal; the five amateurs were (with the exception of Pastoret) actually members of the Government, and could be expected to do its bidding. The foreign governments sent artists and art administrators.[1] There was little justification for characterizing the Jury as composed of "des légistes, des conseillers d'Etat et des financiers," as did Charles Blanc, but, to staunch conservatives, the unprecedented entry of an obviously political contingent into the precincts hitherto reserved for artists, amateurs and art administrators seemed a blatantly political ploy which made them--justifiably--apprehensive.[2]

The Louvre memorandum called for one Grande Médaille d'honneur, which, as it would undoubtedly be awarded to a French artist, would thus crown him the greatest living artist.[3] Was this award promised to Ingres to secure his cooperation? Probably so; anxious as he was about the outcome of his exhibition, it is unlikely that he would have participated otherwise. Nonetheless, the decree of 10 May 1855 simply stated that 150,000 francs was available for awards to art (the total was later raised to 224,000Fr) but set no quota on the number of medals: that decision would be left to each individual Jury.[4]

The Jury des récompenses deliberated from 15 October

to 8 November. On the first day, Delacroix wrote in his Journal: "Première séance du jury. Levée de boucliers de l'Institut contre la pluralité des médailles." Given the Government policy of eclecticism, the multiplicity of medals should have been anticipated; to the Academicians, however, it must have seemed sacrilegious, a species of polytheism in the face of the One True Church. In the end there would be, for painting, drawing and engraving, 10 Medals of Honor, 48 First Class Medals, 51 Second Class, 57 Third Class and 151 Honorable Mentions. Altogether 169 medals were awarded to Art, 10,564 to Industry.[5]

L'Artiste announced the awards for Grandes Médailles d'honneur as follows: "Horace Vernet, Ingres, Decamps, Cornélius (Prusse), Landseer (Angleterre), Leys (Belgique), Heim (!), Delacroix, Meissonier (après coup)."[6] The awards were predictable in that, among the critics, there had been a general consensus that these were the outstanding artists--except for Heim and Meissonier. The voting records cast some light upon the awards. They show, for example, that although Troyon received more votes than Heim in the preliminary voting, his name was mysteriously dropped from the ballot on the second round.[7] One might suggest as an explanation that Heim had a strong constituency in the School of David clique of the Academy, and that the Government was trying to propitiate all special interest groups. Troyon and landscape painting in general had no

special constituency and so were not rewarded with a Medal of Honor. (Figure 57)

International priorities came before national ones, however, and Heim had to take a back seat to Meissonier. As the editor of Revue des Beaux-Arts explained: "On en était là, lorsque dans sa séance du 6, le jury, sur la proposition de M. le comte de Morny, infirmant son premier arrêt, a voté une médaille d'honneur à M. Meissonier à qui, dans une réunion précédente et lors d'un second vote, on avait préféré M. Heim.[8] The ballots show that Meissonier had originally failed to receive sufficient votes for a Medal of Honor; he, Léon Cogniet and Robert-Fleury each received 24 votes and their names appeared on the list for First Class Medals only.[9] The story of how Meissonier alone jumped from there to the Medal of Honor list, with a little help from Morny, is probably a tribute to English taste, Prince Albert having preferred Meissonier to all other artists, Napoléon III having seconded his taste by presenting him with Une Rixe (Figure 43). Morny no doubt interfered with the Jury proceedings in order to avoid the embarrassment to both sovereigns if their taste turned out to be ranked at less than the highest quality. But in the end, probably because the story appeared in the press, Heim's name was restored to the list and he too received a Medal of Honor.

The one other recorded incident of interference from the Government was also intended to uphold the reputation of the somewhat dubious Imperial taste. Winterhalter who, it seems, was disliked by practically everyone except the Imperial couple, did not obtain enough votes to receive even a First Class Medal. He didn't even come close, placing ninth after the cut-off mark. The ballot was notated "M. de Morny fait décider qu'on prendra les 9 premiers noms ayant réunis de 20 à 17 voix inclusivement pour les joindre aux lères médailles."[10] L'Artiste detested Winterhalter, referring to him as "the official painter," and so published the following account of the incident:

> Sur ces entrefaits, M. le comte de Morny entre dans la salle des délibérations. "Messieurs, dit-il, nous avons voté hier les médailles de première classe, mais nous avons laissé des noms honorables et qui méritent cette distinction. Nous pouvons ne pas regarder à quelque milliers de francs et augmenter le nombre des médailles de première classe."... M. de Morny propose de faire passer dans la première classe, les neufs premiers noms de la deuxième classe, ce qui est adopté sans discussion. Le neuvième nom est celui de M. Winterhalter. 11

The four principal French awards, to Ingres, Delacroix, Vernet and Decamps, surprised no one; one might even say that with the Government decision to give each artist a retrospective show within the Exposition, the awards were built into its very structure. With these Medals of Honor, the Government acknowledged the same constituencies in art as it did in politics: Ingres--the

Orleanists, Legitimists, the Church and the Academy, in a word, all the conservatives; Delacroix--the Intellectuals and revolutionaries of various degrees of radicalism; Decamps--the Bourgeoisie; Vernet--the Army, the common people and all those susceptible to Patriotism. The landscape painters, although they had not been deemed sufficiently important to have their School ratified by a Medal of Honor, were nonetheless recognized: Corot, Français, Huet, Rousseau and Troyon all received First Class Medals, and the young Daubigny was awarded a Third Class one. Courbet received nothing, of course, but he had only himself to blame, for the Government had intended to honor him as well.

On an international level, the Jury had, for the most part, ratified the status quo. Cornelius, considered second only to Ingres as a history painter, was given a Medal of Honor despite his limited participation and the even more limited French enthusiasm for his work. Kaulbach of Prussia, Winterhalter and Knaus from Bade and Nassau were each given First Class Medals; thus the Jury tacitly recognized, as the critics did not, the different German Schools. Of the British artists, Landseer seems to have been genuinely popular; he received as many votes as Ingres in the preliminary voting by the Jury, more than Delacroix in the finals. Sir Charles Eastlake and William Mulready received no awards, doubtless because they refused to

accept anything less than the highest. After his dismal showing in the ballotting for the Medal of Honor, Mulready wrote an open letter to the French press stating: "Messieurs, j'ai soixante et dix ans. Je ne suis donc plus un enfant; c'est pour cela que je ne veux pas prendre part à un concours, mais seulement à une exposition. C'est pour vous dire de ne pas vous occuper de me décerner une médaille."[12] Both he and Eastlake were appointed Chevalier in the Légion d'honneur in conpensation. Even the Pre-Raphaelites, who had created such a sensation in France, were recognized: a Second Class Medal for Millais (who also received the rank of Chevalier), a Third Class Medal for William Holman Hunt, Honorable Mention for Danby. Henri Leys was universally acknowledged as the leading painter of Belgium: he was given a Medal of Honor; Alfred Stevens, representing the "French" Belgium School, received a Second Class Medal.

Frédéric de Mercey stated with satisfaction that each country had received awards in the exact proportion in which it had participated: France got ten of the fifteen Medals of Honor and more than half of the other awards; England received seventy prizes, Belgium thirty-one, Prussia twenty-nine.[13] From a political point of view, justice had been done. Everything was accepted that had to be accepted. If there was criticism because the status quo had been maintained, one might also note, on the positive

side, that in France the acknowledgment of the status quo was actually a great leap forward.

The Government had shown an admirable eclecticism in its taste; in principle, everyone should have been happy. Prince Napoléon, who had been pressed into service as the instrument of that eclecticism, was not happy, and complained in his Rapport:

> Il faut dans les arts une direction qui ne peut venir que d'une minorité d'élite; cette direction doit même être un peu exclusive: les récompenses doivent être décernées non-seulement à l'oeuvre en elle-même, mais encore au genre qu'il faut encourager; sinon, on risque de tomber dans un système d'éclectisme fâcheux surtout par l'impulsion produite, tout éclectisme aboutissant à l'impuissance. 14

The deed was done, however: a variety of styles, in addition to history painting, had been encouraged. A Government memorandum analyzing the First Class Medals showed the results: "Histoire: 9 français, 1 prussian; Genre: 3 français, 8 étrangers; Paysage: 6 français, 1 étranger." 15

Ingres was even less pleased than Prince Napoléon. Not only were there now nine true religions proclaimed in France, but, even worse, it had been leaked out to the press that in the Jury voting, Horace Vernet and not Ingres had been unanimously acclaimed. 16 Ingres wrote to a friend:

> Plus de grande médaille d'honneur; elle est accouchée de 9 où moi, peintre de haute histoire, je suis sur le même rang que l'apôtre

du laid....

> Aujourd'hui, dans ce moment, on est occupé à faire sanctionner en assemblée de toutes les commissions ces iniquités. Je ne sais en vérité ce que je dois faire. Tout ce que je sais, c'est que si je ne suis cependant pas content de ce que l'on fera pour moi, je déserte le monde, ma position, toute espèce de participation aux travaux d'art, et me clos chez moi pour y mener enfin une vie que d'ailleurs j'aime, retirée, calme, toujours désintéressée, et mes derniers moments donnés à l'amour de l'art, par l'exercice et la seule fréquentation des chefs-d'oeuvre, en vivant en paresseux laborieux. Vous allez dire sur ça: Ah voilà mon Ingres, mais ça se calmera. --Non, cela sera. 17

Eventually Ingres did come to a decision, as Delacroix noted in his Journal:

> Horace me conte, ces jours passés, au jury, la démarche qu'il avait faite auprès d'Ingres, lequel a écrit pour refuser la médaille, outragé profondément d'arriver après Vernet, et encore plus, à ce que m'ont dit plusieurs personnes, non suspectes en ceci, de l'insolence du jury spécial de peinture, qui l'avait placé sur la même ligne que moi, dans l'opération préparatoire. 18

Ingres' outrage was such that he refused to attend the awards ceremony to witness the "iniquities" committed in the name of eclecticism.[19] A solution had to be found, or an international scandal would result. Several days later, Mme Ingres wrote to his fellow Academician Jacques-Edouard Gatteaux:

> Tout est réparé et mon pauvre mari est revenu à de meilleurs sentiments. M. Varcollier sort d'ici; il est venu, de la part du prince, annoncer à M. Ingres qu'il était nommé Grand Officier de la Légion d'honneur, seul titre qui ait été donné dans cette circonstance de l'Exposition! M. Ingres a donc promis d'aller à la séance du 15 recevoir cette grande décoration

de la main de l'Empereur. [20]

As the nominations for the Légion d'honneur were announced and published before the medals, Ingres received what he had probably been promised all along, the honor of being named the world's greatest artist. He accepted.

Ingres thus became the first artist or littérateur to attain the rank of Grand Officier de la Légion d'honneur. Delacroix, also promoted, was now Commandeur, a title he shared with Vernet.[21] But Vernet wasn't happy either. Prince Napoléon, in his speech at the awards ceremony, stressed that he had never interfered in Jury deliberations, with one exception, namely Ingres' Légion d'honneur nomination: "J'ai seulement témoigné le désir qu'il me fût permis de proposer à Votre Majesté une haute distinction pour celui de nos artistes qui, suivant la glorieuse tradition des beaux siècles de l'antiquité, a consacré toute sa vie et son talent au genre que, dans mon opinion personnelle, je regarde comme le type éternel du beau."[22] This may have been music to the ears of Ingres (he copied it into one of his notebooks)[23] but Vernet felt he had been proclaimed the Number One artist in the world by both the Jury and the Public. Silvestre quoted him as saying: "Je ne suis pas trop content, d'avoir vu Ingres mis au-dessus de moi par le discours du prince Napoléon, à la distribution des récompenses de l'Exposition universelle. Lui fait grand officier; moi resté commandeur; lui, le seul

représentant des traditions du beau, allons donc, vieux cuistre! vieux sournois!"[24] Whereupon he wrote the following letter to Prince Napoléon:

> L'infirmation tacite du vote du jury international des Beaux-Arts, contenue dans le discours que V.A.I. a adressée à S.M. l'Empereur, lors de la clôture de l'Exposition universelle, m'a fait comprendre que mes oeuvres ne remplissaient pas les premières conditions que, dans son opinion personnelle, elle regarde comme le type éternel du beau; j'ai dû penser alors que l'exécution de la Bataille de l'Alma ne pouvait satisfaire S.A.I., et considérer comme m'étant rendue la liberté de donner à ce tableau une autre direction.[25]

Then, in what he considered his finest coup, he presented it as a gift to King Jérôme of Westphalia, the father of Prince Napoléon. And he abandoned his commission to paint Napoléon Ier entouré des Maréchaux et Généraux morts sur le champ de bataille.[26]

Perhaps the most significant result of the awards was intangible, a feeling that had no place in this positivistic universe: a fear and an acknowledgment that there had been a fundamental change. An anonymous article published by Revue Universelle des Arts expressed this new mood:

> Si l'Exposition universelle avait eu lieu en 1835, M. Eugène Delacroix, qui était à cette époque la terreur de l'Académie, M. Eugène Delacroix dont le jury contestait toutes les qualités, n'aurait pas seulement obtenu une mention honorable. Qui peut m'assurer maintenant que M. Courbet, dont le nom n'a pas été prononcé dans la distribution des récompenses, M. Courbet, la bête noire de l'Institut, n'aura pas la grande

médaille à l'Exposition universelle de 1865, et que ses tableaux, honnis aujourd'hui, n'occuperont pas la place d'honneur? Hélas! dans les arts, comme dans la politique, l'erreur d'aujourd'hui n'est-elle pas presque toujours la vérité de demain? 27

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

1. The Règlement général of 6 April 1854 specified that the 28e Jury (Painting, drawing, engraving) would have 20 members, 15 French and 5 foreign) but also stated that representation should be proportional to participation; see Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 176-94, art. 59-60. As the foreign participation became more extensive, the composition of the Jury was changed. The Décret of 19 May 1855 raised the total to 32 members (Ibid., 220-21) and the Liste définitive du jury international de l'industrie et des beaux-arts was published three times, 25 March, 10 August and 6 October 1855 (Ibid., 221-38). The list of Jury members published in the 1855 catalogue Explication des ouvrages.... is incomplete; an accurate list was published in the 1857 Salon catalogue.

2. Charles Blanc, "Au Secrétaire de la Rédaction," La Presse, 30 octobre 1855.

3. See the memorandum "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts," in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, dossier 5.

4. Décret, 10 mai 1855, in Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 240-44; Mercey, "Exposition," 491.

5. The totals for the Beaux-Arts (8e Groupe) were: 16 Medals of Honor, 67 First Class Medals, 87 Second Class, 77 Third Class, 222 Honorable Mentions; in addition there were 40 nominations to the Légion d'honneur. For Industry there were 112 Grand Medals of Honor, 252 Medals of Honor, 2,300 First Class Medals, 3,900 Second Class, 4,000 Honorable Mentions; the corresponding awards were titled differently.

6. "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 11 novembre 1855, 152; the engraver Henriquel-Dupont also received a Medal of Honor.

7. Voting records have been preserved in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, dossier 4, and also in AN F21 519.

8. Georges Guénot, "Clôture de l'Exposition Universelle de 1855," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 432. Also see Delacroix, Journal, 16 novembre 1855. Villot came to congratulate Delacroix on his Medal of Honor: "Il me conte à sa manière ce qui s'est passé à propos du rappel de Meissonier à la médaille d'honneur. Je ne puis m'empêcher de l'arrêter au milieu de sa philippique contre ce qu'il

appelle d'horribles coquins, etc."

9. See Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, dossier 4. L'Artiste also published the figures; see 11 novembre 1855, 152.

10. Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, dossier 4.

11. L'Artiste, 11 novembre 1855, 153. According to the Archives du Louvre records, the artists who received First Class Medals because of Winterhalter were: Henry Scheffer, Abel de Pujol, Rouget, Corot, Chenavard, Huet, Lehmann, Larivière. The same story was recounted in Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 431.

12. "Chronique," La Revue Universelle des Arts, 1855, I: 239; also "Mosaïque," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 476; L'Artiste, 2 décembre 1855, 197.

13. Mercey, "Exposition," 492.

14. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 56.

15. Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1855, dossier 4. Other categories cited include portraits, paysage, dessin, miniature, gravure, lithographie, intérieur.

16. Georges Guénot, "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts et de l'Industrie," Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 457; Vernet was called "le chef de l'école nationale."

17. The letter was published by Charles Blanc, Ingres, 183; unfortunately, he appears to have censored the most interesting part, as well as the recipient's name.

18. Delacroix, Journal, 5 novembre 1855.

19. Lapauze, Ingres, 477; also see Louis Flandrin, Hippolyte Flandrin, sa vie et son oeuvre, Paris, 1902, 151-54.

20. Mme Ingres to Jacques-Edouard Gatteaux, n.d., in Lapauze, Ingres, 477-78.

21. "Chronique," La Revue Universelle des Arts, 1855, I: 237. Gudin was promoted to Commandeur, Heim to Officier; Decamps was already Officier, and Meissonier was, for the moment, left at Chevalier. The careful planning that went into the shifts of rank among artists is shown by a document in the AN "Liste des artistes vivants ayant obtenu des récompenses antérieurement au 1er mai 1853," which gave Légion d'honneur dates, ranks and Academic membership for

each of the French Medal of Honor winners; see AN F21 519.

22. Prince Napoléon, "Discours...15 novembre 1855," Rapport, 406.

23. Lapauze, Ingres, 478.

24. Théophile Silvestre, Mémoire de Théophile Silvestre contre Horace Vernet, Paris, 1857, 9. In 1856 Silvestre published some letters Vernet wrote in 1842-43; Vernet tried to suppress them and a lawsuit resulted, of which this is the memoir.

25. Horace Vernet to Prince Napoléon, 19 janvier 1856; Ibid., 9.

26. The records in AN F21 111: Horace Vernet, show that the painting was never finished. After Vernet's death, his heirs gave the painting St. Georges to the Government in 1865 to settle the advance paid Vernet ten years earlier. Vernet did, however, receive and execute other commissions after 1855. According to Silvestre, Vernet actually wrote a letter presenting Bataille de l'Alma to King Jérôme; Silvestre, 1857, 10. The Government must have found a way to pacify Vernet for Bataille de L'Alma (Crimée), le 20 septembre 1854 appeared in the 1857 Salon, with the notation "Appartient à S.A.I. le prince Napoléon;" see the 1857 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., N° 2620, and Lapauze, Ingres, 178-81.

27. "Chronique," La Revue Universelle des Arts, 1855, I: 240; the source is not identified other than that the article is reprinted from another journal.

CHAPTER XII

THE END OF AN ERA

> A l'époque où, témoin déjà passionné, nous nous sommes, pour la première fois, intéressé à ce grand spectacle, l'art moderne était en proie aux luttes les plus vives: une école fortement constituée défendait les traditions anciennes, que battait en brèche un groupe ardent de rénovateurs. Depuis, le parti de la résistance a disparu peu à peu; d'année en année on l'a vu decroître et s'éteindre; l'Exposition rétrospective de 1855 lui a permis de montrer son dernier effort: ce sera, dans l'histoire, sa protestation suprême. Et, maintenant, le calme se fait de toutes parts, et une génération indifférente commence à jouer avec les fleurs poussées sur les tombes des morts.
>
> --Paul Mantz [1]

Whereas the Universal Exposition at the Palais de l'Industrie had opened the door to the future, that at the Palais des Beaux-Arts closed the door on the past. The first half century was over, and with it the historic battle between Ingres and Delacroix, Classicism and Romanticism. With the canonization--and "entombment" of the two major protagonists, an era had come to an end. Ingres would live another twelve years, Delacroix eight, but for them, as Charles Perrier wrote, "posterity has already begun."[2] Rarely does a political event mark so clearly the division between art historical periods.

Regardless of the political expediencies which had determined the awards decisions, the policy of eclecticism took root, for it did correspond to political, economic and aesthetic realities. At the annual awards ceremony of the Ecole des beaux-arts in December 1855, Achille Fould spoke of the recent foreign exhibitions and, in the very seat of the classical tradition, he extolled the merits of eclecticism:

> Leurs principes, leurs procédés, leurs hardiesses, ont excité votre attention, vous ont peut-être fourni des enseignements, ou, du moins, vous ont montré des routes nouvelles.
>
> Toutes les écoles, en effet, ont leurs traditions, fruits précieux de l'expérience des maîtres illustres. L'une a conservé le secret d'un coloris chaud et brillant; une autre a maintenu dans l'exécution la sévérité et la précision des premiers âges....
>
> Toutes ces traditions ont leurs avantages et mènent plus ou moins directement au but de l'art. L'étude du passé doit servir au présent; mais si l'on demande aux anciens maîtres d'utiles leçons, c'est pour les mettre en pratique au profit de ses contemporains. 3

The immediate beneficiary of this policy was Delacroix, who presented himself to the Academy as a candidate for the seat left vacant by the death of Paul Delaroche in 1856. Delacroix had tried unsuccessfully six times to gain membership to this august body; in 1851 he had not even been accepted as a candidate.[4] And yet, on 10 January 1857, he was elected so quickly, by an absolute majority and without discussion, that one might even

suspect some form of behind-the-scenes pressure by the Government, for Nieuwerkerke was a member of the Academy as well as of the Government. Ingres, on hearing of Delacroix' election supposedly shouted "Voilà le loup dans la bergerie!," and Horace Vernet immediately began protesting that the proceedings had been irregular.[5] While the quarrel was raging in the Academy, Napoléon III moved to accept Delacroix' election and the issue was closed.[6] Delacroix himself, claiming that he was in poor health, did not make his triumphal entry into the Academy until 21 March, after the fuss had died down. Thereafter he was a model Academician who, although he did not have an exemplary attendance record at the weekly meetings (and who could blame him?) nonetheless took part in committees, juries, and other Academic reponsibilities.[7]

The possibility of a "deal" between Government and Academy is likely, for their rapport certainly improved during this period. The reign of Louis Philippe had been characterized by virtual open warfare between Government and Academy, the King refusing to accept its recommendations for official commissions, the Academy, in revenge, rejecting his favorites from the Salon. It even rejected him personally when his candidacy was proposed in 1839.[8] This was not the style of Louis Napoléon, however, for his Government was built on compromise and <u>ralliement</u> of all important groups and institutions. Ever since the

1851 coup d'état, he had been attacked by the Académie française which had become a center of liberal opposition. In 1855 he attempted to resolve the problem of the Institut by creating a new branch of the Académie des sciences morales et politiques which would be loyal to the regime.[9] The Académie des beaux-arts seems to have decided at the beginning of the Second Empire to abandon its opposition and rally to the regime in hopes of regaining some of its lost power and prestige. Nieuwerkerke was elected Academicien libre in 1853, followed by Achille Fould and Prince Napoléon in 1857 and Mercey in 1859; the period of the 1850s was like a honeymoon between the Government and the Académie des beaux-arts.

The Salon of 1857, the first held since the Universal Exposition, showed, even more clearly than the medals, what its effect had been. The first inkling that something had irreparably changed came when Le Moniteur Universel announced that the Salon would be held, not in the Louvre, but in the Palais de l'Industrie.[10] The century had begun with artisans and industrialists as temporary guests in the courtyard of the Louvre, the Palace of Art. Now roles were to be reversed, and artists were henceforth to be temporary guests in the Palace of Industry, sharing space with agricultural and industrial exhibitions. Problems began immediately when the Salon had to be postponed because an agricultural show was scheduled for the traditional

May-June period. The Salon would have to open 15 June and continue through 15 August, the arrière saison when many Parisians would have already left the capital.[11] The worst news was yet to come: the Jury would be the Académie des beaux-arts.[12]

The idea of returning the Salon to Academic jurisdiction probably proceeded from Nieuwerkerke, with the Emperor merely agreeing; Nieuwerkerke was ambitious and was cultivating the Academy for his own purposes, and Napoléon III was trying to break the unanimous opposition of the Institut. If the Academy controlled the Salon, Nieuwerkerke would have more personal influence over it than in the presence of either elected artists or appointed amateurs. The Procès-verbal gave the flavor of both the ralliement that Nieuwerkerke had procured, and the privileged position he received as reward:

> M. le Cte de Nieuwerkerke demande la parole pour une communication. L'Empereur l'a chargé de faire connaître à la compagnie que les quatres premières sections de l'Académie et la section des Académiciens libres composeraient le jury de l'exposition des Beaux-Arts, qui doit s'ouvrir le 25 mars prochain, au Palais de l'Industrie. M. de Nieuwerkerke informe aussi l'Académie que les meilleurs mesures ont été prises pour disposer le Palais de l'Industrie à recevoir les ouvrages d'art, et pour assurer tous les services nécessaires à l'exposition.
>
> M. le Président remercie M. le Directeur général des Musées impériaux de cette communication, et le prie d'exprimer à l'Empereur la gratitude de l'Académie pour cette preuve de confiance. L'Empereur peut compter sur le zèle de l'Académie. 13

There would be, during the 1850s, at least one branch of the Institut de France which had rallied, and if the price was to accept one wolf in the sheep-fold, the benefits more than outweighed the perils.[14]

Potentially this Jury would be the most severe since the Restoration, for under the July Monarchy even Academicians had to submit their own works for judgment, and since 1848, artists were accustomed to electing at least part of the Jury. In addition, this would be the first Salon with paid admission every day but Sunday. As a way of ameliorating the new policy, the Government promised to use the receipts to buy works of art, and, in addition, Napoléon III donated a special 4000Fr Medal of Honor to be awarded at each Salon.[15] Nonetheless, art was being made to pay its own way, like other forms of entertainment; previous regimes had considered the commission and purchase of works of art as a responsibility, without asking to be reimbursed.

The results of paid admission were immediately apparent. Critics noted that, in the past, visitors used to come to the Louvre an hour before the first day's opening time; when the doors were opened the crowd rushed in "like an army into a city under siege."[16] Now, because of the entry fee, workers, students, even artists themselves, had to wait a week before the first free day.

The public used to come repeatedly, and it was to France's frequent and free exhibitions that critics attributed the traditional excellence of French taste. To what was to be the classic argument for paid admission advanced by Prince Napoléon in 1855, Anatole de Montaiglon responded in 1857 with what was to be the classic argument for free entry:

> Le public--et les arts en ont besoin, et autant de celui qui n'achète pas que de celui qui achète; c'est même celui qui ne peut pas payer qui fait vendre,--est de toutes les classes et les petites bourses y sont en majorité. On peut encore aller au salon, mais, au lieu d'y aller souvent, on y fait de plus longues séances, et il faut bien aimer la peinture et en avoir bien l'habitude pour garder la tête fraîche pendant quatre ou cinq heures, et je mets en fait que plus des neuf dixièmes du public ne voient à peu près que pendant la première heure....
> D'ailleurs, l'intérêt de tous ne peut être mis en balance; les arts sont une éducation de l'esprit; elle doit être accessible à tous et sans restriction; on ne peut faire qu'elle profite à tous, mais il n'en faut exclure personne, et il y a autant d'injustice à fermer ainsi la porte des expositions annuelles, qu'il y en aurait à faire payer pour entrer au musée du Louvre ou à la Bibliothèque impériale. 17

Paid admission remained, however, and to further reduce costs, as well as to please the Academy, from 1857 on the Salon would be biennial.

Despite artists' apprehensions, the Jury of Academicians in 1857 proved remarkably lenient, accepting 3483 works by 1454 artists--only French 1072 artists had exhibited in 1855.[18] Photography, which Gautier called "an unacknowledged master with many students," was shown at the

Salon for the first time, and, undoubtedly at the suggestion of the Academy, a list of commissions for public monuments was included in the catalogue to compensate for the attention given to easel pictures.[19] It was said that the Jury accepted at least one work by almost every artist.[20] One might believe that even the Academy had been infected by the new spirit of eclecticism, but as this liberality was not repeated at the next Salon, it is more likely that the Government had requested that it placate the community of artists still angry over the severity of 1855.

The Salon d'honneur in the past had assembled what were considered the best paintings. In 1857 it was used for blatantly political ends: it included portraits of the Emperor and Empress and paintings of the Crimean War.[21] It was an undisguised reflection of the Government view of the utility of art. The Jury had renounced for itself the new Medal of Honor and awarded it instead to Adolphe Yvon, who showed La Prise de la tour de Malakoff (Figure 58), an incident from the Crimean War. Thus was the precedent set of awarding this medal to a young artist in the Grand Tradition, or as close to it as possible. Baudry, Pils and Bouguereau, all previous Prix de Rome winners, were given First Class Medals, but Daubigny (landscape) Desgoffe (still-life) and Knaus (genre) were also so honored, and Courbet, despite his Demoiselles des bords de la Seine, was

given a Second Class Medal.[22]

Achille Fould, who in 1855 had preached eclecticism at the Ecole des beaux-arts, spoke again at the awards ceremony of 1857 and warned against "the new School of Realism" in which he included genre and other lowly forms of painting. He held up, as an example to be emulated, Yvon, who painted France's military victories.[23] Thus was established a three way tug of war between Academic, Official and Bourgeois Art: the Academy wanted to perpetuate its own traditions, the Government wanted to use art to glorify itself, and the majority of artists simply wanted to sell their works. This triangulation would remain typical of the Second Empire, its seemingly erratic policies explained by the ascendancy of first one side then another, as it tried to please everyone.

Everywhere there was the feeling that 1855 had marked the end of an era. Perrier wrote: "Entre l'Exposition universelle de 1855 et le Salon de 1857, il y a toute la distance qui sépare une génération morte d'une génération nouvelle," and, in his first Salon review, Castagnary stated: "Jeté dans l'infini de la durée, entre les ruines de genres disparus et les tentatives confuses de genres en formation, le Salon de 1857 se présente à nous comme le berceau d'un art nouveau: l'art humanitaire. Il marque la date glorieuse de l'avènement de l'homme comme objet de

l'art."[24] Only die-hard conservatives of the older generation, such as Delécluze and Planche, refused to look to the future. Delécluze attempted to review the public commissions listed in the Salon catalogue to protest against the horde of easel paintings.[25] Planche--once again--pronounced eclecticism to be anarchy and busied himself setting forth a program for the revival of the traditional French School, thus tacitly admitting its demise.[26]

L'art nouveau was a phrase often heard in 1857; it meant Naturalism in both landscape and genre; this was seen as the movement which had come to replace Classicism, Romanticism and even Realism.[27] In the art of the first half-century, France had led the way; the foreign exhibitions of 1855, however, were to have a lasting influence on the future. Gautier wrote:

> L'Exposition universelle de 1855 est venue aussi apporter des éléments de divergence. Les nationalités de l'art ont fait connaissance, et après le premier étonnement se sont étudiées silencieusement. Chacune a tâché de surprendre les procédés de sa voisine, et nous retrouverons dans plus d'une oeuvre éminente des traces d'influence étrangère. Ces mélanges cosmopolites ont produit des combinaisons et des résultats difficiles à classer dans les anciennes catégories.[28]

Nadar quoted Gautier approvingly and identified the influences which he had so discreetly mentioned as coming from the English and Belgian genre painters.[29] 1857 had

also seen the British Art Treasures Exhibition at Manchester, where paintings of different epochs were arranged geographically, thus presenting a clear contrast between Northern genre and Southern classical modes.[30] In art as well as in industry, the days of isolationism and protectionism had ended.

The English artists seemed to be very much on the minds of critics in 1857; Perrier wrote: "Il est permis à tout le monde d'admirer les peintres anglais chez eux, mais nous ne les verrions pas d'un bon oeil prendre droit de cité parmi nous, surtout si quelqu'un en France devait songer à les imiter."[31] But many painters in France were following along the same path, a fact made all the more apparent by the absence of Ingres and Delacroix at the 1857 Salon. About three-fourths of the paintings shown fell into this category, which Castagnary described thus:

> La majorité, et une majorité compact, appartient aux tableaux de genres. Scènes d'intérieur, paysages, portraits, presque toute l'Exposition est là: c'est le côté humain de l'art qui se substitue au côté héroïque et divin, et qui s'affirme à la fois avec la puissance du nombre et l'autorité du talent. Presque plus de grandes toiles, presque plus de vieux noms: des tableaux de chevalet, une foule de noms inconnus. 32

Ingres noticed the same phenomenon:

> Au reste, nous sommes comme les juifs en captivité, qui pleurent leur malheur. Nous aussi, nous pleurons sur l'art envahi, méconnu tous les jours davantage, détrôné par le mauvais goût et malgré, à ce qu'il paraît, le petit

> peuple de 4 000 tableaux et plus de genre que présente le Salon que je n'ai point encore vu, l'art de l'histoire est dit-on nul et oublié des artistes comme des spectateurs; c'est triste, affligeant et j'en suis malade. 33

Most of the critics echoed Castagnary, however, and not Ingres. Among the conversions were the critic Perrier, an arch-conservative in 1855 who now attacked tradition and espoused l'art nouveau. He who had one praised Ingres as timeless and eternal now announced that there was no such thing, that even the Greeks had been of their own time.[34] It was the painter Gérôme, however, whose defection from the ranks of history painting proved the greatest shock to conservatives. Having been extravagently praised in 1855 for Le Siècle d'Auguste (Figure 34), and considered the young rising star of the traditional French School, Gérôme created a sensation in 1857 with his Sortie d'un bal masqué (Figure 59), a genre subject from contemporary life. Calonne and Delécluze condemned him as a traitor but the public loved him and his reputation was made.[35]

Delacroix may have been the obvious victor of the Exposition of 1855, but Courbet had also managed to "legitimize" himself, as Bertall ironically noted (Figure 60). L'Artiste published engravings of two of Courbet's landscapes in 1856, tucked in among those of various Ingres, Decamps and Bonvins; by 1857, Courbet seemed almost respectable.[36] Paul Mantz wrote:

> M. Courbet n'est plus le lion de nos

> Expositions; la curiosité du public se lasse vite en France; aujourd'hui on regarde paisiblement ses tableaux, on les juge d'une façon diverse, mais sans colère, et les bourgeois les plus épileptiques ont enfin reconquis leur calme vis-à-vis d'un artiste qui évidemment est sincère et qui n'est pas libre d'ailleurs de modifier sa nature pour complaire aux admirateurs de M. Hamon. 37

In the end, the critics found it difficult to articulate what had changed, except themselves. The Universal Exposition had, for the sake of political exigencies, instituted formalist readings of art which had hitherto incarnated the most violent political stances. It had provided the vehicle for a depoliticized self-referential view of art, namely the retrospective show. In its pursuit of eclecticism, it had dealt a fatal blow to the traditional hierarchy of categories, and had created the pre-conditions for a Modernist view of art. It was, then, with a kind of nostalgia that Delacroix' friend Pérignon, looked back on 1855, and wrote of the works:

> Aujourd'hui, tout est oublié, tout est effacé. il n'y a plus ni auréoles, ni balafres; elles apparaissent isolées, dépouillées de l'intérêt qu'elles avaient pu emprunter aux circonstances, à des goûts, à des entraînements passagers; surtout elles ont perdu le cortège de passions violentes qui leur donnaient la vie magique. 38

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1. Paul Mantz, "Salon de 1857," La Revue Française IX (1857): 422.

2. Charles Perrier, L'Art français au Salon de 1857, Paris, 1857, VII-VIII; also see Cte L. Clément de Ris, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 6 juillet 1857, 10; Castagnary, "Philosophie du Salon de 1857," in his Salons 1857-1870, 2 vols., Paris, 1892, I: 15; Philippe Burty, "Le Salon de 1857," Le Moniteur de la Mode, juillet 1857, 1er N°, 111-12.

3. Lord Pilgrim, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 23 décembre 1855, 235.

4. Louis Hautecoeur, "Delacroix et l'Académie des Beaux-Arts," GBA 62 (décembre 1963): 349-64. Also see Institut de France, Archives de l'Académie des beaux-arts, Procès-verbaux 1851-1855: 8-15 février 1851. Delacroix applied in 1837, 1838, 1839, 1849, 1851, 1853. Also see Théophile Gautier, "Eugène Delacroix à l'Institut," L'Artiste, 18 janvier 1857, 81-83.

5. Amaury-Duval, L'Atelier d'Ingres, Paris, 1924, 185-86. Vernet objected that the rules called for a discussion of the candidate's merits which had not been held; see the Archives de l'Académie des beaux-arts, Procès-verbaux 1856-1859: 3, 10, 17, 24 janvier 1856. Hautecoeur states incorrectly that Delacroix was elected on the tenth round; he cites no source for this information.

6. Archives de l'Académie des beaux-arts, Procès-verbaux 1856-1859: 24 janvier 1856.

7. Ibid., 21 mars 1857. The Procès-verbal for each meeting listed attendance and committees.

8. Rosenthal, 15.

9. On the Academic coup of 1855, see Emile Mireaux, "Le Coup d'état académique du 14 avril 1855," Institut de France, Académie des sciences morales et politiques, 1963, vol. 28; also see Campbell, Second Empire Revisited, 30-32.

10. "Ministère de la Maison de l'Empereur," Le Moniteur Universel, 21 novembre 1856 and L'Artiste, 23 novembre 1856, 316; this first announcement scheduled the Salon from 25 March to 25 May, with work to be submitted to the Jury 1-10 February, less than two months away.

11. The agricultural exposition was to be held 1-10 June. As a result of artists' protests their Salon was rescheduled to follow the agricultural exposition; see Cte L. Clément de Ris, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 30 novembre 1856, 328-29;"Ministère de la Maison de l'Empereur," Le Moniteur Universel, 11 décembre 1856; L'Artiste, 14 décembre 1856, 13.

12. The announcement of the composition of the Jury was made when the date was changed, in the Moniteur announcement of 11 décembre 1856, and L'Artiste, 14 décembre 1856, 13.

13. Archives de l'Académie des beaux-arts, Procès-verbaux 1856-1859: 22 novembre 1856; also see the p.v. of 13 juin 1856 when Nieuwerkerke invited Academicians to visit the Salon before it was officially opened.

14. Paul Delaroche died on 4 November 1856 and speculation usually began immediately on the death of an Academician as to who would replace him. As the decision to turn the Salon over to the Academy wasn't announced to its members until 22 November, there was adequate time to discuss the inevitable candidacy of Delacroix. It is also to be noted that it was traditional in the Academy for a eulogy to be read shortly after the death of each member. Delacroix died in 1863 and was not eulogized until 1876; see Jules Guiffrey, Les Membres de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts de 1796 à 1910. Notes Bibliographiques, Paris, 1911, 46.

15. See the announcement in Le Moniteur Universel, 11 décembre 1856, and L'Artiste, 14 décembre 1856, 13; also Louis Auvray, Exposition des Beaux-Arts. Salon de 1857, Paris, 1857, 3-5. On the Medal of Honor and paid admission, see the 1857 catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., LXI-LXVIII.

16. The critics continued to criticize the policy of paid admission; see, for example, Louis Auvray, Exposition des Beaux-Arts. Salon de 1857, Paris, 1857, 3-5; E.J. Delécluze, "Exposition de 1857," Journal des Débats, 2 juillet 1857; Maxime DuCamp, Souvenirs Littéraires, 2 vols., Paris, 1882, I: 343; Anatole de Montaiglon, "Salon de 1857," Revue Universelle des Arts 5 (1857): 533-558.

17. Montaiglon, 1857, 534.

18. See the 1857 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., and Auvray, 1857, 8-9.

19. See the 1857 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages.... and Théophile Gautier, "Salon de 1857," L'Artiste, 14 juin 1855, 190. Paul de Saint-Victor quoted Victor Hugo's metaphor of printed books and Gothic architecture "Ceci tuera cela" to descibe the effects of photography on painting; see his "Salon de 1857," La Presse, 29 août 1857.

20. Auvray, 1857, 8. Auvray described himself as "Secrétaire-Administrateur du Comité central des Artistes;" his Salon criticism always included information on the contemporary art world.

21. The paintings for the Salon d'honneur (the first room one entered at the Palais de l'Industrie) would have been chosen by Nieuwerkerke. It was described by Edmond About, Nos artistes au Salon de 1857, Paris, 1858, 5-6; Gustave Planche, "Le Salon de 1857. La Peinture," Revue des Deux-Mondes, 15 juillet 1857, 386.

22. The awards were listed in the 1859 Salon catalogue Explication des ouvrages....

23. Fould's speech was published in Le Moniteur Universel of 16-17 août 1857 and reprinted in the catalogue of the 1859 Salon, Explication des ouvrages...., VIII-X.

24. Castagnary, Salons, I: 15; Perrier, 1857, VII; Cte L. Clément de Ris, "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 6 juillet 1857, 10.

25. Delécluze, Journal des Débats, 20 juin 1857.

26. Planche, RDM, 15 juillet 1857, 377-403.

27. Perrier used "L'Art Nouveau" as the title for the last chapter of his book L'Art français au Salon de 1857; also see Burty, Le Moniteur de la Mode, juillet 1857, 2e N°, 122-24.

28. Gautier, L'Artiste, 14 juin 1857, 190-91.

29. Nadar, Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857, Paris, 1857, 58. Eugène Loudun commented that there were many foreigners exhibiting at the Salon, nearly all of whom showed genre pictures; see his Le Salon de 1857, Paris, 1857, 32; also see Delécluze, Journal des Débats, 2 juillet 1857.

30. The Manchester Exhibition was well reviewed in the French press and was undoubtedly influential in reinforcing the lessons of the Universal Exposition of 1855. Thoré reviewed it for Le Siècle, Paul Mantz for La Revue Française, Charles Blanc for L'Artiste and Le Courrier de

Paris. Also see the Catalogue of the art treasures of the United Kingdom collected at Manchester, 1857.

31. Perrier, 1857, 120.

32. Castagnary, Salons, I: 3.

33. Letter from Ingres to Magimel, 3 juillet 1857, quoted in Lapauze, 504.

34. Perrier, 1857, 179-89.

35. Alphonse de Calonne, "Exposition des Beaux-Arts de 1857," Revue contemporaine 32 (juin-juillet 1857): 610; Delécluze, Journal des Débats, 2 juillet 1857; also see Victor Fournel, "Salon de 1857," Le Correspondant XLI (juillet 1857): 739-44. Most of the critics applauded this picture; see for example Gautier, L'Artiste, 5 juillet 1857, 245; Planche, RDM, 15 juillet 1857, 392; Montaiglon, 1857, 546.

36. L'Artiste published an engraving of Courbet's La Vallée d'Ornans on 31 août 1856, and of La Vallée de la Loue on 19 octobre 1856.

37. Mantz, 1857, 52; also see Gautier, L'Artiste, 20 septembre 1857, 34; Fournel, Le Correspondant, août 1857, 739.

38. Alexis-Joseph Pérignon, A Propos de 1'Exposition de peinture, Paris, 1856, 3-4.

UNIVERSAL EXPOSITIONS OF THE SECOND EMPIRE: A STUDY IN ART AND POLITICS

by

PATRICIA MAINARDI

VOLUME 2

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- VOLUME 2 -

PART THREE

THE UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION OF 1867:
THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING IN FRANCE

XIII. SECOND EMPIRE ART POLICY: THE 1860S..... 283

XIV. INDUSTRY'S REVENGE..... 299

XV. ARTIST MALCONTENTS..... 321

The Salon of 1867..... 321
Courbet..... 329
Manet's View of the Universal Exposition.... 332

XVI. THE DEATH OF INGRES..... 366

XVII. THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING..... 373

Cabanel..... 381
Historical Genre..... 384
Genre..... 390
English Genre..... 393
German Genre..... 396
Japanese Genre..... 398
French Genre..... 400
Gérôme..... 403
Meissonier..... 405

XVIII. LANDSCAPE: THE PATH NOT TAKEN..... 418

Rousseau's Fate..... 433

XIX. THE TRIUMPH OF GENRE..... 454

XX. THE END..... 478

.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 489

ILLUSTRATIONS..... 527

ILLUSTRATIONS

Paintings and sculpture exhibited in Universal Expositions are marked: *1851, *1855, *1867. Titles are those used in the exhibition catalogues; where these differ greatly from museum titles, the latter are given in parentheses at the end of the citation. Dimensions are in meters.

1. Entrance Portal to the Palais de l'Industrie, Sculpture by Elias Robert, 1851. Photograph by Guevin, 1865. B.N.

2. The Salon of 1699, Grande Galerie, Louvre. B.N.

3. Fête de l'Etre Suprême, Paris, 20 prairial, an II (10 May 1794). B.N.

4. Fête de la Fondation de la République, Paris, 1 vendémiaire, an VII (22 September 1798). B.N.

5. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Champs-de-Mars, Paris, an VI-VII (September 1798). B.N.

6. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Courtyard of the Louvre, Paris, an IX-X (September 1801). B.N.

7. Statistics for National Expositions of Industry, 1798-1849. Chart from 1878 Rapports du Jury International.

8. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Interior of the Louvre, Paris, 1819. B.N.

9. Instrumens de précision, Armurerie, Imprimerie, Serrurerie. Engravings after grisaille decorations by Nicholas-Louis-François Gosse for the 1834 Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, Paris. From Moléon et al., Musée Industriel.

10. The Crystal Palace. The Great Exhibition of Products of Industry of All Nations, London, 1851. B.N.

11. The Interior of the Crystal Palace. The Great Exhibition of Products of Industry of All Nations, London, 1851. B.N.

12. Jean-Jacques Pradier, Phryné, 1845, plaster, 1.80. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Troyes. *1851.

13. Antoine Etex, Cain's Family, Marble, 2.05 x 1.65 x 1.70. Lyons. (La famille de Caïn). *1851.

14. August DeBay, Eve and her children, Plaster. Angers. (Le Berceau primitif). *1851.

15. Jean-Baptiste Clésinger, La Bacchante, 1847, Marble, .64 x 1.94. Petit Palais, Paris. *1851.

16. Jean-Baptiste Clésinger, La Femme piquée par un serpent, 1847, Marble, .56 x 1.80. Louvre.

17. Picture Gallery proposed for 1851 Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, London. A.N.

18. A. Deroy, Vue du Palais de l'Industrie, 1855. B.N.

19. Thérond, Entrée de l'Exposition des Beaux-Arts, avenue Montaigne, aux Champs-Elysées, 1855. B.N.

20. Map of the Universal Exposition of 1855, Paris. B.N.

21. Gustave Doré, La Foule du Dimanche à l'Exposition. Le Journal Pour Rire, 27 juillet 1855.

22. Photograph of Ingres Installation at the 1855 Universal Exposition showing L'Apothéose de Napoléon Ier, 1853 (destroyed). B.N.

23. Eugène Delacroix, La Chasse aux Lions, 1855, (partially destroyed), 2.60 x 3.59. Musée de peinture et de sculpture, Bordeaux. *1855.

24. Eugène Delacroix, La Liberté guidant le peuple, Le 28 juillet 1830, 1830, Salon of 1831, 2.60 x 3.25. Louvre. *1855.

25. Photograph of Delacroix Installation at the 1855 Universal Exposition. B.N.

26. Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, Les Experts, 1837, .464 x .641. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, 1929, The H.O. Havemeyer Collection. *1855.

27. Horace Vernet, La Barrière de Clichy, ou la défense de Paris en 1814, 1820, .975 x 1.305. Louvre. *1855.

28. Gustave Courbet, L'Atelier du peintre, allégorie réelle déterminant une phase de sept années de ma vie artistique, 1855, 3.61 x 5.98. Louvre.

29. Honoré Daumier, Vue prise dans un atelier, quelques jours avant l'ouverture de l'exposition. Le Charivari, 4 mai 1855.

30. Grand Central Salon of the French Exhibition, Palais des Beaux-Arts, Universal Exposition, 1855. B.N.

31. Paul Chenavard, Calendrier d'une philosophie de l'Histoire. From Théodore Silvestre, Histoire des artistes vivants.

32. Marcelin, Le Public à l'Exposition (Beaux-Arts), La couleur de monsieur Ingres, "--Moi, ça me ravit! --Moi, ça m'enrhume!" Le Journal Pour Rire, 17 novembre 1855.

33. François-Joseph Heim, Le Roi Charles X distribuant des récompenses aux artistes à la fin de l'exposition de 1824, d. 1825, Salon of 1827, 1.73 x 2.56. Louvre. *1855.

34. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Le Siècle d'Auguste: naissance de N.S. Jésus-Christ, 1855. Engraving from L'Illustration, 14 juillet 1855. Painting in Musée de Picardie, Amiens. *1855.

35. Paul Flandrin, Montagnes de la Sabine, 1838, 2.01 x 1.50. Louvre. *1855.

36. Jean Baptiste Camille Corot, Souvenir de Marcoussy, près Montlhéry, ca. 1855, .97 x 1.30. Louvre. (La Charette. Souvenir de Marcoussis, près Montlhéry). *1855.

37. Théodore Rousseau, Groupe de chênes, Apremont, 1852, .635 x .995. Louvre. *1855.

38. Constantin Troyon, Les Boeufs allant au labour; effet du matin, d. 1855, 2.60 x 4.00. Louvre. *1855.

39. Paul Huet, Inondation à Saint-Cloud, d. 1855, 2.035 x 3.00. Louvre. *1855.

40. Gustave Courbet, La Roche de Dix-Heures, .855 x 1.60, 1855. Louvre. *1855.

41. Jean François Millet, Un Paysan greffant un arbre, 1855, .81 x 1.00. Neue Pinakothek, Munich. *1855.

42. Charles-François Daubigny, Ecluse dans la vallée

d'Optevoz (Isère), 1855, .44 x .56. Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, Rouen. *1855.

43. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, Une Rixe, 1855, .44 x .56. Windsor Castle, Windsor. *1855.

44. Honoré Daumier, Ce Monsieur Courbet, fait des figures beaucoup trop vulgaires, il n'y a personne dans la nature d'aussi laid que ça!. Le Charivari, 8 juin 1855.

45. Nadar, St. Courbet, peintre et martyr. Comment M. Courbet nous offrira l'année prochaine la 101e édition de son portrait. Le Journal Pour Rire, 13 octobre 1855.

46. Alfred Stevens, Ce qu'on appelle le vagabondage, ca. 1855, 1.32 x 1.62, Musée national du chateau de Compiègne. *1855.

47. Henri Leys, Les Trentaines de Bertal de Haze, 1854, .90 x 1.335. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels. *1855.

48. Peter von Cornelius, Destruction du genre humain par l'envoi des quatre cavaliers (Apocalypse C.VI), la peste, la famine, la guerre et la mort, 1846, cartoon for frescoes for Campo Santo, Berlin. Staatliches Museum, Berlin. *1855.

49. Wilhelm von Kaulbach, La Tour de Babel, cartoon for Berlin Museum, 1.495 x 1.720. Koninklijk Museum Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. *1855.

50. Ludwig Knaus, La Promenade, 1855, .97 x .76. Musée des arts décoratifs, Paris. *1855.

51. Franz-Xavier Winterhalter, L'Impératrice entourée de ses dames d'honneur, d. 1855, 3.00 x 4.20. Musée national du château de Compiègne. *1855.

52. Cham, Le Public observant la plus stricte neutralité vis-à-vis de l'école prussienne. Le Charivari, 14 juin 1855.

53. Sir Edwin Landseer, Animaux à la forge, exhibited in 1844, 1.422 x 1.118. The Tate Gallery, London. (Shoeing). *1855.

54. William Mulready, Le Loup et l'agneau, 1853, .60 x .51. The Royal Picture Collection, Buckingham Palace, London. (The Wolf and the Lamb). *1855.

55. John Everett Millais, Ophélia, d. 1852, .762 x 1.118. The Tate Gallery, London. *1855.

56. Cham, M. Prudhomme à l'Exposition. Le Charivari, 25 juin 1855. "--Mon ami, je crois qu'il y a une legère faute de dessin dans ce tableau anglais! --Madame, les Anglais sont nos alliés, je n'avouerai donc jamais qu'ils ont pu commettre une faute dans un de leurs tableaux, je ne le dois pas et ne le ferais pas!"

57. Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts. Médailles d'Honneur. Paris 1855, popular print. B.N.

58. Adolphe Yvon, La Prise de la tour de Malakoff, le 8 septembre 1855, Salon of 1857, 6.00 x 9.00. Musée National du Château, Versailles.

59. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Sortie d'un bal masqué, Salon of 1857, .50 x .72. Musée Condé, Chantilly. *1867.

60. Bertall, A la fin de son Exposition universelle, Courbet se décerne à lui-même quelques récompenses bien méritées en présence d'une multitude choisie, composée de M. Bruyas et son chien. Le Journal Pour Rire, 12 janvier 1856.

61. Pinot et Sagaire, Vue Générale de Paris et l'Exposition Universelle de 1867, Epinal print. B.N.

62. L. Dumont, Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée, masthead engraving.

63. G. Randon, Au Temple de Mémoire. Courbet, Maître Peintre. Le Journal Amusant, 15 juin 1867.

64. Gustave Courbet, Paysage, d. 1865, .94 x 1.35. Louvre. (Le Ruisseau couvert, Ornans). *1867.

65. G. Randon, Le Temple du Goût, "L'Exposition d'Edouard Manet." Le Journal Amusant, 29 juin 1867.

66. Edouard Manet, Vue de l'Exposition Universelle de Paris, 1867, 1.08 x 1.965. Najonalgalleriet, Oslo. (Fra Verdensutstillingen, Paris 1867).

67. Berthe Morisot, Vue de Paris des hauteurs du Trocadéro, 1872, .45 x .81. Collection Mr. and Mrs. Hugh N. Kirkland, Palm Beach, Florida.

68. J.A.D. Ingres, L'Apothéose d'Homère, d. 1827, 3.86 x 5.15. Louvre. *1855.

69. Alexandre Cabanel, Naissance de Vénus, Salon of 1863, 1.30 x 2.25. Louvre. *1867.

70. Stefano Ussi, Le Duc d'Athènes, 1.62 x 2.25. Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna, Rome. (La Cacciata del Duca di Atene). *1867.

71. Henri Leys, L'Archduc Charles, âgé de 15 ans (plus tard Charles-Quint) prêtant serment entre les mains des bourgmestre et échevins d'Anvers, 2.31 x 1.85, ca. 1863. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Bruxelles. *1867.

72. William von Kaulbach, Engraving after the Cartoon for L'Epoque de la Réformation, 1862, for fresco at Neuen Museum, Berlin. Present whereabouts unknown. From Muther, The History of Modern Painting. *1867.

73. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Phryné devant le tribunal, Salon de 1861, .80 x 1.28. Hamburger Kunsthalle. *1867.

74. Ludwig Knaus, Garçons Cordonniers, 1861, .41 x .485. Marburger Universitätismuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschicte. (Kartenspielende Schusterjungen). *1867.

75. Hokusai, Folding and Unfolding, The Mangwa. B.N. *1867.

76. Jean-Léon Gérôme, Arnautes jouant aux échecs, d. 1859, .38 x .27. The Wallace Collection, London. (The Draught Players). *1867.

77. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, Le Capitaine, d. 1861, .23 x .15. The Wallace Collection, London. (A Cavalier, Time of Louis XIII). *1867.

78. Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier, S.M. l'Empereur à Solférino, d. 1863, .435 x .76, Salon of 1864. Louvre. *1867.

79. Paul Huet, Grande marée d'équinoxe aux environs de Honfleur, d. 1861, Salon of 1861, 1.01 x 1.645. Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture, Bordeaux. *1867.

80. Théodore Rousseau, etching after Le Chêne de roches, Salon of 1861, *1867, now in a private collection, The Netherlands. Etching: .124 x .167, 1861. B.N.

81. Jean-François Millet, Des Glaneuses, Salon of 1857, .835 x 1.11. Louvre. *1867.

82. Eugène Fromentin, Fauconnier arabe 1863, Salon of 1863, .74 x .95. Louvre. (Chasse au Faucon en Algérie). *1867.

83. Francois-Louis Français, Bois sacré, d. 1864, Salon of 1864, 1.09 x 1.34. Musée de Lille. *1867.

84. Jules Breton, La Bénédiction des Blés (Artois), d. 1857, 1.30 x 3.20. Louvre. *1867.

85. Charles-François Daubigny, Le Printemps, Salon of 1857, .96 x 1.93. Louvre. *1867.

86. Théodore Rousseau, Paris vu de la Terrasse de Belleville, .610 x 1.15, n.d. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Bruxelles.

87. Trichon, Distribution solonnelle des récompenses par l'empereur, au Palais de Champs-Elysées, le 1er juillet 1867. B.N.

88. Gustave Brion, La Lecture de la Bible; intérieur protestant en Alsace, engraving by Rajon from GBA of the painting shown in the Salon of 1868. Present whereabouts unknown.

PART THREE

THE UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION OF 1867: THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING IN FRANCE

CHAPTER XIII

SECOND EMPIRE ART POLICY: THE 1860S

Political historians divide the Second Empire into the Authoritarian Empire of the 1850s, following the coup d'état, when Napoléon III attempted to consolidate his regime, and the Liberal Empire of the 1860s when, in order to stay in power, he was compelled to make concession after concession to the growing pressure for liberty.[1] The world of art was subject to the same forces, and the Universal Exposition of 1867 must be seen against this new milieu. The relative power and influence of the protagonists of 1855, the Academy, the Government Art Administration, the independent artists, had changed in the intervening decade, and an understanding of these changes is necessary to place the second French Universal Exposition in context.

We have already seen that, during the 1850s, the Salon became biennial, its jurisdiction taken from the artists and given to the Academy. As reward for rallying to the Empire, the Academy was accorded the privileged position it had enjoyed during the Restoration. In principle, the Government had struck a good bargain, for it had secured the support of the major cultural institution and made a

breach in the united front of opposition of the Institut de France. In practice, the experiment was not a success for, typical of the Second Empire politics of appeasement, what was given with one hand was taken back with the other. Having set in motion the forces of eclecticism, having officially recognized and rewarded a number of different styles in art, the Government had dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the Academy as the arbiter of French art. After the liberal Salon of 1857, the Academy attempted to repair this damage by becoming more and more severe and exclusive in its Salon decisions; beginning in 1859, artists' protests became both more vociferous and more conspicuous.[2]

The honeymoon period between the Government and the Académie des beaux-arts abruptly ended in 1860; the cause: the incompetent restorations carried out on paintings in the Louvre under Nieuwerkerke's supervision. Such "restorations" had been criticized as early as 1853 by Delacroix, heartsick over what was being done to the Veronese;[3] the Academy did not involve itself until the "conservateur" Villot began repainting the Raphaels. Ingres supposedly took one look at the repainted Saint-Michel and went straight to Napoléon III, stating of Nieuwerkerke "l'avenir saura juger sévèrement cet assassin!"[4] Unfortunately, "this assassin" was also a member of the Academy, present at all discussions and thus privy to its

intentions and able to sabotage them. The Academicians decided to publish a report critical of the restorations, but Nieuwerkerke got to Le Moniteur first and announced there that the Direction des musées impériaux was cognizant of criticism of the recent restorations and would undertake no future restoration without consulting the Academy. On this basis he managed to block publication of the Academy's plan to send its report to the National Assembly. When, in early 1861, it became apparent that he had no intention of living up to his promise, the Academy resumed plans to publish its report, and further, to write directly to the Emperor. Nieuwerkerke again got there first and arranged for Napoléon III to appoint a consultative body for restorations which, out of fourteen members, would have only two Academicians. Presented with a fait accompli, the outraged Academy sent a delegation to the Emperor, but was told that the arrêté decreeing the commission could not be withdrawn: it was too late.[5] The result of all this was, as Viel-Castel wrote in his memoirs: "Nieuwerkerke déteste l'Académie des Beaux-Arts et il la craint parce qu'elle a blâmé et dénoncé à l'Empereur la funeste restauration des tableaux du Louvre et parce qu'elle a demandé l'exposition dans le Musée de la collection Campana tout entière."[6] Ingres, who had played leading roles in these battles, was punished by having his paintings withdrawn from the Luxembourg and hung in a badly lit Salon.[7] He had been

correct when he said "Voilà le loup dans la bergerie!" but the wolf turned out to be Nieuwerkerke, not Delacroix.

The relationship between the Academy and the Government deteriorated rapidly after this. In the summer of 1861, when arrangements were being made for French participation in the 1862 English International Exhibition, the Government suddenly redefined the Jury d'admission for art, breaking it down into constituencies: three collectors of contemporary art, three members of the art administration, four elected by the Academy from among its members, and five artists elected by all those submitting work. For the first time since 1849, a species of universal suffrage was tried in art--although the regime was based on universal manhood suffrage in politics. The results were not revolutionary and must have been reassuring to the Government: the artists elected Gérôme, Dauzats, Cavelier and Barye.[8] It was an experiment which was prophetic for the future.

The year 1863 marked a turning point in the Government's relations with both Academy and artists, for this was the year of both the Salon des refusés and the reform of the Ecole des beaux-arts. In both cases criticism had been brewing for several years. In 1859 artists demonstrated under Nieuwerkerke's windows against the harshness of that year's Salon Jury, and, by 1863, when

the jury rejected 70% of the works submitted, the outcry was so great that it reached the ears of Napoléon III, always finely attuned to majority opinions. After visiting the Palais de l'Industrie to view the rejected works, he decreed that they should be shown, with the artists' consent, in another part of the Palais. As usual, he believed that compromise would placate both sides; as usual, he was wrong. Both the Jury of Academicians and Nieuwerkerke, its President, saw the Emperor's gesture as a public reprimand and attempted to justify their decisions by hanging the worst paintings in the best places. They were partially successful, for the public did come to laugh; nonetheless, the Salon was reformed: it would henceforth be annual, its control wrested from the Academy. Future Salons were to have a Jury three-fourths elected by artists who had received medals or decorations at previous Salons, one-fourth appointed by the Administration.[9] The Academy was out in the cold, the narrowness of its judgments having excluded the majority of French artists, it was, in 1863, no longer deemed the representative of French artists.

But worse was to come, for, in the Fall of 1863, the Academy was again attacked by the Government. By Imperial decree, control of the Ecole des beaux-arts was taken away from the Academy (which had founded it over two hundred years before) and given to the Government, which would

henceforth appoint professors, administrators and jurors for its competitions.[10] Reform of the Ecole had been strongly urged by Léon de Laborde in his monumental report on the 1851 London Exhibition. Sent to the Academy by the Government in 1857, the report was bitterly attacked in the Academy's counter-report the following year.[11] Nothing was done until the 1860s, however, after Nieuwerkerke had turned on the Academy and after it was all too apparent that it no longer represented the art community. The battle over the Ecole was similar to that of 1855 over the Académie des sciences morales et politiques. The Government had been forced to retreat on that occasion; in 1863 it was more successful. In the 1850s a repressive Government had attacked a liberal institution; in the 1860s a liberal Government was attacking a repressive institution: the tide of history had turned. Nonetheless, whatever the faults of the Académie des beaux-arts, it must also be acknowledged that a dominant concern of the Government was to consolidate and centralize power in its own hands. The Institut de France had existed as an autonomous Government within the Government; the Ecole des beaux-arts, for example, was separate from the University system controlled by the Ministère de l'Instruction publique, the Institut library the only one in France not under Government jurisdiction. Whether the separate Academies rallied or were in outright opposition, the very

existence of the Institut de France was a thorn in the side of the Government, for it presented a permanent challenge to its hegemony. As the Académie des beaux-arts had demonstrated, even a ralliement could be withdrawn, and the power and prestige of a major cultural institution could suddenly become weapons with which to attack the regime. Fortunately for the Académie française, its popularity made it invulnerable and the Government feared to attack. Unfortunately for the Académie des beaux-arts, it had become unpopular--the worst possible crime in the Second Empire--and, as events proved, it could be attacked with impunity.

Nieuwerkerke may have turned on the Academy, but that did not mean that he was now a supporter of the independent artists. Nonetheless, the elected Jury of 1864, with him as President, showed itself extremely liberal and the percentage of refused work dropped from 70% to 30%, with the most notorious artists of 1863, such as Manet, admitted.[12] As a result, the Salon des refusés held in 1864 was a failure, being really a collection of inferior works. With this as an excuse, the experiment was dropped for the duration of the Second Empire, although artists continued to demand it. As artists were beginning to learn, any vehement protest brought a temporary improvement which quickly evaporated with the protests that had engendered it. The new Jury, elected by those who had

already won medals and decorations, was not necessarily more lenient than the previous one composed of Academicians. Both groups being themselves exempt from the judgments of the Jury, the Salons resumed their earlier tradition of self-perpetuation.[13] Several years later, after the period of heavy press censorship was over, the critic Louis Auvray explained this phenomenon:

> Hélas, le résultat resta toujours le même, parce que toujours les mêmes intérêts et les mêmes hommes se retrouvaient seuls en présence: les décorés, visant à l'Institut, votaient pour et comme les membres de l'Institut; les médaillés, avides de nouvelles récompenses, votaient dans le même sens pour flatter messieurs de l'Institut et messieurs les décorés, de sorte que les motifs de plainte n'avaient pas ou peu changé. 14

The new era of Naturalism heralded in 1857 flourished during this period, although often unrecognized in fact by the very critics who praised it in theory. The group of young artists who would eventually be called Impressionists all made their Salon debuts; the "young radicals" of 1855, Courbet, Millet and the Barbizon painters, continued to exhibit regularly, gaining in both age and respectability; the older generation, Ingres and Delacroix, no longer exhibited, and Delacroix died in 1863. The major new reputations were Meissonier, Gérôme and Cabanel, all elected to the Academy during this period. The "geography" of the art world was thus very different on the eve of the 1867 Universal Exposition from what it had been in 1855.

The cast of characters introduced earlier in this study was also undergoing changes between 1855 and 1867. Napoléon III, after the Universal Exposition of 1855, was more confident of his taste and even, according to Chennevières, became somewhat of a collector, personally choosing Cabanel's Nymphe enlevée par un faune in 1861 and Naissance de Vénus in 1863.[15] Ludovic Halévy, secretary to the duc de Morny, recounted an episode of 1863 which confirmed the Emperor's taste:

> J'ai acheté un tableau pour l'Empereur, ou du moins avec l'argent de l'Empereur. Voici comment. J'arrive à deux heures à l'hôtel des Ventes et je tombe sur mademoiselle Marguerite Bellanger qui, elle, se précipite sur moi. Mademoiselle M.B. est la petite Impératrice du moment. "Venez, venez vite, me dit-elle, je cherche partout quelqu'un qui pousse un tableau pour moi." On met le tableau en vente. Je le pousse jusqu'à 350 francs et on me l'adjuge. Je le repasse à mademoiselle M.B. et voilà. C'était une Tentation de Saint-Antoine. Il y avait une petite femme nue assez appétissante et qui divertira vraisemblablement les regards de l'Empereur. [16]

Napoléon III's personal taste notwithstanding, Second Empire art policy continued to support artists favored by previous regimes, to glorify itself, to flatter the Church, and--this last undoubtedly coming from the Emperor himself--to reward artists most favored by the public.[17]

The Empress Eugénie also came into her own during these years, discovering a passion for interior decoration which led her to borrow, rather freely, works from the

Louvre to add the authentic period flavor to various ensembles. Needless to say, Nieuwerkerke was nothing loath to accommodate Imperial fancies.[18]

Princess Mathilde began a literary Salon in 1860; it overshadowed her artistic Salon, which she continued nonetheless. Her literary friends included Sainte-Beuve, Gautier, Flaubert, the Goncourt brothers, Taine and Renan, while the brightest stars in her artistic circle were Hébert, Baudry, Gavarni, Fromentin and her teacher Giraud. In 1859 she began exhibiting watercolors at the Salon, and even received a medal in 1865. Her liaison with Nieuwerkerke continued through the 1860s, he becoming increasingly flagrant in his infidelities, she, humiliated but proud, pretending not to notice, continuing to advance his career.[19]

Prince Napoléon, after 1855, was not a conspicuous presence in the world of art. Appointed President of the French Commission for the British International Exhibition of 1862, he quite naturally assumed, once again, the Presidency of the 1867 Universal Exposition. His career was abruptly ended in 1865, however, when political differences with Napoléon III resulted in his resignation. He lost interest in his Maison Pompéiienne and sold it in 1866, his collection of antiquities in 1868.[20]

The duc de Morny continued to indulge his tastes for

collecting and speculation until his death in 1865. When he was a member of the Salon Jury, Chennevières noted, he always tried to buy what the jury praised, and even attempted to organize lotteries as a regular part of the Salon.[21] With his death and Prince Napoléon's resignation, the world of art was left in the hands of Nieuwerkerke.

The comte de Nieuwerkerke's star was in the ascendant in the period between the two Expositions. Mistrusted, even disliked, by the Bonaparte family (except Mathilde) and the Government administration, to say nothing of artists, he not only stayed in power, but managed to increase his influence during this period. In 1863 Mathilde prevailed upon Napoléon III to create a new title for him "Surintendant des Beaux-Arts;" in 1864 she had him made Sénateur. From 1853 to 1860 he used the Academy for self-aggrandizement, then abandoned it and stripped it of much of its power when it dared to criticize him. As Director of the Louvre, he freely disposed of its treasures for the benefit of himself, the Inperial family and friends; when this became known he protested his innocence and threatened to resign. Unfortunately he didn't. He weathered the scandals of the Louvre restorations, the acquisition of fake (and expensive) works for the Louvre collections, the loan of Louvre treasures for Imperial interior decoration. He was President of the Salon Jury during the turbulent period which resulted in the Salon des

refusés, and emerged even more powerful afterwards. He was chased from the Ecole des beaux-arts by angry students in 1864, in the company of Théophile Gautier and Viollet-le-Duc; Gautier ended up in jail, Viollet-le-Duc was forced to resign his chair, and Nieuwerkerke was made President of the Ecole's Conseil supérieur de l'enseignement.[22] The man had charm.

During this period, two new figures emerged in the art administration:

Jean-Baptiste Philibert Vaillant, Maréchal de France (1790-1872): Vaillant had a long and distinguished military career under all the regimes of the nineteenth century. A supporter of the 1851 coup d'état, he was made Sénateur and Maréchal by Napoléon III. From 1854 to 1859 he was Ministre de la Guerre and in 1860 was appointed Ministre de la Maison de l'Empereur; in 1863 he was made Ministre des Beaux-Arts as well. He was thus a cabinet level appointee, successor to Frédéric de Mercey (who had died in 1860) and the immediate superior of Nieuwerkerke. A member of the Académie des sciences, he seems to have had virtually no interest in art, introducing himself at the Salon of 1863 as "an old soldier." Nonetheless, he made speeches in the Emperor's name at every Salon, alternately praising originality and tradition.[23]

Charles-Philippe Chennevières-Pointel (1820-1899):

Chennevières, by his own admission, was a protégé of Nieuwerkerke whom he admired boundlessly and excessively. he began his administrative art career in 1846, was made (by Nieuwerkerke) Inspecteur des musées de province in 1852 and, in 1855, Inspecteur général des expositions d'art, responsible for the Salon. In 1857 he was made curator at the Louvre and, in 1863, at the Luxembourg. Under the Third Republic he rose to the post of Directeur des Beaux-Arts, Nieuwerkerke's job retitled. A prolific author, he produced many catalogues and books on art and his invaluable Souvenirs d'un Directeur des Beaux-Arts, which is reliable on all aspects of the world of art save those that reflected badly on Nieuwerkerke.[24]

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

1. For a discussion of the various political approaches to the Second Empire, see Campbell, Second Empire Revisited and Zeldin, Political System.

2. On artists' reactions to each Salon, see Germain Bazin, "Le Salon de 1830 à 1900," in Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Lionello Venturi, 2 vols., Rome, 1956, II: 117-23; John Rewald, The History of Impressionism, 4th rev. ed., Greenwich, Conn., 1973; Chennevières, Souvenirs, Part II: 6. A chart showing the relative harshness of the Juries is in Harrison C. White and Cynthia White, Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World, N.Y., 1965, 142-43.

3. See Delacroix, Journal, 12 octobre 1853.

4. Rioux de Mailloux, Souvenirs des Autres, Paris, 1917, as quoted in Amaury-Duval, 220.

5. Archives de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, Procès-verbaux: 28 avril, 5, 12 mai, 18 août 1860, 19, 26 janvier, 2, 9, 16, 23 février, 2, 9, 16, mars 1861; also see Le Moniteur Universel of 10 mai 1860 for Nieuwerkerke's promise to the Academy.

6. Viel-Castel, Mémoires, VI: 5 avril 1863.

7. Ibid.; Viel-Castel noted that Chennevières (curator at the Luxembourg) had acted with Nieuwerkerke.

8. See AN ADXIXD 20/21/23 and F21 565; also the Archives de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, Procès-verbaux: 24 août 1861. Prince Napoléon was designated President of the Imperial Commission, the comte de Morny the President of the Jury Central des Beaux-Arts, and Nieuwerkerke its Vice-President. Only four artists were elected.

9. On the Salon des refusés, see Albert Boime, "The Salon des Refusés and the Evolution of Modern Art," The Art Quarterly 32 (1969): 411-26. Boime dates the first major challenge to the Academy as the arbiter of French art at 1863; as has been described in Part Two of this study, I place it at 1855. Also see Daniel Wildenstein, "Le Salon des Refusés de 1863," GBA, septembre 1965, 125-52; Rewald, Impressionism, 77-89. The new Règlement was signed 14 août 1863 and published in the 1864 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., XXIII-XXIX.

10. On the reform of the Ecole, see Albert Boime, "The

Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France," The Art Quarterly, n.s. I (Autumn 1977): 1-39; Rewald, Impressionism, 89-90. Maxime DuCamp gave a hilarious account in his Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle, I: 217-24. The reforms were published in Le Moniteur Universel, 13 novembre 1863 and in GBA, "Ecole Impériale et spéciale des beaux-arts," 1 décembre 1863, 563-72. I have here tried to place the reforms in the larger context of Second Empire politics.

11. Archives de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, Procès-verbaux: 14, 21 mars, 18 avril, 23 mai 1857, 24 avril 1858.

12. On the Salon of 1864, see Boime, Art Quarterly; Bazin, Scritti; Rewald, Impressionism, 102-107.

13. Ibid.; see Rewald, Impressionism for a year by year account of the Salon.

14. Auvray, 1868, 9.

15. Chennevières, "L'Empereur et l'Impératrice," Part II, 1-19. It is difficult to know whether Chennevières' account of the Emperor's taste is reliable, or to what degree the Emperor's Salon purchases reflected his own taste. The large proportion of religious paintings on Chennevières' list would seem to imply that paintings were being chosen for other reasons. Napoléon III's preference for tasty nudes, however, (in art as well as in life) has been amply corroborated by other sources. See my Chapter IV, Note 3, for bibliography on Napoléon III.

16. Ludovic Halévy, Carnets, Daniel Halévy, ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1935, I: 27 novembre 1863.

17. Chennevières noted this last intention as that of Napoléon and Eugénie's personal art purchases; see his Souvenirs, Part II, 13-14.

18. In addition to the bibliography cited in my Chapter IV, Note 4, see Chennevières, "L'Empereur et l'Impératrice," in his Souvenirs, Part II, 1-19. On her taste in interior decoration, see Philadelphia Museum of Art, The Second Empire, 12. Chennevières' account of her taste in art is somewhat more positive than that given by the rest of her biographers; see Kurtz, 330 and Leroy, 117-40. It is probably true, however, that she liked the trips to the Salon to choose paintings bought on the Civil List.

19. In addition to the bibliography cited in my Chapter IV, Note 7, see Castillon du Perron, 183, 203-206,

212-13.

20. In addition to the bibliography cited in my Chapter IV, Note 6, see Holt, Plon-Plon, 118-19, 194, 205, 210.

21. In addition to the bibliography cited in my Chapter IV, Note 11, see Chennevières, "Collectionneurs," Souvenirs, Part IV, 123-27.

22. See the bibliography cited in my Chapter IV, Note 8. All the scandals mentioned here were known to Nieuwerkerke's contemporaries. Chennevières mentioned them but attempted to "explain." His contemporaries were extremely harsh in their judgment; see, for example, "Alfred Emilien, comte de Nieuwerkerke," in Pierre Larousse, Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe siècle, 15 vols. + 2 supp., Paris, 1865ff, s.v. Maxime DuCamp recounted the story of how the Imperial delegation was chased from the Ecole in 1864; see his Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle, I: 217-24.

23. On Vaillant, see "Jean-Baptiste Philibert Vaillant" in Larousse, Grand Dictionnaire, s.v. His speeches were published in the annual Salon catalogues, Explication des ouvrages...., beginning in 1864 (which contained his 1863 speech).

24. On Chennevières, see his Souvenirs and "Charles-Philippe Chennevières-Pointel" in Larousse, Grand Dictionnaire, s.v.

CHAPTER XIV

INDUSTRY'S REVENGE

> Quel spectacle, Sire! qu'il est à-la-fois plein de magnificence et de douceur! Quelle autre nation pourrait le produire! Quel essor de l'esprit public! Quelle source de prospérité pour le présent et pour l'avenir! Et dans le moment même de cette admirable réunion des chefs d'oeuvre de la peinture et des produits des arts industriels, la nature couvrait de ses dons notre sol fertile, et d'abondantes moissons rentrant de toutes parts, récompensaient l'agriculture de ses laborieux travaux.
>
> --Duc de la Rochefoucauld, President of the Jury, 1819 Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, speech to Louis XVIII. [1]

> Au spectacle merveilleux de pincettes et de savons, de brouettes et de bassinoires coudoyant des oeuvres d'art; au sifflement des machines qui trouble la tranquillité si désirable pour qui veut bien voir une statue ou une peinture, l'homme sent battre son coeur d'un noble orgueil.
>
> --Emile Galichon, Editor of Gazette des Beaux-Arts, writing of the Universal Exposition, 1867. [2]

Just as the 1855 Universal Exposition was intended as the French response to England's Great Exhibition of 1851, so did the second French event, in 1867, follow the 1862 International Exhibition. Others had been held in the intervening twelve years, in Brussels in 1857, Algeria in 1862, and Dublin in 1865, but insofar as things industrial were concerned, France looked to England as its chief rival.[3] The motivation behind the 1867 Universal Exposition

was frankly set forth in the 1863 Rapport à l'Empereur by Eugène Rouher, Ministre de l'agriculture, du commerce et des travaux publics:

> Après la clôture de l'Exposition de Londres et avant la distribution des récompenses faite, le 25 janvier dernier, par Votre Majesté, les principaux exposants manifestèrent le désir qu'une Exposition universelle fût ouverte à Paris en 1867.
>
> La Commission, qui s'est réunie le 5 juin, a pensé, d'un avis unanime, que les avantages industriels et moraux des Expositions universelles se manifestent de plus en plus. Les producteurs en ont retiré une grande utilité pratique pour eux-mêmes, pour leurs contre-maîtres et pour leurs ouvriers; ils y ont trouvé le moyen d'améliorer leurs procédés de fabrication et d'étendre le cercle de leurs opérations commerciales. 4

The era of international trade was well under way, and, despite the opposition of manufacturers, Napoléon III had managed to force passage of the 1860 Cobden Free Trade Treaty with England. With reductions in French tariffs, the age of protectionism was ending, and an international exhibition assumed, as Rouher pointed out, a practical function. So much so that French manufacturers offered to form a holding company to raise the funds to finance it. In view of the losses suffered by the 1855 Exposition, this is probably the only way that the Government would have consented. Within two years over ten million francs had been raised, mostly from industrialists; this, combined with grants from the Imperial Government and the city of Paris, formed the economic base for the Exposition.[5]

The Universal Exposition was decreed on 22 June 1863. Again there was an Imperial Commission and again Frédéric LePlay was named Commissaire général. Prince Napoléon, who resigned as its President in 1865, was replaced by the nine year old Prince Impérial; fortunately, the position was honorary. Eugène Rouher, now Ministre d'Etat, actually exercised the functions of the Presidency. The trilogy that represented the Government included, besides Rouher, Armand Béhic, Ministre de l'agriculture, du commerce et des travaux publics, soon replaced by Fourcade La Roquette, and Maréchal Vaillant, Ministre de la Maison de l'Empereur et des Beaux-Arts.[6] The sixty members of the Imperial Commission were mainly industrialists, Presidents of Chambres de Commerce, or members of the Government. Several had served in 1855, such as Baroche, now Ministre de la Justice, Fould, now Ministre des Finances, and the industrialists Péreire and Schneider. As the commercial sector had financed the Exposition, it also wanted to control it; notably absent were the Grands Notables and artists, whose illustrious presence in 1855 had helped to legitimate both the regime and the Exposition. Among artists, only Ingres and the architect Lefuel were included.

On the very day the formation of the Imperial Commission was announced, 1 February 1865, the Exposition

Universelle des Beaux-Arts was decreed to take place simultaneously with the agricultural and industrial exhibitions.[7] Curiously enough, Rouher had asked for an art exhibition in 1863, at the same time as he requested the other shows. The delay might be explained in part by the disarray in the world of art in 1863, for both the Salon des refusés and the reorganization of the Ecole des beaux-arts had caused unparalleled rancor and dissension. Yet the delay might also be construed as symptomatic of the secondary position that art would play in the 1867 Universal Exposition.

It could never have been seriously doubted that France would include an art exhibition, for England had included one in 1862. Designed to show English art to best advantage, that Exposition had admitted all work done by artists alive in the past century, since 1762; the French commission, however, resolved to limit its entries to work done since 1850.[8] The British decision not to award prizes in the Fine Arts Section was probably responsible for the desultory French showing: 258 artists exhibited 506 works. Of these, well-known painters such as Ingres, Delacroix, Courbet, were represented by one or two works drawn from private or state collections; only lesser known artists bothered to participate directly.[9] The significance of the event, however, was less aesthetic than political. For the first time, the French Jury d'admission was seen as a kind

of parliament, with sections representing specific constituencies such as the Government, the Art Administration, collectors, the Academy, and independent artists; the last two groups were even allowed to elect their own representatives.[10] It was the beginning of the Liberal Empire in the world of art, and its success led directly to both the 1863 Salon reforms and the 1867 Universal Exposition.

The Règlement général for the Universal Exposition was signed on 12 July 1865, and established the location as the Champ-de-Mars, site of the first National Exposition of Industry in 1798. It would be open from 1 April to 31 October 1867; classification would comprise ten groups, of which works of art would make up the first.[11] On 12 May 1866, an Arrêté concernant l'admission et l'envoi des oeuvres d'art was issued by the Imperial Commission. It announced that only works executed since 1 January 1855 and not exhibited that year would be eligible. The Jury d'admission for painting and drawing was set at twenty-four members, one-third elected by artists who were either recipients of medals or members of the Légion d'honneur, one-third chosen by the Académie des beaux-arts from among its own members, and one-third named directly by the Imperial Commission.[12] The Academy, eliminated from the Salon Jury in the 1863 reforms, was probably reinstated to demonstrate solidarity in an international context (echoing

the eclecticism of 1855) and to guarantee a severe selection. In either case the ploy failed, for the Academy, still outraged over its 1863 defeats, refused to play its assigned role. Its entire post-Revolutionary history was reflected in its Procès-verbaux, as the Academicians discussed the question of their participation in 1867. On 14 September 1866, Eugène Rouher, Ministre d'Etat and Vice-President of the Imperial Commission, wrote to Jacques-Edouard Gatteaux, President of the Académie des beaux-arts, asking that the Academy nominate its third of the Jury d'admission by 3 November.[13] At the session of 22 September, Rouher's letter was read to the assembled Academicians; they decided to summon all members to a meeting to decide what their response should be.[14] The minutes of that meeting follow:

> Séance du samedi 29 septembre 1866. A laquelle ont assisté: M.M. Léon Cogniet, Lehmann, Forster, Hittorff, A. Couder, Taylor, Gatteaux, Guillaume, LeBas, Hesse, Berlioz, Perraud, Gilbert, Baltard, Lemaire, Picot, Lefuel, Müller, Pelletier, Amb. Thomas, Henriquel, Cavalier, Cabanel, Meissonier, F. Duban, E. Signol, Martinet, Beulé, Carafa, Seurre.
>
> L'ordre du jour est la discussion relative à la lettre de M. le Ministre d'Etat, Vice-Président de la Commission Impériale de l'Exposition universelle, lettre par laquelle l'Académie est invitée à vouloir bien prendre, dans le plus bref délai possible, les mesures nécessaires pour la nomination des membres du jury de l'Exposition universelle qui doivent appartenir à l'Académie et dont le nombre d'après l'arrêté du 22 mai 1866, doit former un tiers du jury.
>
> M. le Président expose qu'à l'occasion de

cette lettre qui a déjà été communiquée à l'Académie, dans la séance précédante, deux opinions contradictoires se sont manifestées dans le sein de la Compagnie. Il rappelle que plusieurs Membres ont été d'avis que l'Académie ne pouvait pas, sans compromettre sa dignité, consentir à se faire représenter pour un tiers, dans un jury chargé de juger des oeuvres d'art. D'autres membres, au contraire, n'ont trouvé aucun inconvénient à déférer à l'invitation ministérielle.

M. le Président, après avoir résumé les motifs présentés à l'appui des deux opinions, donne la parole à divers membres qui continuent la discussion.

L'Académie, est-il dit d'une part, ne peut accepter d'être représentée dans un jury composé de manière à annuler toute influence de sa part. En effet, après avoir été souveraine dans le jugement des oeuvres d'art envoyées aux Expositions, pourrait-il lui convenir d'accepter aujourd'hui le 3e rang? Systématiquement mise à l'écart, au nom de doctrines qu'elle a courageusement combattues, voudrait-elle prêter son concours à l'application de ces doctrines, aux expériences dont elles sont l'objet? Si l'Académie acceptait l'invitation de M. le Ministre d'Etat, non seulement elle compromettrait les principes qu'elle défend, mais encore, inévitablement entraînée par ce précédent à suivre l'administration dans tous ses essais, elle ne pourrait refuser, plus tard, de faire partie du jury annuel des Beaux-Arts, dont on veut que la constitution soit semblable, et peut-être du jury des grands prix de Rome? L'Académie, comme Corps, doit donc décliner l'invitation ministérielle: Elle ne peut déléguer pour juges, un nombre limité de ses Membres. Mais cette décision ne liera en rien les Membres de la Compagnie qui, comme artistes et sur une désignation personnelle du Ministre, seront toujours libres d'accepter ou de refuser les fonctions de juré.

Dans le sens contraire, plusieurs Membres, soit par écrit, soit verbalement, développent les motifs de leurs opinions. L'influence de l'Académie dans le jury sera, à leur avis, plus grande qu'on ne suppose, car au tiers qu'elle désignera dans son propre sein, il est possible que d'autres membres de la Compagnie soient

adjoints par l'administration ou par le suffrage des artistes. L'Académie, en outre, ne peut pas avoir la prétention d'être chargée seule du jugement des oeuvres d'art envoyées à l'Exposition universelle. Pareil travail serait au dessus de ses forces; il lui faudrait toujours s'adjoindre des étrangers. La composition d'un jury mixte n'est point d'ailleurs une nouveauté. Le jury de l'Exposition universelle de 1855 était dans ce cas, et l'Académie n'a pas refusé d'y entrer, pour une partie seulement. Pourquoi refuserait-elle de faire en 1866, ce qu'elle a jugé convenable de faire en 1855? (Le fait allégué a été reconnu inexact, les nominations en 1855 ayant été faites directement par le Ministre.) Enfin, si l'Académie se rend à l'invitation du Ministre, elle n'en aura que plus de liberté dans l'avenir, pour se recuser; car elle aura donné au moins une preuve de bonne volonté. Si elle rejette cette invitation, on ne verra dans son refus qu'un acte d'opposition.

La discussion étant close, M. le Président met aux voix la question de savoir s'il y a lieu de déférer à l'invitation de M. le Ministre d'Etat.

Le scrutin est ouvert. Il y a 25 votants. Le dépouillement du scrutin constate 18 <u>non</u> et 7 <u>oui</u>.

M. le Président, en conséquence, fera connaître cette décision à M. le Ministre d'Etat, Vice-Président de la Commission impériale de l'Exposition universelle, par une lettre dont la rédaction, adoptée par l'Académie, est ici transcrite:

"Monsieur le Vice-Président,

L'Académie remercie Votre Excellence de l'invitation que vous avez bien voulu lui adresser; mais elle a le regret de ne pouvoir s'y rendre comme Corps, ses usages ne l'autorisant pas à déléguer pour juges, un nombre limité de ses membres.

Agréez, Monsieur le Vice-Président, l'assurance de mon dévouement respectueux."

La séance est levée.

Le Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie 15

The Academicians either had forgotten or did not want to remember that in 1855 virtually the entire painting section had participated as a section of the Jury. Nor was it true that the Academy as a matter of policy did not designate its members to serve as judges, for that is exactly what had been done at the 1862 English Exhibition when four Academicians were requested by the Government and supplied by the Academy. But that was before the debacle of 1863. Probably the most truthful explanation is that the Academy recognized that it was being used to legitimize an impending shift to a more popular taste, a taste which it had opposed for decades. Outnumbered, deprived of any real influence, it was reduced to choosing between an active or a passive role in the orchestration of its own demise. Its withdrawal left the door open to the very forces it feared.

The immediate result of this withdrawal was a letter from Nieuwerkerke to Rouher proposing that the elected artists' section be increased to two-thirds of the Jury d'admission.[16] His plan was ratified by Imperial Decree, and elections for the artist-members of the Jury were held in the Louvre on 15-16 November 1866.[17] As might have been expected, the elected Jury was conservative, no doubt truly representative of its bemedalled and decorated constituency. Chosen by 147 voters, the "most popular"

artists included Pils, Cabanel, Gérôme, Ingres, Bida, Hébert, Fromentin, Jules Breton, Baudry, Meissonier, Gleyre, Théodore Rousseau, Français, Brion, Jalabert, and Couture. Ingres resigned and was replaced by Dauzats.[18] The list included five Academicians and four future Academicians. Least represented was landscape painting, with only Rousseau and Français. The best represented category was genre painting; encompassing historical genre as well, it was practiced by almost everyone else. Despite the encouragement of history painting by Academy and Government, despite the Grand Medal of Honor which, since 1857, had been awarded at each Salon to a painter or sculptor of suitably elevated taste, the fastest growing and most popular category had become genre painting. This was the Naturalism heralded in 1857.

To this elected Jury, the Government added eight other members: critics, curators, and collectors.[19] In comparison with 1855, when Prince Napoléon, Morny, and Baroche took part directly, this was a low-keyed group. The political heavyweights had been replaced by art professionals in the same way as, on the Imperial Commission, they had been replaced by professionals from the world of commerce and industry. For the very structure of the Exposition, the Government had adopted a laissez-faire policy, in keeping with the liberalization of the 1860s. The most striking difference between the Beaux-Arts Juries of 1855 and 1867

was that art critics, many of whom had played an opposition role in 1855, were now absorbed into the system. Charles Blanc, Paul de Saint-Victor, and Théophile Gautier, the three most powerful critics, all served on Juries, and Ernest Chesneau wrote the Government report.[20]

Despite appearances, however, the Government was not prepared to completely surrender its role in the art Exposition. When a complicated jurying system was announced, it became transparently obvious that competition was to exist in name only. Artists were to submit their works before 15 October 1866; most private lenders would not have yet returned to Paris; works accepted would be held for more than a year. But what proved most disturbing was this clause: "Le Jury pourra admettre, avec l'assentiment de leur auteur ou ayant droit, les oeuvres d'une notoriété incontestable, sans astreindre leur propriétaire au dépôt préalable dans le local destiné aux opérations du Jury."[21] As criticism and anxiety mounted, the Imperial Commission would do no more than reiterate these rules. Until, that is, Emile Galichon, in a front-page editorial in La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité pointed out the embarrassing fact that the Jury would not be chosen until November. How, then, and by whom would "works of unquestioned renown" be chosen before 15 October?[22] Doubtless the proposal had originated with Nieuwerkerke, for, aside from Ingres and Lefuel, he was the

only member of the Imperial Commission with any expertise in art. Liberalization might be taking place in other sectors of the Empire, but Nieuwerkerke accepted each advance only reluctantly.

As a result of Galichon's criticism, the rules were hastily revised to give at least the appearance of fair play. All artists were now required to present, by 15 December, only a written and signed declaration of works they would like to exhibit. The "works of unquestioned renown" would then be selected from these lists and artists would be notified of the Jury decision by 1 January 1867. Artists who had not succeeded in this first competition could then submit their actual works to the Jury between 5 and 20 January. Nieuwerkerke, as Surintendant des beaux-arts, was named President of all the Jurys d'admission, and Théodore Rousseau was elected President of the Jury for painting and drawing.[23]

By 10 February 1867, the Admissions Jury had completed its work: only 550 paintings had been accepted. The bitterness among artists surpassed even that of the previous Universal Exposition where space had been found for 1872 paintings.[24] A petition was sent to Vaillant criticizing the Jury for having reserved for itself 500 of the 700 places available for art.[25] Except for the one unsuccessful attempt to circumvent the Jury, however, the

Government does not seem to have meddled in the art Exposition. No retrospective shows were offered to individual artists, as had been done in 1855, nor was there evidence of a renewed attempt to encourage artists' participation. On the contrary, Yvon was outraged because the Government was unwilling to lend his huge battle paintings, and Prince Napoléon flatly refused to lend works in his collection; Galichon reported persistent rumors that the Government would refuse to lend any works in public collections.[26] Nieuwerkerke, now the only link between the world of Art and the world of Government, unlike Morny or Prince Napoléon, had no wider political view. As a result, the artists' fate had been left to the Jury, which took care of itself first.

The Jury and the older generation were liberally represented in the Exposition: Meissonier had fourteen paintings, Gérôme thirteen, Dupré twelve, Bouguereau, Breton, and Rosa Bonheur ten each, Millet nine, Théodore Rousseau, Daubigny, and Huet eight each, Corot seven. Courbet only sent four pictures but they were all accepted.[27] The younger Naturalist generation which followed Millet, Courbet, and Daubigny--the future Impressionists--was completely excluded; like that of 1855, the Universal Exposition of 1867 was designed to be a retrospective event.

One of the major problems of 1855 had been that the Exposition was scattered among many buildings constructed to meet last minute demands of space. This was, in fact, the official explanation for the heavy financial loss. In his Rapport, Prince Napoléon had suggested that future international expositions should be laid out on the grid system, with national sections along one axis and exhibition categories along the other.[28] This plan was adopted in 1867, and a vast oval exhibition hall, designed by Frédéric LePlay, was constructed on the Champ-de-Mars (Figures 61 and 62); symbolically, it was the fruit of the Revolutionary fêtes and the tiny Temple of Industry of 1798. Within, exhibitions were organized in concentric ovals, heavy industry being the outermost ring, the fine arts being near the center (and thus taking less space). Paul Mantz wrote "Les choses de la matière occupent la première circonvallation, et chaque cercle traversé vous rapproche des choses de l'esprit."[29] This lovely symbolism was ruined, however, or perhaps we should say that in a moment of supreme honesty the Imperial Commission revealed its true choses de l'esprit, by placing in the innermost circle, as the heart of the Exposition, a display of money.[30]

The decision to downgrade the importance of the fine arts was undoubtedly made on practical grounds. Maxime DuCamp wrote of the Imperial Commission: "Entre ses mains,

l'exposition universelle paraît être une affaire à laquelle on veut faire produire tout le profit possible. Avec une telle préoccupation dominante, il n'est point extraordinaire qu'on se soit assez médiocrement soucié des beaux-arts."[31] In the absence of cultured leaders, and with the Exposition costs met by the commercial class, art could not help but be seen as an unnecessary expense, useful only to preserve a veneer of respectability. The most outspoken critic of this situation was Emile Galichon, editor of Gazette des Beaux-Arts. In a long editorial, he related all the problems which had arisen.[32] Chief among them was the stinginess of the Imperial Commission which, with 146,000 square meters of space at its disposal, had allotted room for only 1043 works of art; in 1855, with only 80,000 meters available, space had been found for 2711 works. Proportionately, the exhibition was one-fifth the size. Nor did artists want to exhibit with industry. Galichon stated that there had been artists' petitions asking for a separate installation such as they had had in 1855, but the request had been rejected. In 1855 the Government had feared a boycott by artists; in 1867, the businessmen who organized the Exposition feared an unnecessary expense. Nor was the Government willing to come to the artists' aid: "Comme à tous les industriels, la commission impériale n'a guère livré aux artistes qu'un espace--mesuré mesquinement--et les quatre murs, leur laissant le soin de

la décoration. L'Etat, d'autre part, considérant cette exposition comme une entreprise particulière, n'a pas cru devoir intervenir et voter un subside." Unlike industrialists who wanted to sell the products they displayed, and thus were willing to absorb the cost as business expenses, the artists did not even own most of the art displayed, which had been borrowed for the show. The contradictions between art and industry were once again asserting themselves, for art was more and more considered a product like any other. Galichon vividly described the results: statuettes of zinc, of soap, of chocolate, displayed on velvet in magnificent installations; sculpture placed on plain pedestals covered with "miserable green serge;" paintings hung in a narrow gallery, six rows high, up to twelve meters from the floor. Many, for lack of space, were not shown at all. In order to conserve space, drawings and architectural plans were hung on walls behind the sculpture.[33]

Most critics condemned the installation, which Paul Mantz called "sans luxe, sans confort."[34] In 1851, Jules Janin had written a polemic against the philistinism of the British, who had used sculpture to decorate their Great Exhibition.[35] In 1867 it seemed that the French were following suit. Charles Blanc, member of the Jury though he was, echoed Janin, publishing in the opposition journal Le Temps: "Est-il convenable cependant que l'art, dont la

mission est de manifester le beau, et de rappeler parmi nous l'idéal, vienne figurer dans une fête comme un appoint agréable, comme une gentillesse additionnelle?[36]

As a result of the criticism, some improvements were made. The sculpture of the French section was moved into the central garden (to join the exhibition of money), and benches were placed in the painting galleries; the installation was still considered far from adequate.[37] To add to the confusion, some countries, among them Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Bavaria, Japan, erected separate buildings on the Champ-de-Mars where they installed their own exhibitions, the French decided to hold an annual Salon in addition to the Universal Exposition of Art, and following Courbet's 1855 example, several artists decided to mount their own shows. In 1867 the forces of art were decidedly centrifugal; the center could not hold.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIV

1. The speech of Duc de la Rochefoucauld was given at the awards ceremony, 25 September 1819; it was reprinted in the 1819 Rapport du jury central, XIII-XIV.

2. Emile Galichon, "Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 mai 1867, 409.

3. Until the 1873 Vienna Exposition, no other country but England merited the publication of official French Government reports; see the bibliography in Comité français des expositions, Cinquantenaire 1885-1935, 271-73.

4. Eugène Rouher, Rapport à l'Empereur, 22 juin 1863, reprinted in the 1867 Exposition Universelle, Documents Officiels, 2-3.

5. The manufacturers' offer was included in Rouher's Rapport, Ibid.; also see Document N° 4, Documents concernant l'organisation de l'association de garantie, which listed the contributions by date. Prince Napoléon pledged 100,000 francs, Rouher, Béhic, Vaillant, and Nieuwerkerke, 25,000Fr each. The Government and the City of Paris each gave 6,000,000Fr.

6. An Exposition universelle des produits agricoles et industriels was decreed on 22 juin 1863 in response to Rouher's Rapport; Ibid., 1. The Imperial Commision was appointed 1 février, 4 mars, 1 juillet 1865, 6 janvier 1866; Ibid., Deuxième Décret, Quatrième Décret, Cinquième Décret, 3-11, N° 19, 161. Prince Napoléon's letter of resignation of 27 mai 1865 is in the Archives du Louvre, Exposition Universelle de 1867, dossier 2; he stated: "Cette détermination m'a été dictée par la publication au Moniteur de ce matin d'une lettre qui m'a adressée Sa Majesté l'Empereur." The dispute came about as a result of Prince Napoléon's speech in Ajaccio in which, as a representative of the Emperor, but without his permission, he had attacked the Pope and called for extreme liberalization of the Empire; see Holt, Plon-Plon, 205. The Prince Impérial was named President of the Exposition by the Décret of 22 février 1866; 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 20, 165.

7. Ibid., Deuxième Décret, 1 février 1865, 3-5.

8. AN ADXIXD 21, Exposition Universelle de 1862 à Londres. Section Française. Recueil de Documents Officiels publiés par ordre de la Commission Impériale, Paris, 1863, N° 15, 20 août 1861.

9. AN ADXIXD 20, Rapport de l'Administration de la Commission Impériale sur la section française de l'Exposition Universelle de 1862, Paris, 1864, 23-25. Also see the London 1862 Official Catalogue of the Fine Art Department, rev. ed., and ADXIXD 23, Exposition Universelle de 1862 à Londres. Section Française. Catalogue Officiel publié par ordre de la Commission Impériale, Paris, 1862. The archives of the art exhibition are in AN F21 565.

10. See the Archives de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts, Procès-verbaux, 24 août 1861. LePlay asked the Academy to designate four of its members, one from each section; Robert-Fleury, Petitot, Martinet and Gisors were chosen. Elected artists were Gérôme, Dauzats, Cavelier and Barye; see ADXIXD 21, Recueil de Documents, N° 15 and 19.

11. For the Règlement général of 12 juillet 1865, see 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 6, 45-52. The classification comprised ten Groups: I: Oeuvres d'art; II: Matériel et application des arts libéraux; III: Meubles et autres objets destinés à l'habitation; IV: Vêtements (tissus compris) et autres objets portés par la personne; V: Matières premières; VI: Travaux des arts usuels; VII: Aliments et boissons; VIII: Produits vivants et spécimens d'établissements de l'agriculture; IX: Produits vivants et spécimens d'établissements de l'horticulture; X: Objets spécialement exposés en vue d'améliorer la condition physique et morale de la population.

12. Arrêté concernant l'admission et l'envoi des oeuvres d'art, 12 mai 1866, Ibid.; N° 22, 166-68.

13. Archives de l'Académie des Beaux Arts, Pièces annexes, 1866, N° 39.

14. Archives de l'Académie des Beaux Arts, Procès-verbaux, 22 septembre 1866.

15. Ibid., 29 septembre 1866. The Secrétaire perpétuel was Ernest Beulé.

16. Draft of letter from Surintendant to Ministre d'Etat (Nieuwerkerke to Rouher), 18 octobre 1866, in AN F21 523; this letter was preceded by one from Chennevières to Nieuwerkerke, 17 octobre 1866, stating that the artists couldn't hold their elections without knowing how many places they were to fill and urging Nieuwerkerke to push Rouher to make a decision; Ibid.

17. The Avis modifying the constitution of the Jury d'admission was published in Le Moniteur Universel, 11

novembre 1866. Because of the problems caused by the Academy's refusal, the elections originally scheduled for 1-2 November were postponed to 15-16 November.

18. See the Archives du Louvre, Exposition Universelle de 1867, Chennevières' memorandum to Nieuwerkerke, in which he listed the elected artists and stated "Les peintres viennent de se réunir, ils étaient peu nombreux, mais on y trouvait un peu de tous les ateliers." The list was published in La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité on 2 décembre 1866, 276-77; also see 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 25, Arrêté instituant le jury d'admission des oeuvres d'art (Section Française), 25 novembre 1866, 182-85. The arrêté naming Dauzats to replace Ingres is in AN F12 3185.

19. Nieuwerkerke, as Surintendant des Beaux-Arts, was named President of the Jury d'admission. The Government appointees included the collectors Maurice Cottier and Louis Lacaze, the artist Charles Leroux (who also had a political career as a Government candidate), the curator Frédéric Reiset, the art critic Paul de Saint-Victor, and three sons: Welles de La Vallette, son of the Ministre de l'Intérieur, J. Halphen, son of a rich merchant, and the Marquis Maison, son of a Napoléonic General. See Documents Officiels, N° 25, 25 novembre 1866, 182-85.

20. Charles Blanc and Théophile Gautier served on the sculpture Jury.

21. See Arrêté concernant l'admission et l'envoi des oeuvres d'art, 12 mai 1866, Documents Officiels, N° 22, 166-68.

22. Emile Galichon, "Exposition Universelle de 1867," La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 20 septembre 1866, 225-26.

23. Deuxième Arrêté, 29 septembre 1866, Documents Officiels, N° 22, 169. Nieuwerkerke was named President of all the Juries by the Arrêté of 25 novembre 1866; Ibid., N° 25, 182-85. Rousseau was identified as the President of the Jury d'admission for painting and drawing in the list of jurors published in the 1867 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., VII-XII.

24. Unfortunately the registers and minutes of the Jury d'admission have been lost. The information on Jury decisions has been taken from La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, which seemed to be very well informed; see 10 février 1867, 44. The Exposition eventually included 254 French artists with 684 works, as the works awarded prizes in the 1867 Salon were moved to the Universal Exposition; this was reflected in the second edition of the catalogue,

published at the end of the Exposition.

25. Although the petition has not been preserved, an article about it was published as "Correspondance de Paris, 23 janvier 1867" in Le Courrier du Centre, Limoges, 24 janvier 1866, and Le Salut Public, Lyon, 25 janvier 1866; the notated clipping is in AN F21 523.

26. Adolphe Yvon to Ministre le Surintendant Nieuwerkerke, 12 mai 1866, in AN F21 522; the correspondance shows that he succeeded in having his two paintings of Malakoff included in the Exposition. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité reported on 10 mars 1867 that Prince Napoléon had refused to lend works by Français, Breton, Pils and Gustave Moreau; 78. On 7 avril it reported that his collection at the Palais-Royal (where he lived) would be open to the public; 109. Emile Galichon reported, in his editorial for La Chronique of 20 septembre 1866, the rumors that the Government didn't want to lend works from museums or other public collections. Undoubtedly it was this criticism and the resulting bad publicity for the Government that caused the hasty revision of the rules.

27. The totals are taken from the catalogue for the 1867 Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. Courbet stated in his letter to Bruyas of 18 février 1867 that he was sending only four paintings; see Cabinet des estampes, B.N. Yb 3 1739 (8): Lettres de Gustave Courbet.

28. Prince Napoléon, Rapport, 1856, 140-41.

29. Paul Mantz, "Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 juillet 1867, 7.

30. On the exhibition of currency, see Grand Album de 1'Exposition Universelle, 1867, Paris, 1868, XII.

31. Maxime DuCamp, "Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle" in his Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle et aux Salons de 1863-1867, Paris, 1867, 297.

32. Galichon, GBA, 1 mai 1867, 409-414.

33. A. Louvrier de Lajolais, "Exposition Universelle," La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 14 avril 1867, 115.

34. Mantz, GBA, 1 juillet 1867, 8.

35. Janin, The Illustrated London News en Français, 10 mai 1851, 19.

36. Charles Blanc, "Exposition Universelle de 1867. Beaux-Arts," Le Temps, 12 avril 1867.

37. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 5 mai 1867, 142.

CHAPTER XV

ARTIST MALCONTENTS

The Salon of 1867

Unlike 1855, when the Salon was cancelled in order to encourage artists to participate in the Universal Exposition, in 1867 both shows would take place simultaneously. At the awards ceremony following the 1866 Salon, Maréchal Vaillant explained why:

> Dans la pensée du gouvernement de l'Empereur, l'institution des expositions annuelles est le meilleur des encouragements pour les artistes, puis qu'elle appelle incessamment sur leurs travaux l'attention et l'intérêt du public; aussi l'Empereur a-t-il décidé, vous le savez, qu'il ne serait pas fait d'exception à la règle établie, même pour l'année de l'Exposition universelle; ce serait d'ailleurs une erreur de croire que les deux expositions puissent faire double emploi, car, il ne faut pas s'y tromper, le concours international de 1867 s'applique à toutes les oeuvres executées depuis le 1er janvier 1855, c'est-à-dire pendant une période de douze années; et d'un autre côté l'emplacement réservé aux beaux-arts dans le palais du Champ de Mars n'étant pas illimité, les travaux récents rencontreront dans les travaux anciens une concurrence redoutable: vous le voyez, Messieurs, le Salon de 1867 conserve toute son utilité. 1

For younger artists, shut out of the major show on the Champ-de-Mars, the annual Salon at the Palais de l'Industrie represented their only hope of being seen in

this Exposition year. They were to be disappointed. The Jury was elected on the same terms as that of the Universal Exposition and with virtually the same results; for the administrative section, Chennevières suggested the same members as for the 1866 Salon.[2] The Salon was to run from 15 April to 31 May, six weeks, while the Exposition would last six months. Artists petitioned the Government repeatedly to keep it open for the same duration.[3] The best they could accomplish was that it was extended another week, to 5 June, for the Palais de l'Industrie had to be emptied and prepared for the great awards ceremony of the Universal Exposition, to be held 1 July.[4]

The Admissions Jury for the 1867 Salon proved to be as harsh as that for the Universal Exposition. Castagnary published a report in La Liberté:

> Jamais, de mémoire de peintre, jury n'a été plus sévère. Sur trois mille artistes qui avaient envoyé, deux mille ont été refusés. M. le marquis de Chennevières, pour ne pas accepter la solidarité de cet immense massacre, a donné sa démission, et, comme M. Walewski, il a été complimenté par ses adversaires.
>
> En attendant que les artistes aient obtenu ce que possèdent depuis longemps les bouchers et les boulangers--la liberté de leur art--peintres et sculpteurs refusés pétitionnent auprès de M. le surintendant des beaux-arts pour obtenir l'autorisation d'exposer leurs oeuvres dans une des galeries restées libres au palais des Champs-Elysées. 5

Emile Zola wrote to his friend Valabrègue "le jury, irrité de mon 'Salon' a mis à la porte tous ceux qui marchent dans

la nouvelle voie."[6] Cézanne, Sisley, Bazille, Pissarro, Renoir, Monet were all refused, the worst across-the-board rejection that this group of artists was ever to experience. Among them, only Degas, Berthe Morisot and Fantin-Latour were accepted. Bazille decided to do something about it and composed a petition (probably the one referred to by Castagnary), signed by 125 artists. The text was simple and straightforward, addressed to Nieuwerkerke:

> Les artistes soussignés, refusés au salon de cette année, prennent la liberté de s'adresser à votre excellence pour demander une exposition de leurs oeuvres.
>
> Connaissant votre bienveillante sollicitude pour nos intérêts, nous espérons que vous voudrez bien prendre notre demande en considération. [7]

The first to sign after Bazille were his friends Monet, Manet, Renoir, Pissarro, Sisley and Guillemet; Jongkind, Bracquemond, Diaz and Daubigny also signed. This was only one of the many letters and petitions that Nieuwerkerke received throughout the 1860s. Beginning with angry letters from individuals, they were progressing into informal alliances, such as this, and would eventually lead to action in the 1870s. Bazille's group apparently went so far as to elect a President (Grosclaude fils) and committee of delegates (Honoré Pinel, A. Chataud, Ed. Bureau) who wrote to Nieuwerkerke and the Emperor, demanding an appointment to present their petition.[8] Nieuwerkerke's response was:

"Je recevrai bien volontiers vous et les autres signataires de la lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'adresser, le 9 de ce mois, mais je dois vous prévenir que, si votre démarche a pour objet d'obtenir une exposition des peintures refusées, elle demeurera sans effet: il a été décidé que l'essai fait, il y quelques années, ne se renouvellerait plus."[9] The meeting took place anyway and, along with their request, the artists presented the following manifesto which reflects the growing militance of the art community:

> A Monsieur le Sénateur, Surintendant des Beaux-Arts
>
> Au moment où l'Exposition des Champs-Elysées va s'ouvrir, les rigueurs excessives du Jury des beaux-arts connues depuis peu de jours ont excité une émotion profonde, et qu'on peut dire générale, parmi les artistes, nos confrères.
>
> Nous savons, Monsieur, le Surintendant, que les décisions prises par le Jury à l'égard des oeuvres présentées à l'Exposition sont irrévocables. Mais s'il est vrai que dans l'état actuel de nos institutions artistiques, nous n'avons aucun moyen d'en appeler devant une autre jurisdiction pour obtenir l'accès du Salon officiel, nous espérons toutefois que votre Excellence prendra en considération notre petition ci-jointe. En nous permettant de mettre nos ouvrages sous les regards du public dans un Salon spécialement affecté aux oeuvres, votre Excellence nous facilitera l'exercice d'un droit incontestable, le droit d'appel devant l'opinion publique, des décisions qui nous blessent et nous causent à tous les points de vue un dommage très sérieux.
>
> Si l'on nous disait que l'épreuve a été faite et que le Salon des refusés a suffisamment démontré la justice des arrêts rendus par le Jury, nous protesterions de toute notre force contre une telle assertion.

Nous pensons en effet que pour tout esprit impartial et éclairé, la question de l'infallibilité du jury en fait comme en principe est resolue negativement. A toutes les époques les hommes appelés à accorder ou à refuser aux oeuvres de leurs collègues l'entrée des Expositions ont commis des erreurs de jugement constatées quelquefois avec bruit par l'opinion publique. Nous n'avons ni à le chercher, ni à signaler à cette place la cause de ces erreurs, mais c'est un devoir pour nous d'insister sur les déplorables conséquences qu'elles peuvent avoir et sans attaquer la caractère de nos juges, sans mettre en suspicion leur zèle, leur bon vouloir, leurs lumières, nous nous croyons autorisés par le bon sens et par l'expérience du passé à prétendre qu'ils peuvent se tromper.

Aussi croyons nous que la faculté d'avoir une Exposition spéciale des oeuvres rejetées devrait être garantié d'une façon permanente aux artistes qui se croyant mal jugés et possédant le courage de leur opinion voudraient en référer aux sentimens publics, jusqu'à ce que la liberté des Expositions soit proclamée et assurée à jamais. Nous considérons les Expositions d'appel comme une sauvegarde indispensable contre la faillibilité des arrêts du Jury.

Le refus d'une production artistique au Salon est toujours pour l'artiste frappé une mortification assez pénible, mais il peut devenir pour cet artiste une cause de ruine, et cette hypothèse nous semble assez grave pour motiver à elle seule notre demande. Qu'il nous soit donc permis de croire, Monsieur le Surintendant, que vous voudrez bien nous accorder une Exposition qui nous mette à même de connaître le jugement du public à qui nous en appelons.

Dans l'espérance que vous voudrez bien faire droit à notre juste demande, nous avons l'honneur d'être avec respect, Monsieur le Surintendant,

Vos très humbles et très obéissants serviteurs,

N.B. Les soussignés signataires de cette lettre, sincèrement convaincus qu'ils sont, de la justice de leurs doléances et de l'urgence de leurs réclamations, s'engagent formellement si leur petition est agréée, à envoyer leurs oeuvres

au Salon des refusés. [10]

Among the twenty-five signatures (many of them illegible), the first were A. Chataud, F. Bazille, C. Pissarro, C. Monet, Bureau, Grosclaude fils, Guillemet, A. Renoir, Honoré Pinel, and Louis Buchheister.

Although he rejected the artists' request for a new Salon des refusés, Nieuwerkerke did promise that, at the Salon of 1868, the Jury would be elected by universal suffrage: all artists who had exhibited in at least one Salon (except for that of 1848) would be allowed to vote.[11] This was not, however, a satisfactory solution for the artists in 1867, for this was the year when all of Europe, it seemed, would be in Paris. Constant Cimetière attempted to organize privately an exhibition of the refused artists, but Nieuwerkerke wouldn't allow him access to their names.[12] More petitions were signed: Le Figaro and La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité directed artists to "La Caisse des Associations Populaires" where they could add their names to a new demand.[13] A group of anonymous artists, signing as "Les refusés qui ont conscience de leur valeur" wrote a menacing letter to Nieuwerkerke stating: "C'est l'injustice qui révolte, et croyez bien que ce n'est point une faveur que nous reclamons, mais c'est notre droit, et nous avons espéré que vous l'accorderez."[14]

During this turbulent month, Bazille wrote to his parents, announcing that his paintings had been rejected at the Salon and that there was a petition for a Salon des refusés:

> Il est par trop ridicule, quand on sait qu'on n'est pas une bête, d'être exposé à ces caprices d'administration, surtout quand on ne tient aucunement aux médailles et aux distributions de prix. Ce que je vous dis là, une dizaine de jeune gens de talent le pensent comme moi. Nous avons donc résolu de louer chaque année un grand atelier où nous exposerons nos oeuvres en aussi grand nombre que nous le voudrons. Nous inviterons les peintres qui nous plaisent à envoyer des tableaux. Courbet, Corot, Diaz, Daubigny, et beaucoup d'autres que vous ne connaissez peut-être pas nous ont promis de nous envoyer des tableaux et approuvent beaucoup notre idée. Avec ces gens-là, et Monet qui est plus fort qu'eux tous, nous sommes sûrs de réussir. Vous verrez qu'on parlera de nous. Si par hasard l'exposition des refusés était accordée, nous ne ferions rien cette année, et notre cercle ne commencerait que l'année prochaine: J'en serai bien aise pour ma part.... Ne vous effrayez pas; je vous assure que je suis fort raisonnable, nous avons certainement raison. Ce n'est rien moins qu'une révolte de collégiens. 15

Several weeks later, he wrote again:

> Je t'ai parlé du projet de quelques jeunes gens de faire une exposition à part. En nous saignant autant que possible, nous sommes arrivés à réunir une somme de 2500 francs, qui n'est pas suffisante. Nous sommes donc forcés de renoncer à ce que nous voulions faire. Il faut rentrer dans le giron de l'administration, dont nous n'avons pas sucé le lait, et qui nous renie. 16

For most of the younger generation of artists, then, 1867 was not a good year; it marked, however, the first attempt in over a hundred years, since the Salons of the

Académie de Saint-Luc in the eighteenth century, to mount an Independent series of exhibitions without Government support. Abandoned in 1867, the attempt would succeed in 1874 with the first of the Impressionist shows. The artists had a kind of revenge, however, for by all accounts the Salon of 1867 was not a success. Whether the works were better or worse than usual was a matter of opinion; that it was unvisited and ignored was a fact. Léon Lagrange wrote "Le salon annuel s'est ouvert sans éclat et s'est fermé sans bruit, au milieu de l'indifférence de la foule."[17] Many journals didn't even bother to review it; the ones that did all remarked the infrequency of visitors, even on opening day; for the first time there had been no official ceremony to mark its opening.[18] It seemed that everyone signed a petition in 1867: those exluded demanded a Salon des refusés, those included protested official neglect and indifference.

In reviewing the Salon, Castagnary stated: "Malgré les préjugés de l'administration, malgré l'hostilité de l'Ecole, malgré l'opposition des jurys, le naturalisme l'emporte de tous les côtés. La religion est morte, l'histoire est morte, la mythologie est morte."[19] As a partisan of naturalism, Castagnary would be expected to feel that way, but Paul de Saint-Victor, a conservative and a member of the Exposition Jury, came to the same conclusion, for, even with the severity of the Jury, about

1000 of the 1581 pictures exhibited were genre scenes.[20] Saint-Victor wrote:

> Il faut à peu près faire son deuil de la peinture d'histoire et de la peinture religieuse, l'art moderne semble renoncer décidément à poursuivre la forme héroïque et la beauté pure. Il se rabat sur les scènes de moeurs, sur les petits coins de l'histoire, sur les curiosités de l'ethnographie et du genre. L'Antiquité même n'est guère étudiée qu'au point de vue de l'anecdote et de la vignette. 21

These sentiments had been expressed with increasing frequency since 1855, the annual Salon bringing forth annual lamentations for "le style." What made 1867 different was the international context.

Courbet

> L'Exposition universelle devait amener par contre-coup des expositions particulières. A côté de la basilique officielle de l'industrie et des arts, il devait se bâtir des temples de non-conformistes, des églises de dissidents et jusqu'à des chapelles de mormons.
>
> --Hippolyte Babou 22

Courbet again decided to mount his own exhibition, as he had done in 1855. This time, however, there was none of the high drama preceding it, and it is in an almost casual tone that he announced his decision in a letter to Bruyas in a letter of 18 February 1867:

> En dehors de ces deux expositions, j'espère en faire encore une, à part moi, pour recevoir les étrangers qui viendront à Paris, où j'exposerai toutes les oeuvres que j'aurai et qu'on voudra me prêter....

> Cette fois-ci ce serait un atelier définitif pour le restant de ma vie et je n'enverrai presque plus aux expositions du gouvernement qui s'est si mal conduit vis-à-vis de moi jusqu'ici.[23]

Courbet had his pavillion constructed on the Place de l'Alma; it was a good location, for anyone going from the Salon at the Palais de l'Industrie to the Universal Exposition on the Champ-de-Mars would have to pass by. He wrote to Bruyas: "J'ai fait construire une Cathédrale dans le plus bel endroit qui soit en Europe, au pont de l'Alma, avec des horizons sans bornes, au bord de la Seine et en plein Paris, et je stupéfie le monde entier."[24] Courbet's carnival tent of 1855 had become, by his own admission, a Cathedral (Figure 63). While it would be a mistake to think that he was wholly acceptable in 1867, his fortunes had certainly improved. In 1855 he had plastered posters advertising his show throughout Paris; in 1867, according to Bazille, he mailed out 3000 invitations and sent a copy of his catalogue to every artist in Paris.[25] L'Artiste noted that all of them praised his show, "même ceux qui reviennent de Rome."[26] His portrait, palette and beer stein in hand, appeared on the cover of two revues, Le Hanneton illustré and La Lune.[27]

On the other hand, Ernest Chesneau, official critic for the Exposition, discussed Courbet in an article entitled "La Jeune Ecole. Peintres et Excentriques" and, in

his Government report, dismissed him in one sentence consisting of an unfavorable comparison of his landscapes (Figure 64) to those of Troyon.[28] As a landscapist, Courbet was lauded, but his figure paintings and personal theatrical style were no more esteemed in 1867 than they had been in 1855. For critics there was the same problem as in 1855, of judging the man apart from his work. Chesneau wrote: "On reproche au peintre son réalisme, mais, dégagez le système et ne voyez que le résultat. L'homme est jugé sans doute, mais le peintre reste."[29] Even a conservative such as Léon Lagrange could praise Courbet the landscapist: "La plus grande part de personnalité revient encore à M. Courbet, dont l'exposition particulière révèle, à côté d'un réaliste fourvoyé, un paysagiste singulièrement doué du sentiment de l'air."[30]

The younger generation of critics was not so equivocal: Théodore Duret wrote: "M. Courbet, enfin délivré de toutes ses imperfections, arrive à prendre définitivement place au rang des maîtres de l'école moderne."[31] The events of the early 1850s had now sufficiently receded into the past so that Courbet's paintings had lost what Pérignon called "the train of violent passions that gave them their magic life."[32] Castagnary wrote that foreigners visiting his exhibition were astonished at the controversy which had surrounded the artist's early works. Looking at Courbet's 1867 show, he

pronounced that the exhibition had the importance of a museum:

> Nous même, qui reverrons, après douze et quinze ans écoulés, ces oeuvres si fortes et si belles, nous nous demanderons avec tristesse par quelle aberration étrange nos aînés ont répudiés si violemment un art dont la société contemporaine fournissait à la fois le modèle et l'inspiration et qui, par cela même, avoisinait ce que l'art des peuples de tous les âges a produit de plus effectif et de plus durable.... Comment se fait-il, dis-je, que cet art soit tombé, il y a quinze ans, sous l'exécration universelle.... La peinture de Courbet a été enveloppée dans la réaction de 1850, et elle est tombée sous les mêmes coups que la République de Février. 33

Courbet received no honors or awards in 1867; his gesture of setting up his own show in defiance of the Government could not, officially speaking, be rewarded. Nonetheless, he was promoted to a kind of "Old Master" status which permitted his earlier paintings, at least, to be seen outside of the partisan politics which had informed their creation and initial reception. It was not quite the canonization that Delacroix had been awarded in 1855 and that the Revue Universelle des Arts had predicted for Courbet,[34] but it was about as close to official respectability as Courbet would ever be--or allow himself to be.

Manet's View of the Universal Exposition

On 1 January 1867, Emile Zola published a long defense of Edouard Manet in La Revue du XIXe Siècle; the next day

Manet wrote to thank him for the article:

> C'est de fameuses étrennes que vous m'avez données là et votre remarquable article m'est très agréable; il arrive en temps opportun, car on m'a jugé indigne de profiter comme tant d'autres des avantages de l'envoi sur liste, aussi comme je n'augure rien de bon de mes juges, je me garderai bien de leur envoyer mes tableaux; ils n'auraient qu'à me faire la farce de m'en prendre un ou deux, et voilà pour le public les autres bons à jeter aux chiens.
>
> Je me décide à faire une exposition particulière; j'ai au moins une quarantaine de tableaux à montrer. On m'a déjà offert des terrains très bien situés, près du Champ de Mars; je vais risquer le paquet et, secondé par des hommes commes vous, je compte bien réussir. [35]

Manet's prediction that the Jury would have accepted one or two of his pictures (Zola was later to repeat this) was probably overly optimistic, for the Jury proved so severe that in the official report Daubigny--at 50--became, by default, the leader of the "Jeune Ecole," "son plus jeune chef."[36]

Manet was determined to be seen, however, with or without official approval, for the eyes of the world were on Paris in 1867. He borrowed money from his mother and had a private pavillion constructed, next to Courbet's, on the Place de l'Alma (Figure 65).[37] Courbet's motives were straightforward; he wrote to Bruyas "toute la peinture qui est en Europe est exposée à Paris dans ce moment. Je triomphe non seulement sur les modernes, mais encore sur les anciens."[38] Manet, younger and innately more modest,

wrote in his exhibition catalogue: "Montrer est la question vitale, le sine qua non pour l'artiste, car il arrive après quelques contemplations qu'on se familiarise avec ce qui surprenait, et, si l'on veut, choquait. Peu à peu on le comprend et on l'admet.... Montrer, c'est trouver des amis et des alliés pour la lutte."[39]

Courbet and Manet were an odd couple to find themselves neighboring renegades on the Place de l'Alma, Courbet with his intentionally crude peasant ways, Manet with his refined manners. L'Artiste, after announcing that "les deux coryphées du réalisme" would be holding private exhibitions, made only one comment, that in comparison with Courbet's show, Manet's was "la chapelle à côté de l'église."[40] Legend even has it that Courbet himself didn't approve of Manet. On visiting his exhibition, Courbet's only remark, occasioned by Manet's evident fondness for Vélazquez, is reported to have been "Que d'Espagnols!"[41]

The enormity of Manet's act in setting himself in opposition to the art establishment can better be gauged by comparing him to his predecessors who took the same step. When Jacques-Louis David, after playing an active role in the French Revolution (and after spending time in jail when Robespierre fell), opened his one-man show in the Louvre in 1799, he accompanied his exhibition with an aggressively worded manifesto announcing that he was instituting a new

custom in France, that henceforth the public should pay artists for the privilege of seeing their works.[42] When Horace Vernet, an outspoken Republican, sent two anti-monarchist paintings to the Salon of 1822, which promptly rejected them, he withdrew all his works and refused to exhibit there. Instead, he held a large exhibition in his studio; it became as much a political as an artistic event.[43] Courbet's Le Réalisme was published in the catalogue of his 1855 exhibition and began: "Le titre de réaliste m'a été imposé comme on a imposé aux hommes de 1830 le titre de romantiques. Les titres en aucun temps n'ont donné une idée juste des choses; s'il en était autrement, les oeuvres seraient superflues."[44] In contrast to this militancy, Manet accompanied his exhibition with a statement so mild as to seem almost apologetic: "M. Manet n'a jamais voulu protester. C'est contre lui, qui ne s'y attendait pas, qu'on a protesté au contraire...."[45]

And yet, however distasteful it may have been for him, he did protest, by erecting his own pavillion and filling it with more than fifty paintings. The results were disappointing. His schoolmate and biographer Antonin Proust described the event in prose reminiscent of Zola's account of the Salon des refusés:

> Et cependant le public fut sans pitié. Il riait devant ces chefs-d'oeuvre. Les maris conduisaient leurs femmes au pont de l'Alma. Les femmes y menaient leurs enfants. Il fallait que tout le monde s'offrît et offrît aux siens cette

> rare occasion de se dilater la rate. Tout ce que Paris comptait de soi-disant peintres classés se donnait rendez-vous à l'Exposition Manet. C'était un concert de poussahs en délire. L'un d'eux, je ne veux pas le nommer, se livrait à des plaisanteries grossières qui faisaient la joie de ses auditeurs. Théophile Gautier aurait pu, devant ce spectacle, dire dans sa langue imagée que, à ce moment, la foule faisait l'effet d'énormes citrouilles riant des facéties d'un melon dans un raout de cucurbitacées. La presse était unanime ou presque unanime à faire echo. Jamais, dans aucun temps, il ne s'est vu un spectacle d'une injustice aussi révoltante. 46

Proust's testimony notwithstanding, Manet was simply ignored. In this Exposition year, Manet appeared too insignificant to receive much attention. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, after announcing the opening of Manet's show, listing the principal works and where they had first been shown (beginning with the Salon des refusés), merely stated: "Ils ont été jugés dans la Gazette. Les oeuvres nouvelles n'ajoutèrent guère à la discussion du système de l'artiste."[47]

Zola reissued his January article as a pamphlet (Manet feared it would be seen as bad taste to sell it at his exhibition)[48] and then went on to write one of the most wickedly funny pieces of art criticism ever published, "Nos Peintres au Champ de Mars," in which he dissected the official prize-winners.[49] There were some caricatures in the press and a sympathetic account which appeared in L'Indépendance Belge.[50] Théodore Duret, later to become one of Manet's friends and supporters, in 1867 damned him with

faint praise. Admitting that he had been unjustly treated by Juries and allowing that he had gifts as a colorist, Duret nevertheless stated that Manet had begun to paint without knowing how to use a brush, that he worked too quickly, and that he left his paintings unfinished.[51] Most of the other critics were busy with the two official shows and had no time for maverick exhibitions.

The major exception to this indifference came from a surprising quarter, the critic Ernest Chesneau. Couservative enough to be designated by the administration to write the official report, Chesneau had enough insight to realize that, although he himself was committed to la Grande Peinture, such painting was on the decline. Unlike most critics, Chesneau did see very well what Manet was doing, and regarded it as a valid endeavor, yet he could forgive neither his "vularité inconcevable" nor his "ignorance presque enfantine des premiers éléments du dessin."[52] In his essay "La Jeune Ecole. Peintres et Excentriques," he began with Courbet and ended with Manet as the latest entry in the "tribe of eccentrics" that had descended on the contemporary art scene.[53]

He perceived Manet's intention to present "true tone," absolutely faithful to nature, rather than the synthetic color systems used by other artists. Provided that Manet placed his subjects in a diffused light, Chesneau found him

praiseworthy, but his attempt to paint sharp contrasts of light and shade, omitting half-tones, was criticized because it involved the creation of a new convention which was, as Manet had said, surprising, and even a little shocking. Nonetheless, Chesneau was second only to Zola in his understanding of Manet's painting in 1867.

Sometime between the opening of the Universal Exposition on 1 April and his departure for Boulogne in August, Manet painted his Vue de 1'Exposition Universelle de Paris, 1867 (Figure 66), a painting which broke all of Chesneau's rules against vulgar subjects, loose drawing and strong contrast of tones in outdoor light. It was Manet's first--and last--view of Paris, and if he painted it on the motif it would be his first plein-air picture.[54] Indeed, Monet and Renoir both began doing cityscapes of Paris in 1867, Monet painting Le Jardin de 1'Infante, Renoir, Le Pont des arts. Manet's method of picture construction for outdoor subjects during this period, however, was to develop them in his studio from preliminary sketches and drawings. That is how La Musique aux Tuileries (1862), the Racetrack paintings (1864-65) and the 1869 paintings of Boulogne were done;[55] the Vue de 1'Exposition Universelle, because of its size (1.08 x 1.965 m.), its disjunctive spatial construction, and its disposition of figures, seems to be in the same category.

Manet's vantage point for this painting has been identified as the upper meeting of the rue Franklin and rue Vineuse close to the Trocadéro, looking directly across the Pont d'Iéna to the Exposition on the Champ-de-Mars.[56] A comparison with popular prints (Figures 61 and 62) or with Berthe Morisot's later painting of the same motif (Figure 67) shows, however, that he has compressed the space into a more immediate image.[57] In his study of cityscape painting, J.G. Links has stressed that most cities have one or two viewpoints which, favored by artists, come to symbolize the city itself.[58] In Paris in 1867 it was the view from the Trocadéro, recommended in popular literature and shown in a majority of popular images of the Exposition.[59] Many such images were available for inspiration or reference, and, in addition, Manet had probably seen, in the Prado, Mazo's View of Saragossa which employed a similar spatial convention.[60] The problem with cityscape as a motif is that, in order to adequately represent the subject, a high vantage point is necessary; this, however, reduces figures to ant-like proportions or presents them in severe foreshortening (like the old joke about a circle being a man seen from above). Most of the popular images of the Exposition minimized this problem by adopting a distant view and eliminating the foreground. The brightly colored Epinal print (Figure 61) is an exception for, in order to convey the immediacy of near and far seen together, it

breaks all perspective rules. The figures are shown frontally, from eye level, and the panorama is in bird's-eye perspective. Manet, whom Zola had recently defended against the accusation that his painting was as primitive as Epinal prints,[61] here has adopted a similar spatial disjunction and taken it even further. He has dropped out the middle-ground completely and jammed together the two areas of maximum interest, the immediate foreground and the distant panorama. Instead of taking a long view, which would clarify the objective spatial relationships, he has thrust the viewer so abruptly into the foreground that the articulation of the Pont d'Iéna, the Seine and the Exposition itself has become almost indecipherable. Before noting the "modernity" of Manet's solution, however, it is worth remembering that the most famous cityscape of all, El Greco's View of Toledo, is also topographically inaccurate and that, in fact, paintings are rarely as accurate as maps.[62]

Even a comparison of the two popular images (Figures 61 and 62) will show that, once the drawn-to-scale accuracy of a map is left behind, there is always a judgment necessary as to what should be included and how prominently it should be portrayed. As Links has noted, a few significant landmarks come to stand for the whole: both prints and Manet's painting include the oval exhibition hall, the Palais de l'Exposition, the tall French

lighthouse, the Phare des Roches-Douvres, and, that symbol of Paris, the domed church of the Invalides. In almost every other detail they differ. For example, while the dome of the Invalides is conspicuous in all the depictions, the masthead engraving (Figure 62) gives almost equal prominence to the nearby dome of the Institut de France, while in the Epinal print this latter dome is greatly diminished in importance. Manet has reduced this symbol of the Academy so that it is barely visible.

Manet's panorama begins at the far left with, appropriately enough, the dome of the Panorama National; here changing panoramas of military subjects were constantly on display. Adjacent to the Panorama was the larger and more conspicuous Palais de l'Industrie where the annual Salon was being held; although the Palais is shown on the far left of Berthe Morisot's painting (Figure 67) and was certainly within Manet's field of vision, he has omitted it. Below the Panorama is the Pont de l'Alma, the bridge leading to Manet's exhibition. Not only has he given it extreme prominence but, as a comparison with any of the other images (or even modern photographs) will show, its pylons have been made much more massive than they actually are. To the right of the Panorama can be seen the twin spires of the Church of Sainte-Clotilde, recently completed. Commissioned by the city of Paris in what was considered the true national style of France, this Gothic

Revival church had been built over the protests of the Academicians who favored only classically inspired architecture.[63] Manet has painted it more distinctly than it would appear, and in contrast he has the dome of Saint-Louis-des Invalides, built by Louis XIV and housing the tomb of Napoléon, partially obscured by a puff of smoke from the Exposition chimneys. Most popular images were careful to clearly articulate this landmark. Two other landmarks are identifiable: to the left of the tall French lighthouse can be seen the twin towers of Notre Dame, and to the right of the Invalides dome, partially painted over, is the Panthéon. Both of these monuments are traditional symbols of Paris, and all images tended to include them, even if their scale and location had to be shifted. Behind the oval of the Palais de l'Exposition, which contained the art exhibit, rises the dome of the Ecole Militaire; the Champ-de-Mars was actually its parade ground. The irony that an exhibition dedicated to peace should take place on a field associated with war was not lost to Parisians, and Daumier kept up a steady stream of lithographs on this theme. On 16 January 1867, in Charivari, he showed a father and son standing on the Trocadéro looking down on the Champ-de-Mars: "O mon fils! Quel admirable tableau! Vois-tu d'ici le Palais de l'Exposition, ce temple de la Paix! --Oui papa, et l'Ecole militaire aussi!"[64] Manet has somewhat exaggerated the size of the Ecole militaire to

preserve this counterpoint. Most popular images did the same thing although the sentiment was not always ironic; in the popular press it ran to mawkish, e.g., "the field of war must now be renamed the field of peace."[65]

The relationship between Sainte-Clotilde and Saint-Louis-des-Invalides was echoed by that of the English and French lighthouses erected on the Exposition grounds. Electricity was something new (most of the Exposition was gas-lit) but the Phare des Roches-Douvres, resembling a neoclassical column, was traditional in both function and design. The English, however, chose to erect the skeletal structure, seen at the right, powered by electricity. It was greeted with the same cries of outrage which the Eiffel Tower was to receive at the 1889 Exposition. The editor of L'Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée wrote: "A plusieurs reprises, nous avons supplié MM. les Anglais d'achever cet énorme échafaudage au haut duquel ils ont posé leur phare électrique, et qui déshonore le Champ de Mars de sa charpente décharnée."[66] In consequence, most popular images either omitted it altogether or gave it a proper "finish." The quarrel over whether the inner structure should be covered or exposed was one which had raged in painting ever since Delacroix had abandoned the smooth anonymous surface so desirable in academic paintings. Manet, whose painting facture had much in common with English lighthouse construction, and who was

also criticized for leaving his work "unfinished," could be expected to be sympathetic to the English attempt (as Seurat was to the Eiffel Tower) and his depiction is more accurate than most popular images.

This discussion of the topography of Manet's panorama, with its inclusions, exclusions, exaggerations and diminutions, is not intended to impute to Manet an articulate programmatic intent, but rather to suggest that "seeing" is dependent as much on attitudes and expectations as on the topographical reality of the sight seen.[67]

The Seine, which should occupy the middleground, has been omitted by Manet, and the Pont d'Iéna makes a somewhat awkward transition to the foreground "stage" across which is strung a rather odd cast of characters. Because of the loose composition and the strange disjunctions of space, this painting has been called one of Manet's failures.[68] The workman at the lower left does not appear to be standing on the same ground plane as the women behind him, and the two gentlemen on the right, who seem to be in correct scale to the soldiers, are too large to be that far back from Léon Leenhoff and his dog. Not only do the figures exist in differing perspectives from each other, they also seem to be in a different perspective from the panorama. The result is that while the figures in Berthe Morisot's painting explicate the unity of the space,

Manet's figures are disruptive of any spatial continuity and can only be seen separately. In this sense they partake more of the character of the icon than of genre.

The figure at the lower left provides a traditional entry into the painting--a repoussoir figure whose function is to establish the first plane. That a workman should be given this role is appropriate, for this was an exposition of products of industry whose central exhibit was "The History of Work." The two women behind him are sketched in a humorous, almost caricatural, style and present the conventional image of working-class women, one fat and dumpy with heavy legs, the other thin, standing stiff and awkward.[69] Next comes a most extravagent creature whose orange dress contrasts vividly with the more conventional attire of the other figures. She is dressed at the height of fashion: crinolines were "out" in 1867, "short" skirts (meaning that the ankles showed) were all the rage, and tiny oval hats perched forward on the forehead were popular. A dress very like hers, double-skirted with turreted squares edged in contrasting trim, was described in the magazine Le Follet for August.[70] Historians of the period never tire of describing its eccentricities and excesses, for only with difficulty could a harlot be distinguished from a fashionable lady. Here the presence of her more soberly clad companion, possibly a chaperone, indicates that she is the latter, a cocodotte rather than a

cocotte.[71] The cocodotte, also known as a femmelette (literally "little woman") was the female equivalent to the dandy. In French society, the complement of the femmelette was the amazone, the horsewoman who fenced, rode, hunted and disdained the ladylike ways of her doll-like sister. She too could be harlot or lady of fashion; Manet has painted her in the center of the picture.[72]

Between the cocodotte and the amazone stands a bourgeois couple whose informal dress suggests that they are provincials, or possibly English tourists.[73] The interest the man is taking in the captive balloon, observing it through his binoculars, implies that they are visitors taking in the sights of the big city. The children playing on the grass are gamins, youngsters of the lower classes. In contrast, Manet's son Léon Leenhoff, walking his dog, at sixteen is already dressed as a young dandy.[74]

Behind him are two older dandies, the petits crevés, the male version of the cocodotte. They also are wearing the latest fashions, the short jackets and tophats which were just becoming popular during the Spring of 1867 and which can be seen in illustrations slowly replacing the tall tophats and tailcoats favored by more conservative bourgeois gentlemen.[75] The three Imperial Guardsmen in their blue jackets and red trousers complete the cast.

Obviously off-duty, they present a most unmilitary appearance, one lounging on the grass, another without his bicorne hat.[76] Manet has painted a "panorama" of types such as one might expect to see in Paris in 1867. There are men and women, children and adults, members of the working class, the bourgeoisie, the fashionable world of the capital, and the military. The concept itself is not original to Manet; from the beginning of townscape images there was a trend, particularly evident beginning in the seventeenth century, to have the staffage indicate "tout le monde," thus adding overtones of universality, civic pride and world view.[77] The Epinal print (Figure 61) reflects this earlier tradition as well as the mid-nineteenth century interests in Parisian "types" to which such illustrations are usually related. Most illustrators, however, tended to depict a few normative "types," such as "the lady" or "the gentleman" over and over with little variation. Manet's concept differed in that he tended towards the encyclopedic; he presented one isolated figure group of each "type" with no repetitions. This further reinforced the emblematic rather than the genre aspect of the painting.

Although Manet's interest in Parisian "types" has been well documented, from the lower classes of Le Vieux Musicien to the upper classes of La Musique aux Tuileries,[78] he never before--or after--attempted to paint

the entire spectrum in a single picture. Here, in the same way that the Panorama National has become emblematic of the entire painting, so also has the idea of Universal Exposition: Manet has extended it metaphorically from the topography to include the figures as well, and thus has painted a truly Universal Exposition of Paris in 1867.

The only aspect of Manet's painting which does not appear in the popuplar images of the Exposition is the balloon floating over the Champ-de-Mars, and yet it is a good touch as it represents the very essence of French Expositions. Balloons were a French invention: the first hydrogen balloon ascension had been made from the Champ-de-Mars in 1793. Thereafter balloons became part of all public fêtes, including the first Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française on the Champ-de-Mars in 1798.[79] Manet's balloon is that of his friend Nadar. Called Le Géant, it was, at the time, the largest ever built. It had made its first ascent in 1863, the year of the Salon des refusés, and had crashed in 1865, the year of the scandal over Olympia. It had survived, yet in 1867 there were still skeptics who considered aeronautics impossible and absurd. Nadar hoped that the Universal Exposition would establish its respectability.[80] Le Géant had, in many ways, a career parallel to Manet's.

The artist actually changed the silhouette of Le

Géant: a popular print showed it as having a teardrop shape with a smaller teardrop below.[81] Manet painted it as a globe, making it a metaphor for the world. Nor was he the first to do this, for, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, balloons (called globes aérostatiques) were sometimes shown replacing a smaller sun as a symbol for the conquest of nature.[82] Victor Hugo's La Légende des siècles of 1859 contained the long poem "Plein Ciel" in which the balloon, "globe comme le monde," became the symbol of his hope in the future.[83] He had concluded the preceding poem with the statement "Ce monde est mort.... Regardez là-haut."[84] Throughout "Plein Ciel" the balloon is seen as ascending over all the baser qualities of human experience, everything old and vile: "Les vieux champs de bataille étaient là dans la nuit; / Il passe, et maintenant voilà le jour qui luit / Sur ces grands charniers de l'histoire."[85] The balloon as a symbol of hope existed before Hugo; Charles Meryon in the early stages of his etching Le Pont-au-Change (1854) placed in the sky a balloon labeled Esperanza. In a similar vein, although less poetically, Théophile Gautier wrote in 1848 "C'est un instinct profondément humain que celui qui nous pousse à suivre dans l'air, jusqu'à ce qu'on le perde de vue, ce globe gonflé de fumée qui porte les destinées de l'avenir."[86] Daumier, in an 1868 lithograph, was even more direct: on his balloon was written "Le Progrès."[87]

Hope, progress, the future, the world; in Manet's painting, the balloon floating over the old battlefield of the Champ-de-Mars, followed by the gaze of the man with the binoculars, becomes a symbol of the Exposition that brought together the art and industry of the entire world.[88] The painting itself is ambivalent as to its actual themes, and yet the coupling of images of peace and progress with reminders of military presence is an accurate reflection of the mood of Paris in 1867: a mixture of gaiety and apprehension, hope and fear. Prussia sent an enormous Krupp cannon to the Exposition, and the tensions that would lead to the Franco-Prussian War were already much in evidence.[89]

Manet saw his own artistic career in terms of military imagery. He wrote in his catalogue: "si les tentatives d'art sont un combat, au moins faut-il lutter à armes égales, c'est-à-dire pouvoir montrer aussi ce qu'on a fait;" he concluded his preface with the statement: "Il ne s'agit plus, pour le peintre, que de se concilier ce public dont on lui a fait un soi-disant ennemi."[90] Zola's essay accompanying Manet's show was built around a similarly combative metaphor:

> J'imagine que je suis en pleine rue et que je rencontre un attroupement de gamins qui accompagnent Edouard Manet à coups de pierres. Les critiques d'art, --pardon, les sergents de ville font mal leur office; ils accroissent le tumulte au lieu de le calmer, et même, Dieu me pardonne! il me semble que les sergents de ville

ont d'énormes pavés dans leurs mains. Il y a déjà, dans ce spectacle, une certaine grossièreté qui m'attriste, moi passant désintéressé, d'allures calmes et libres.

Je m'approche, j'interroge les gamins, j'interroge les sergents de ville, j'interroge Edouard Manet lui-même. Et une conviction se fait en moi. Je me rends compte de la colère des gamins et de la mollesse des sergents de ville, je sais quel crime a commis ce paria qu'on lapide. Je rentre chez moi et je dresse, pour l'honneur de la vérité, le procès-verbal qu'on va lire. 91

It is interesting to note that in Manet's painting the officers of the peace, Napoléon III's Imperial Guard, have been appeased, the street urchins are playing harmlessly on the grass, and the fashionably dressed gentlemen (the art critics?) are regarding with great interest the two symbols of progress, the English lighthouse and Nadar's balloon. Whether he intended it or not, Manet has shown the results that Zola hoped his essay would achieve.

Manet's Vue de l'Exposition Universelle is an ambitious paiinting, both in size and scope. Attempting to combine slice-of-life immediacy with a more suggestive treatment of types and symbols, it wavers between genre and allegory, never quite becoming either. It is a hopeful painting, probably done in June, after his show had opened but before he realized that it would not be a success.[92] It seems to be an unfinished painting; there is a large area of pentimenti on the left, and it was never signed.[93]

As the summer of 1867 wore on, Manet became deeply

depressed; he rarely went out at all.[94] By August he had fled Paris for Boulogne. He stopped painting. Proust visited him in Boulogne, later recalling: "Quand le courrier arrivait, lui apportant des nouvelles de son Exposition, il disait: 'Voici le flot boueux qui vient. La marée monte.'"[95] Fifteen years later, Proust described him looking back on his struggles: "Cette guerre au couteau, me dit-il, m'a fait le plus grand mal. J'en ai cruellement souffert, mais elle m'a donné le coup de fouet. Je ne souhaite à aucun artiste d'être loué et encensé à ses débuts. Ce serait pour lui l'anéantissement de sa personnalité."[96] But that was hindsight. On 19 June 1867, the Emperor Maximilien was executed in Mexico. On 1 July, the day of the awards ceremony for the Universal Exposition, rumors of this event reached the Parisian press; the first accurate reports arrived on 10 August.

Sometime after this Manet started painting again; he began the first version of L'Exécution de l'Empereur Maximilien, now in Boston; legend states that he intended to include it in his exhibition. Eventually he completed four paintings and a lithograph on the theme; when he placed the Mexican soldiers in French uniforms, the Government of Napoléon III, which had installed and then abandoned the unfortunate monarch, suppressed the lithograph.[97] These are the most explicitly political works Manet ever did, grim and pessimistic rejoinders to the

optimism of his Vue de 1'Exposition Universelle.

In setting up his own exhibition and in painting his Vue de 1'Exposition Universelle, Manet sought to identify himself with the leading themes of the enterprise: optimism, universality and progress. The exhibition through which he had hoped to reach an understanding audience met with incomprehension and neglect; the painting was abandoned. Never exhibited during his lifetime, it remained in his studio, unsigned and unsold at his death.

Chesneau concluded his 1867 evaluation of Manet by stating: "On me dit que M. Manet lui-même auprès d'un groupe de jeunes gens passe déjà pour un timide, un classique à perruque, et que nous n'avons rien vu de l'art de l'avenir."[98] Chesneau was right, for in 1867 these young artists--Monet, Renoir, Cézanne, Pissarro--had been successfully eliminated from public view and, officially speaking, did not exist. But Manet, although his exhibition was not the success he had wished, did accomplish his purpose, for, ironically, his Vue de 1'Exposition Universelle is the only memorable artistic evidence of the Exposition which excluded him.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XV

The section of this chapter entitled Manet's View of the Universal Exposition was taken from my article "Edouard Manet's 'View of the Universal Exposition of 1867,'" Arts Magazine 54 (January 1980): 108-115.

1. Vaillant's speech was reprinted in the 1867 Salon catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., XI-XII. At the 1865 Salon, Vaillant had announced only that there would be an 1867 Universal Exposition to prepare for; the decision to maintain the annual Salon was probably made in 1866 at the same time as the decision to limit the space for art in the main exhibition.

2. The Academy's refusal to participate extended to the Salon Jury as well and so it also was redefined as two-thirds elected artists. The records of the elected and appointed Jury are in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1867, dossier 1867 X 20. The Government appointed Cottier, Lacaze, Reiset, Théophile Gautier, Marquis Maison; Rousseau was elected its President, Fromentin its Secretary; all the artist-members were elected to the Exposition Jury d'admission as well. See the 1867 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., LXXXX-LXXXXIV and the Règlement on pages XVIII-XXIII.

3. See La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 10 mars 1867, 78; on 28 avril 1867, 133, La Chronique announced that artists could sign the petition at M. Taluet's, 55 rue du Cherche-Midi.

4. Ibid., 26 mai 1867, 172.

5. Castagnary, "Le Monde artistique," La Liberté, 1 avril 1867. Also see a news item titled "Correspondance de Paris, 1 avril" in AN F21 530, notated that it appeared in Le Phare de la Loire (Nantes) and La Gironde (Bordeaux), 9 avril 1867; it appears to be a paraphrase of Castagnary's article.

6. Emile Zola to Antony Valabrègue, 4 avril 1867; Emile Zola, Correspondance 1858-1871, B.H. Bakker, ed., Paris, 298-300. It is more likely that the Jury's conservatism was due to the Universal Exposition.

7. The petition is in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1867; it is dated "Samedi, 30 mars 1867" and is in the handwriting of Frédéric Bazille, who was the first to sign immediately after the text.

8. The correspondence is in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1867: Artistes refusés: demandes pour une exposition. On 13 April 1867, the Under-Secretary for the Cabinet de l'Empereur sent several of the demands to Nieuwerkerke with a note that they were in his jurisdiction. The artists' representatives were: President, Louis-Frédéric Grosclaude (Grosclaude fils), a portraitist who exhibited in the Salon 1849-1880 (birth and death dates unknown); Philippe Honoré Pinel, a genre painter who showed at the Salon 1848-1868 (birth and death dates unknown); Marc Alfred Chataud (1833-?), an orientalist who lived in Algeria after 1892; Pierre-Isadore Bureau (1827-1876), a landscape painter. Grosclaude signed Bazille's petition as délégué, linking it to the demand of 9 April, signed by the above representatives, requesting an appointment with Nieuwerkerke.

9. Nieuwerkerke to Frédéric Grosclaude, Président délégué, 11 avril 1867; Ibid.

10. Ibid. The manifesto is undated.

11. Nieuwerkerke's refusal was reported in La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 28 avril 1867, 134, and 5 mai 1867, 142; also see "Petits Evénements," Le Figaro, 22-23 avril 1867.

12. Cimetière had written asking for the refused artists' names in order to organize an exposition of their work; Nieuwerkerke said he would have to ask them directly; Cimetière pointed out that without their names he couldn't ask them anything; Nieuwerkerke didn't answer this letter. The correspondence, dated 23-25 avril 1867, is in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1867.

13. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 28 avril 1867, 134, 5 mai 1867, 142; "Petits Evénements," Le Figaro, 22-23 avril 1867.

14. The letter was addressed to Monsieur le Surintendant des Beaux-Arts, dated 5 mai 1867; AN F21 530: Salon de 1867. There are several similar letters both in this dossier and in that of the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1867.

15. Bazille's letter was published in Gaston Poulain, Bazille et ses amis, Paris, 1932, 78-80; although undated, it was probably written in April.

16. Ibid., 82-83; the letter is undated but, as Bazille mentioned that the Courbet and Manet shows were about to open, it was probably written in May.

17. Léon Lagrange, "Les Beaux-Arts en 1867. L'Exposition Universelle, Le Salon," Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 992; also see Paul de Saint-Victor, "Salon de 1867," La Presse, 9 mai 1867; Edmond About, "Salon de 1867," Le Temps, 22 mai 1867, P. Challemel-Lacour, "Ouverture du Salon," Le Temps, 16 avril 1867; Castagnary, "Salon de 1867," La Liberté, 25 mai 1867.

18. See Castagnary, La Liberté, 25 mai 1867.

19. Ibid.

20. About, Le Temps, 13 juin 1867.

21. Saint-Victor, La Presse, 9 mai 1867.

22. Hippolyte Babou, "Les Dissidents de l'Exposition," Revue Libérale II (1867): 284-89.

23. Gustave Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, 18 février 1867, B.N., Cabinet des estampes, Yb 3 1739(8): Lettres de Gustave Courbet.

24. Gustave Courbet to Alfred Bruyas, jeudi, 28 mai 1867, Ibid.

25. Bazille's letter to Monet, undated, was probably written around 22 mai 1867 as he mentioned that Courbet's show would open in a week; he also stated that Courbet had a studio for himself constructed above the gallery and that he intended to rent the gallery after the Exposition; see Poulain, 81.

26. Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 juin 1867, 479. Monet criticized Courbet for having included many works of lesser quality; see his letter to Bazille, undated, in Poulain, 94.

27. A portrait of Courbet by L. Petit was on the cover of Le Hanneton illustré, 13 juin 1867; Gill did one for the cover of La Lune, 9 juin 1867.

28. See Ernest Chesneau, "Groupe I," in the 1867 Rapports du Jury International, I: 86. Chesneau's articles were originally published in Le Constitutionnel, one of the principal Imperialist journals, and reprinted as Les Nations rivales dans l'art, Paris, 1868. "La Jeune Ecole, Peintres et Excentriques" formed Chapter VIII.

29. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 326-27.

30. Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (Août 1867), 1024; Also see DuCamp, 1867, 344; his critique was originally

published in Revue des Deux-Mondes.

31.Théodore Duret, Les Peintres français en 1867, Paris, 1867, 101.

32. Pérignon, A propos, 3-4.

33. Castagnary, "Exposition des oeuvres de M. Gustave Courbet," La Liberté, 11 juin 1867.

34. "Chronique," Revue Universelle des Arts (1855:I): 240.

35. Edouard Manet to Emile Zola, 2 janvier 1867, in Manet raconté par lui-même et par ses amis, 2 vols., Geneva, 1953, I: 47.

36. See the 1867 Rapports du Jury, I: 84-85. Zola reprinted his essay of 1 January 1867 "Une nouvelle manière en peinture," as a pamphlet to accompany Manet's private exhibition, adding a preface reiterating Manet's statement that the Jury would have accepted a few of his pictures; see Emile Zola, Ed. Manet, Etude Biographique et Critique, Paris, 1867, 5. In view of Manet's complete rejection by the more lenient Salon Jury of 1866, it is unlikely that he would have met with any success in 1867.

37. Manet borrowed 18,305 francs from his mother, according to A. Tabarant, Manet et ses oeuvres, Paris, 1947, 135. Zola, in a letter of 8 mai 1867 to the editor Lacroix, said Manet had already spent 15,000 francs (the show opened 24 May); see Zola, Correspondance, 302-304. A worker earned about two francs a day.

38. Courbet to Bruyas, jeudi, 28 mai 1867, B.N. Estampes YB 3 1739(8).

39. Edouard Manet, "Motifs d'une exposition particulière," Catalogue des tableaux de M. Edouard Manet exposés avenue de l'Alma en 1867, Paris, 1867, 6. While Manet's statement has often been attributed to Zacharie Astruc, Sharon Flescher in her study Zacharie Astruc, Critic, Artist and Japoniste, New York, 1978, 104, feels it is stylistically dissimilar to his writings.

40. Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 mai 1867, 328, 1 juin 1867, 479.

41. Edmond Bazire, Manet, Paris, 1884, 51; also see Jacques de Biez, Edouard Manet, Paris, 1884, 36-37. Biez also recounted the story that Courbet said Manet's Olympia was as flat as a playing card.

42. See the exhibition catalogue of Jacques-Louis David, Le Tableau des Sabines, exposé publiquement au palais national des sciences et des arts, salle de la ci-devant académie d'architecture, par le Citoyen David, an VIII (1799), 7.

43. MM. Jouy et Jay, Salon d'Horace Vernet. Analyse historique et pittoresque de quarante-cinq tableaux exposés chez lui en 1822, Paris, 1822, 4.

44. See Gustave Courbet, "Le Realisme," Exhibition et vente...de l'oeuvre de M. Gustave Courbet, Avenue Montaigne, Paris, 1855; in 1867 Courbet did not issue a manifesto with his catalogue.

45. Manet, Catalogue, 1867, 5.

46. Antonin Proust, Edouard Manet, Souvenirs, Paris, 1913, 55.

47. "Nouvelles," La Chronique de l'art et de la curiosité, 2 juin 1867, 174. In a letter to Antony Valabrègue, 29 mai 1867, (five days after Manet's exhibition had opened), Zola wrote that it wasn't doing well but he hoped that his pamphlet would help; see Zola, Correspondance, 305-308. Monet wrote to Bazille, 25 juin 1867, stating that Manet's receipts were improving; see Poulain, 94.

48. Manet's letter to Zola concerning the pamphlet is published in Denis Rouart and Daniel Wildenstein, Edouard Manet, Catalogue raisonné, 2 vols., Lausanne/Paris, 1975, I: 14.

49. Emile Zola, "Nos Peintres au Champ de Mars," in his Salons, Robert J. Neiss and F.W.J. Hemmings, eds., Geneva/Paris, 1959, 107-115; originally published in La Situation, 1 juillet 1867.

50. Jules Claretie's account was published in L'Indépendance Belge, 15 juin 1867.

51. Théodore Duret, Les Peintres français en 1867, Paris, 1867, 103-11.

52. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 343.

53. Ibid., Chapter VIII; for a discussion of Manet, 338-45.

54. Manet painted several middle-distance street views in 1877-78, but this was his only panorama. See the 1982 Washington, D.C. exhibition catalogue Manet and Modern

Paris.

55. On Manet's picture construction, see Nils Gösta Sandblad, Manet, Three Studies in Artistic Conception, Lund, 1954, 17-64; Jean C. Harris, "Manet's Race-Track Paintings," Art Bulletin XLVIII (1966): 78-82. Alain de Leiris, "Manet: Sur la plage de Boulogne," GBA 57 (janvier 1961): 53-62.

56. See Sigurd Willoch, "Edouard Manets 'Fra Verdensutstillingen' Paris 1867," Konsthistorisk tidskrift, XLV (December 1976): 101-108. I am indebted to Sigurd Willoch for clarifying some points in his article for me.

57. Berthe Morisot's painting was traditionally identified as Vue prise en aval du pont d'Iéna, shown in the 1866 Salon, causing historians to assume that Manet was inspired by her painting; see Paul Jamot, "Etudes sur Manet," GBA, janvier 1927, 27-50. M.L. Bataille and Georges Wildenstein, in their Berthe Morisot, Catalogue des peintures, pastels et aquarelles, Paris, 1961, identified Vue prise... as another painting (catalogue N° 11), completely unlike Manet's, and redated her Vue de Paris du Trocadéro, shown here, to 1872 (catalogue N° 23).

58. J.G. Links, Townscape Painting and Drawing, New York, 1972, 124. I am indebted to Ann Sutherland Harris for bringing this study to my attention.

59. This was the view recommended in L'Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée, the official publication of the Exposition; see Fr. Ducuing, "L'Empereur au Champ de Mars et l'ouverture de l'Exposition," N° 2, 18, and Comte de Castellan, "La Seine et l'Exposition," N° 3, 47-48. Of the twelve views of the Exposition preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des estampes, ten show the view from the Trocadéro; see the collection Exposition Universelle 1867, Champ de Mars, Tome I. This view was recommended outside of Exposition years as well: see Dumas, Paris et les Parisiens au XIXe siècle, 237.

60. Sigurd Willoch was the first to suggest this in his 1976 article. Previous scholars had cited Goya's Pradera de San Isidro until it was discovered that Manet had not been able to see it during his trip to Spain; see Elie Lambert, "Vélazquez et Manet," Vélazquez, Son temps, son influence. Actes du colloque tenu à la casa de Vélazquez, les 7, 9 et 10 décembre 1960, Paris, 1963, 121-22. Mazo's View of Saragossa may also have been available to Manet through an engraving published in Charles Blanc, Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles. The volume Ecole Espagnole, published as a book in 1869, was probably available earlier in fascicles (the paging is

not continuous). W. Bürger wrote the section "Juan Bautista del Mazo" and stated that Vélazquez painted the figures in Mazo's View of Saragossa; modern scholarship has rejected this theory but it was widely held at the time. Bürger also noted that at Comte de Gessler's 1866 sale in Paris there was a Vue de ville possibly representing Saragossa or Pamplona, with figures attributed to Vélazquez. Considering Manet's interest in Spanish painting, it is reasonable to assume that he attended this sale, and that, in any case, his Vue de l'Exposition Universelle had Spanish as well as popular sources.

61. Zola, Manet, Etude, 1867, 24.

62. See Links, 116-20.

63. Paris dans sa splendeur. Monuments, vues, scènes historiques, descriptions et histoire, 3 vols., Paris, 1863, I: Chapter II: 107-10.

64. Daumier's first lithograph on the subject appeared in Charivari, 5 janvier 1867, his last on 26 novembre 1867. They are reproduced in Loys Delteil, Le Peintre-Graveur illustré, 31 vols., Paris, 1906-26, XXVIII (Daumier): N° 3547-610.

65. See, for example, Paris-Guide, par les principaux écrivains et artistes de la France, 2 vols., Paris, 1867, II: 1380; also L'Exposition populaire illustrée, (1867): N° 1, 2-6.

66. Fr. Ducuing, "Le Phare électrique anglais," L'Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée, (1867): N° 26: 406-407. An engraving of the lighthouse appeared on page 408. For a further discussion of this structure and its significance, see my article "The Eiffel Tower and the English Lighthouse," Arts Magazine 54 (March 1980): 141-44.

67. For a further discussion of the relationship between "seeing" and "picture-making," see Louis Finkelstein, "On the Unpicturelikeness of Our Seeing," Perception and Pictorial Representation, Calvin F. Nodine and Dennis F. Fisher, eds., New York, 1979, 61-83. Sigurd Willoch has called my attention to an article by Werner Hofmann, "Poesia und Prosa, Rangfragen in der neueren Kunst," Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen 18, Hamburg, 1973, 173-92; Hofmann discusses the Epinal print (the prose) in relation to Manet's vision (the poetry).

68. John Richardson, Edouard Manet, Paintings and Drawings, New York, 1958, 13; Richardson wrote of Manet's "compositional difficulties" in his paintings of the 1860s, including his Vue de l'Exposition Universelle. Michel

Florisoone, Manet, Monaco, 1947, XX, called it "clumsy." Alan Bowness, "A Note on 'Manet's Compositional Difficulties,'" The Burlington Magazine 103 (June 1961): 276-77, responded to Richardson by stressing Manet's search for informal compositions suitable for scenes of everyday life.

69. For a general discussion of Manet's use of popular imagery, see Anne Coffin Hanson, Manet and the Modern Tradition, New Haven, 1977, 36-43, 58-68. Alain de Leiris has noted the quality of caricature in Manet's work of the 1860s; GBA 57 (janvier 1961): 53-61. Manet's images of working class women are similar to those of caricaturists such as Cham; see his collections La Comédie de l'Exposition, 1er acte and L'Exposition charivarisée, Paris, 1867. Earlier collections such as Les Français peints par eux-mêmes showed the same general "types": "La Ménagère Parisienne" (1841 edition, III: 17-23); "L'Ouvrier de Paris" (1842 edition, V: 361-76); "Les Cris de Paris," (1841 edition, IV: 201-209).

70. "La Mode," Le Follet, Journal du Grand Monde, Fashion, Polite Literature, Beaux-Arts, etc. This magazine, published in English, included a fashion column which was a report from Paris, translated from French. Short skirts were described beginning in May, and small oval bonnets were reported in the June issue. Le Monde Illustré also had a fashion column, "Courrier de la mode," written by Vicomtesse de Renneville who preached "simple elegance." She too may have seen Manet's extravagent creature, for on 15 June, after having previously reported the small hats and the absence of crinolines, she wrote: "Laissons les coquets déshabillés de mousseline...;" 375-76. On current fashions, also see "Les Modes du Printemps," L'Illustration, 25 mai 1867, 333-34.

71. For a discussion of cocottes and cocodottes, see Octave Uzanne, Monument esthématique du XIXe siècle. Les Modes de Paris. Variations du goût et de l'esthétique de la femme 1797-1897, Paris, 1898, 165-67.

72. Les Français peints par eux-mêmes included a discussion of La Lionne (as the amazone was then called); see the 1841 edition, II: 9-16. Manet subsequently painted the amazone several times; see Rouart and Wildenstein, I: N° 160, 394, 395, 396. The amazone's riding habit changed little during the century: Renoir, Constantin Guys and Daumier all depicted her in approximately the same attire. For an example contemporary with Manet, see the advertisement of Lavigne & Cheron, 1867, reproduced in Joanna Richardson, La Vie Parisienne 1852-1870, London, 1971, 244.

73. They were identified as a provincial couple by Etienne Moreau-Nélaton in his Manet raconté par lui-même, 2 vols., Paris, 1926, I: 92. While his Tyrolese hat and short jacket and her parasol, sash, and short skirt were fashionable, they represented a more bourgeois, less dandified fashion than shown by either the young woman on their left or the two gentlemen on their right; see Uzanne, 177, and "La Mode," Le Follet, June 1867. A caricature in Le Monde Illustré, 27 avril 1867, 260, "Les Etrangers sont dans nos murs," showed English tourists dressed similarly; the French liked to show the English dressed in "sensible" clothing. An advertisement for "tourist and shooting suits," almost identical to the man's outfit, was in Bradshaw's Handbook to the Paris International Exhibition 1867, London, 1867, VI. The bourgeois couple reappeared, with minor changes, in Manet's 1869 Le Départ du Bateau de Folkestone and have there been identified as Léon Leenhoff and Madame Manet; it is likely that Manet either copied them from his Vue de l'Exposition Universelle, or used the same preliminary sketches for both; see Rouart, Wildenstein, I: N° 147.

74. While I have referred to Léon Leenhoff as Manet's son, there is still discussion on this point; see Hanson, 71, Note 89. He appears here in the same attire as in Le Déjeuner dans l'atelier of 1868; for his outfit, see the fashion plates for 1 May 1867 issued by Edward Minister and Son, included in the N.Y.P.L. collection Costume plates showing styles for men, taken from French fashion journals of the period between September 1854 and February 1869, New York, 1900, IV (January 1866-February 1869). It is not surprising that Léon Leenhoff should be dressed in English fashions, for London was the ruler of men's fashion just as Paris determined women's styles. The anthology Le Diable à Paris, Paris et les Parisiens, 2 vols., Paris, 1845-46 (reprinted 1857 and 1868), had a cartoon by Bertall, "Les Enfants à Paris," showing the different types of children (II: 256-57). Léon is similar to the obviously bourgeois child captioned "Fort en thème" who is shown next to a voyou, a lower-class child. Les Français peints also included a chapter on "Le Gamin à Paris" (1841 edition, II: 161-70). Manet depicted the gamin several times: an etching of 1861 shows him, with Léon's large dog, as does the related painting; see Jean C. Harris, Edouard Manet, Graphic Works, New York, 1970, N° 11, and Rouart, Wildenstein, I: N° 47. There is also an 1862 lithograph, Harris N° 30.

75. Bertall had a cartoon, "Coup d'oeil sur l'Exposition Universelle de 1867," in L'Illustration, 31 août 1867, 141, which showed a fashionable dandy pair much like Manet's cocodotte and petit crevé. In March 1867 a verse was published mocking this style: "Le chapeau de

forme est très bas. / Le gilet est presque invisible; / Le pantalon, lui, c'est risible, / Est collant du haut jusqu'en bas. / L'habit est plus court qu'une veste, / Le tout est si court qu'on en rit; / Devons-nous parler de l'esprit? / Il est aussi court que le rest." See Uzanne, 178.

76. Because of the proliferation of uniforms according to battalion, function, rank and occasion, it is difficult to make an exact identification. Théodore Duret, Manet's contemporary, identified them as Imperial Guardsmen; see his Manet et son oeuvre, Paris, 1902, N° 92. The history by Capitaine Richard, La Garde (1854-1870) showed photographs of Imperial Guardsmen wearing seemingly identical uniforms; see 177, 222, 271. The Imperial Guard was created by Napoléon III in 1852, immediately after the coup d'état, to imitate that of the first Empire; see Richard, 1.

77. For some early French examples, see the work of Israël Silvestre, principal engraver to Louis XIV, in Israël Silvestre, Vues de Paris, Paris, 1977. The more ambitious the panorama, the more inclusive the staffage; see particularly N° 118, Veüe du Palais des Tuilleries du costé du Jardin, 1668. I am grateful to Leonard Slatkes for many discussions on the meaning of staffage in Northern townscape images.

78. For a summary of the findings of Manet scholars on this subject, see Hanson, 58-68.

79. For the early history of balloons, see François-Louis Bruel, Histoire aéronautique par les monuments peints, sculptés, dessinés et gravés, des origines à 1830, Paris, 1909; also see John Grand-Carteret and Léo Delteil, La Conquête de l'air vue par l'image (1495-1909), Paris, 1909.

80. On Nadar's balloon, see Fulgence Marion, Les Ballons et les voyages aériens, Paris, 1869, 229-47; the activities of Nadar's balloon during the Exposition were reported in "L'aérostation en présence de l'exposition," L'Exposition populaire illustrée, (1867): N° 9: 70-71.

81. See the full page illustration of Le Géant in L'Exposition populaire illustrée, (1867): N° 9: 72,

82. See, for example, Bruel, N° 54.

83. Victor Hugo, "Plein Ciel," La Légende des siècles, 2 vols., Paris, 1859, II: 219-48. George Mauner cites Hugo's poem in connection with Manet's images of balloons, but interprets them in a religious sense; see his Manet, Peintre-Philosophe. A Study of the Painter's Themes,

University Park, Pa., 1975, 173-76.

84. Hugo, "Plein Mer," Légende, II: 207-17.

85. Hugo, "Plein Ciel," Légende, II: 241.

86. Théophile Gautier, "A propos de ballons," Le Journal, 25 septembre 1848, reprinted in his Fusains et eaux-fortes, 1880, 253-64; 256.

87. For the Daumier lithograph, see Delteil, XXVIII: N° 3643. Originally published in Charivari 30 mai 1868, it showed a little boy looking at the balloon "Le Progrès" and asking "Pourquoi donc papa, qu'il ne s'élève pas plus haut?"

88. This same metaphoric use of the balloon-as-globe seems to occur in Manet's 1862 lithograph Le Ballon (Harris N° 23) which also includes a full spectrum of Paris society, from a crippled beggar to ladies and gentlemen. See the article by Douglas Druick and Peter Zegers, "Manet's 'Balloon': French Diversion, The Fête de l'Empereur 1862," The Print Collector's Newsletter XIV (May-June 1983): 38-46.

89. On the Krupp cannon, see "A propos de canons," L'Exposition populaire illustrée, (1867): N° 5: 39. When the King of Prussia visited the Exposition with Bismarck, he was taken on a ceremonial tour of the gardens, the Prussian section, the exhibitions of machinery and art; he later returned without the official party to study the exhibition of the French War Ministry. This was reported in the press; see L'Exposition populaire illustrée (1867): N° 7: 50.

90. Manet, Catalogue, 1867, 2-7.

91. Zola, Manet, Etude, 1867, 11. Zola closed his essay with the same image, "Et voilà comme quoi une troupe de gamins a rencontré un jour Edouard Manet dans la rue...;" 48. Manet's "crime" was his disrespect for "le beau."

92. Tabarant has also dated the painting June 1867; Manet, 140

93. The signature on the lower right was added by Mme Manet; see Rouart, Wildenstein, I: N° 123.

94. On Manet's state of mind during this time, see Proust, Edouard Manet, Souvenirs, 55-56, and Tabarant, Manet, 139.

95. Proust, Edouard Manet, Souvenirs, 55-56.

96. Antonin Proust, "L'Art d'Edouard Manet," Le Studio, 15 January 1901 (Supplement N° 28 to The Studio, London), 76.

97. The various sources and versons of Manet's painting and their chronology are discussed by Sandblad (109-61) who feels that Manet did not begin until his return to Paris in September, after Baudelaire's death. Although it has been stated that Manet was prevented by the Government from exhibiting L'Exécution de l'Empereur Maximilien at his private exhibition, Sandblad feels it unlikely that the Government would have had advance knowledge of his plans. Only the first version, which did not show the soldiers in French uniforms, could have been finished in time. He concludes that legend has confused the painting with the lithograph, which was, in fact, suppressed. Albert Boime, in his "New Light on Manet's Execution of Maximilian," Art Quarterly 34 (Autumn 1973): 172-208, has argued that, in the distraught frame of mind that followed the failure of his exhibition, Manet may have personally identified with Maximilien who was his exact age, bore a physical resemblance to him, and had also been "betrayed" by lack of support from the French Government. For a compilation of documents on L'Exécution de Maximilien, see the 1983 Paris exhibition catalogue, Edouard Manet, 1832-1883, 529-31.

98. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 345.

CHAPTER XVI

THE DEATH OF INGRES

Surveying the fine arts at the 1867 Universal Exposition, Théophile Thoré wrote: "Nous sommes entre deux mondes...entre un monde qui finit et un monde qui commence...."[1] His consciousness of 1867 as a crossroads was shared by his fellow critics, for this was the year when the confluence of the death of Ingres and the Universal Exposition would bring about the general acknowledgment that the hegemony of history painting--for over two hundred years synonymous with the French School--had finally come to an end, and that it was necessary to look to other kinds of painting for its continuation. Thoré himself could hardly conceal his delight. He wrote: "'Ce qui est mort avec M. Ingres, dit un de ses panégyristes, M. de Ronchaud, c'est la dernière autorité qui maintenait un reste de règle...c'est le glorieux passé.' Le passé étant mort, cherchons à nous consoler avec le présent, et surtout espérons en l'avenir."[2] If Thoré was optimistic about the future of French art, there were others for whom the death of Ingres recalled the words of Louis XV: "Après nous, le déluge." In the obituary for Ingres, published in Gazette des

Beaux-Arts, Léon Lagrange voiced these fears:

> Mais sa présence parmi nous était une garantie, sa vie une sauvegarde. Champion muet des principes du Beau, il n'enseignait plus, il ne prêchait pas, il n'écrivait pas, il avait cessé d'exposer. Mais il vivait, et c'était assez pour imposer le repect, pour ralentir le torrent, pour conjurer bien des tempêtes. Sa mort brise le dernier lien de pudeur qui retenait l'anarchie. 3

The death of Ingres would have been felt as a severe loss at any time, but coming just before the Exposition, its consequences were even more severe. For it was not just Ingres who had died since 1855: France had lost virtually the entire generation of history painters. Lagrange explained:

> L'art moderne ressemble à un temple dévasté dont toutes les colonnes gisent dans la poussière. Delaroche est tombé le premier, puis Ary Scheffer, puis Horace Vernet, Eugène Delacroix, Hippolyte Flandrin, sans parler des sculpteurs, David d'Angers, Pradier, Rude, Simart, Duret. Enfin, celui que l'on pouvait considérer comme le plus ferme appui du sanctuaire vient de s'affaisser à son tour, et le temple lui-même s'écroule avec lui. 4

The French art exposition was thus deprived of all those who had previously served to demonstrate to the world French superiority in what was considered the most elevated category of art. Looking back at 1855, Maxime DuCamp wrote: "Depuis ce temps, la mort a été cruelle pour nous, elle a frappé sans relâche, abattant les meilleurs, tuant les généraux les uns après les autres, creusant les vides qui n'ont point été comblés et laissant notre armée

d'artistes sans chefs, sans discipline."[5] Practically all the critics mentioned the losses, from Thoré's "Hélas! les plus fameux ont disparu" to Pierre Dax' succinct "C'est un désastre."[6]

To understand the magnitude of the disaster, however, it is necessary to remember that cultural predominance had real importance for France in maintaining international prestige; in a way it helped to make up for France's undeniable industrial inferiority. At home, cultural leadership continued to be necessary to establish the legitimacy of the Second Empire. It was no less true in 1867 than it had been in 1855 that charges of decadence in art were really veiled attacks on the regime. Charles Clément, for example, critic for the Orléanist Journal des Débats, stated that the level of art had been declining for the last fifteen or twenty years, in other words since the advent of Louis Napoléon.[7] It had become customary to invoke the lineage of artists associated with every past regime, from the School of Fontainebleau, established by François I, to David and Gros, favorites of Robespierre and Napoléon I, to Delacroix, honored by Louis Philippe.[8] In 1867, with all the reliable names in Grand Painting gone, it was necessary for Napoléon III to choose his artists, the heirs to the Grand Tradition of the French School.

In 1855 the problem had been sidestepped by giving

retrospective exhibitions to the representatives of the leading movements of the period, all of whom had been inherited from previous regimes. Had any of them survived to 1867, they undoubtedly would have been honored again, but by 1867 only Ingres remained. He was the sole artist Napoléon III appointed to the Imperial Commission; his death left the French School, as the critics said, décapitée.[9] In the resulting absence of prefabricated choices, the Government preserved a discreet--or cowardly--silence, and abstained from the risk of designating in advance the major artists. The future of French art, officially speaking, was thus left in the hands of the Jury.

The first reaction to the death of Ingres was to offset this loss by organizing an immense commemorative exhibition at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts to run concurrently with the Universal Exposition. The idea for the show seems to have originated with Emile Galichon, Editor of Gazette des Beaux-Arts, who suggested it shortly after Ingres' death.[10] Organized by Nieuwerkerke, the show opened on 8 April 1867 and united almost six hundred works "in order to propose them to artists and the public as an education and an example."[11] It included, among other works, l'Apothéose d'Homère (Figure 68) with fifty studies for it, Roger délivrant Angélique, le Voeu de Louis XIII, Jupiter et Thétis. As a demonstration of the methods of a great artist

in the classical tradition, the exhibition was unsurpassed, but it had the reverse effect from that anticipated. Confronted with this magnificent display, one could no longer ignore the poverty of contemporary history painting on display at the Universal Exposition. In his absence, Ingres' influence over the Exposition was thus greater than that of any living artist. His works did serve as "an education and an example," but what his contemporaries learned was that the tradition he represented was exhausted. As the Universal Exposition unfolded, it became universally apparent that the death of Ingres meant, in effect, the death of history painting in France.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

This chapter has been drawn from my article "The Death of History Painting in France, 1867," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1982, 219-26.

1. Théophile Thoré, "Exposition Universelle de 1867," Salons de W. Bürger, 1861 à 1868 avec une préface par T. Thoré, 2 vols., Paris, 1870, II: 385.

2. Ibid., II: 344. Théodore Duret voiced a similar opinion: "Quand on se dit que l'école dont il était le chef se meurt ou est morte, on ne saurait vraiment regretter de voir disparaître avec elle du domaine de la peinture des conceptions abandonnées sans retour, depuis longtemps, pour tous les autres arts et pour la poésie." See Duret, 1867, 18.

3. Léon Lagrange, "Bulletin Mensuel. La Mort de M. Ingres," GBA, 1 février 1867, 206. Ingres was born 29 August 1780 and died 14 January 1867.

4. Léon Lagrange, "Ingres," Le Correspondant 55 (mai 1867): 33. The deceased history painters included Paul Delaroche (1797-1856), Ary Scheffer (1795-1858), Horace Vernet (1788-1863), Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863), Hippolyte Flandrin (1809-1864).

5. DuCamp, 1867, 334; also see Charles Clément, "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts," Journal des Débats, 28 mars 1867.

6. Thoré, Salons, II: 344; Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 avril 1867, 157.

7. Clément, Journal des Débats, 28 mars 1867.

8. See, for example, Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 août 1867, 290.

9. DuCamp, 1867, 334; Paul Mantz, "Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle," GBA, 1 juillet 1867, 7.

10. On a black-bordered page in which he announced the death of Ingres, Galichon at the same time suggested the memorial exhibition: "il ressortira pour notre génération et celle qui nous suit un profond enseignement et pour la France une grande gloire." See Emile Galichon, "La Mort de M. Ingres," GBA 1 février 1867, 105-106. On 10 février 1867, 44, the show was announced in La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité.

11. See the Catalogue des tableaux, études peintes, dessins et croquis de J.A.D. Ingres, Peintre d'Histoire, Sénateur, Membre de l'Institut, exposés dans les galeries du palais de l'Ecole impériale des beaux-arts, Paris, 1867, 1. For Nieuwerkerke's role, see La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 10 février 1867, 44, and 7 avril 1867, 109. The show ran until 15 June, with paintings from public and private collections being added during the entire period; see La Chronique, 24 février, 63; 24 mars, 93; 7 avril, 109, 5 mai 1867, 142-43.

CHAPTER XVII

THE DEATH OF HISTORY PAINTING

> L'étude de l'art européen, tel qu'il s'offre à nous en ce moment, est vraiment bien faite pour nous plonger dans les étonnements les plus singuliers, et--si nous ne tenions ferme--pour nous troubler en nos convictions les plus chères.
>
> --Ernest Chesneau [1]

A major difference between the Universal Exposition of 1855 and that of 1867 was that the awards were made at the end of the first but at the very beginning of the second. The 1867 critiques reflected these decisions and in several cases were structured after them. A discussion of the Jury and its verdicts is thus necessary to introduce any analysis of the reception and influence of the Exposition. The Imperial Commission reserved the right to name the Jury des récompenses from the members of the Jury d'admission, half of whose twenty-four members were thus eliminated. The proportion of two-thirds elected artists and one-third Government appointees was retained.[2] Among the artists, the youngest and the least popular were eliminated, leaving Bida, Cabanel, Français, Fromentin, Gérôme, Meissonier, Pils, Théodore Rousseau. The Government choices were more debatable, for the collectors Cottier and Lacaze were

dropped in favor of Marquis Maison and Comte Welles de La Valette, neither of whom was particularly qualified except as a "Government candidate." The curator Reiset and the critic Paul de Saint-Victor were, however, retained. It was, in general, a well-balanced and representative group, although decidedly conservative. To the French Jury were added fourteen foreigners, one or two from each of the major countries, based on participation. The elected President of the painting Jury, Lord Hardinge, was English, but the appointed President of the Jury de Group, encompassing all the art Juries, was Nieuwerkerke.[3] By taking over Morny's 1855 role, he demonstrated that he had, in the intervening twelve years, become the undisputed art dictator of France.

How different this was from 1855, when the Juries were filled with political appointees, when Morny and Prince Napoléon oversaw even the smallest decisions. Did this reflect changes in the political atmosphere of the 1860s, the growing liberalization and democratization of the Government? Or did it merely reflect the fact that in 1867 neither Napoléon III nor the Imperial Commission considered the Art Exposition important enough to manipulate? To be sure there was no one left who was qualified to do it. Probably all these factors came into play, but, in any case, the Jury seems to have been left to its own devices, and there is little evidence of Government attempts to

interfere.

The Règlement established that there would be 8 Medals of Honor for painting (there had been 9 in 1855), 15 First Class medals (48 in 1855), 20 Second Class medals (51 in 1855), and 24 Third Class medals (57 in 1855). There had also been 222 Honorable Mentions in 1855, but in 1867 none were allowed in Art; Industry, on the other hand, gave 6247. In all, there had been almost six times as many prizes for art in 1855 as were permitted in 1867.[4] As in 1855, the number of medals had been increased during the period of Jury deliberations; unlike 1855, Art was not allowed to share in the largesse. In desperation, the painting Jury asked for permission to reduce the value of the medals and thus award a greater number of them. Permission was refused; La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité reported: "Les beaux-arts, malgré la demande du jury, n'ont eu aucune part dans cette averse inattendue de générosité."[5] Attempting to dissociate itself from the commercialism of the Exposition as a whole, the Art Juries voted to exclude themselves from prizes. The Imperial Commission annulled the vote as contrary to the Règlement which stipulated that members of these Juries were eligible for awards.[6] Charles Blanc stated that the Jury's idealistic gesture had been passed by a weak majority, and that the losers had then appealed to the Imperial Commission:

> Toutefois, la minorité ayant fait appel devant la commission impériale, celle-ci a jugé, en dernier ressort, que les membres du jury ne devaient pas s'exclure du concours, parce que la question de délicatesse personnelle était primée, ici, par un intérêt d'un ordre supérieur, l'intérêt de la France, qui, engagée dans une joûte solennelle, ne pouvait souscrire d'avance à sa défaite, en autorisant l'abdication de ses plus habiles joûteurs. [7]

Despite its qualms, the Jury soon adjusted to the necessity of being eligible for medals. Maxime DuCamp wrote: "Le Jury, du reste, a trouvé immédiatement des compensations, car tous ses membres se sont mutuellement distribué des médailles d'honneur."[8] It was difficult not to be snide under the circumstances: every French Juror was awarded either a Medal of Honor or a First Class medal. One reason for the necessity of obtaining more medals for Art was that the Jury had taken the lion's share for itself.

While the awards were not officially announced until the ceremony of 1 July, the results found their way into the French press at the end of April.[9] The eight recipients of the Medal of Honor for painting were Cabanel (France): history painter; Ussi (Italy), Leys (Belgium), Kaulbach (Bavaria): historical genre painters; Knaus (Prussia), Gérôme, Meissonier (France): genre painters; Rousseau (France): landscape painter. Ernest Chesneau wrote in the official Government report: "Les décisions du Jury international des récompenses ont constaté officiellement l'état de délaissement où la grande peinture est tenue

aujourd'hui en Europe. Parmi les huits médailles d'honneur dont il avait la libre disposition, une seule a pu être accordée à un peintre d'histoire."[10] The shock of this decision reverberated through all the art criticism written in 1867.

Marc de Montifaud, writing in L'Artiste, asked rhetorically: "Est-ce que la muse de l'histoire ne pourrait suivre la muse du progrès?"[11] And Charles Blanc, after surveying the contemporary mediocrities at the Universal Exposition, answered in Le Temps: "On le voit clairement aujourd'hui: douze années ont suffi pour nous désintéresser de la grande peinture."[12] The twelve year interval since 1855 had been marked by decline and attrition in history painting, noted from year to year in the annual Salon reviews. Yet only in 1867 did the confluence of these two major events, the death of Ingres and the Universal Exposition, forcibly demand a reassessment of the direction French art had been taking since the glorious success of 1855. Beginning in 1855, critics had developed the habit of making comprehensive analyses of the state of French art, past, present, and future, at these regular intervals: a large proportion of the major studies of art written in the second half of the nineteenth century were originally written as critiques of Universal Expositions.

In the wake of the first Universal Exposition, 1857

had marked for many critics the end of the era of le style and the beginning of le naturalisme: they were simply observing what was being exhibited as the major history painters were aging, their places being taken by a younger generation uninterested in the ancient verities. In the 1850s, so politically charged was the atmosphere that it was usually the youngest and politically radical critics who remarked the impending demise of la Grande Peinture, considered thoroughly imbued with the values of everything reactionary. Castagnary had written in 1857, in his first Salon:

> La peinture religieuse et la peinture historique ou héroïque se sont graduellement affaiblies, à mesure que s'affaiblissaient comme organismes sociaux, la théocratie et la monarchie auxquelles se réfèrent; leur élimination, à peu près complète aujourd'hui, amène la domination absolue du genre, du paysage, du portrait, qui relèvent de l'individualisme: dans l'art comme dans la société, l'homme devient de plus en plus homme. 13

In 1867 even staunch conservatives were forced to acknowledge this reality. With the demise of history painting, they mourned more than the loss of a great tradition, they mourned the passing of, as Castagnary pointed out, Theocracy and Monarchy.

In addition to Charles Blanc, Léon Lagrange and Marc de Montifaud, other critics joined the funeral cortège. Paul de Saint-Victor wrote: "Il faut à peu près faire son deuil de la peinture d'histoire et de la peinture

religieuse: l'art moderne semble renoncer décidement à poursuivre la forme héroïque et la beauté pure."[14] Ernest Chesneau closed his report on religious painting thus: "Osera-t-on conclure? On ne le fait qu'en tremblant; comment dire, en effet, que l'avenir immédiat de l'art religieux paraît appartenir uniquement aux praticiens."[15]

These conservative critics, by virtue of their age and position, had access to the most important journals. Yet there was another response to these events which manifested itself in the writings of those who were either younger or politically progressive. Théodore Duret, for example, wrote of Ingres and his School: "Quand on se dit que l'école dont il était le chef se meurt ou est morte, on ne saurait vraiment regretter de voir disparaître avec elle du domaine de la peinture des conceptions abandonnées sans retour, depuis longtemps, pour tous les autres arts et pour la poésie."[16] Henry Fouquier wrote in the opposition <u>L'Avenir national</u>: "La réaction, l'appui du gouvernement, qui appelle complaisamment la peinture religieuse la 'grande peinture' et commande volontiers des toiles qui lui valent la réconnaissance des curés de province et les votes des marguilliers, n'ont pu galvaniser cet art mort."[17] And, of course, there was Thoré: "Une société policée ne saurait vivre sans la mythologie païenne et la mythologie catholique. Ce qui constitue le grand art, c'est la perpétuation des vieilles formes étrangères à la vie....

Tout ce qu'ils appellent "de la grande peinture" est banal et insignifiant. Rien à citer dans les tableaux militaires, religieux, allégoriques, ou même historiques. C'est un malheur."[18]

The French School of history painting was, by friend and foe alike, pronounced dead in 1867. But if it had ceased to exist in France, it was at least some comfort to know that history painting was no better off elsewhere. Cornelius, the only other European artist comparable to Ingres, had also died just before the Exposition. Charles Clément announced it thus in Journal des Débats: "Les deux plus illustres représentans des écoles allemande et française, les derniers de cette puissant lignée issue de la Révolution, Ingres et Cornélius, viennent de mourir, presque au même moment, chargés de gloire et de jours."[19]

In 1855, French critics had looked to Germany as the land of philosophy and intellectual painting. Conservatives at that time saw Germany as an ally in preserving traditional values and hierarchy in art. In 1867, German art continued to be seen as linked to the fate of the French School, and the simultaneous deaths of Ingres and Cornelius resulted in an almost superstitious belief that the "Age of History Painting" was now over. Charles Clément wrote of contemporary German painting: "Le grand style que ces hommes distingués et savans, possédés du plus

noble enthusiasme pour les chefs-d'oeuvre d'Athènes et de Florence, éclairés par un goût pur et sévère, échauffés par la ferveur religieuse ou par le sentiment patriotique, ont pris tant de peine pour acclimater en Allemagne, me paraît singulièrement abandonné."[20]

Thus deprived of the two major exponents of history painting, the 1867 Universal Exposition revealed more accurately the true state of contemporary painting.

Cabanel

The one Medal of Honor awarded to a history painter went to Cabanel, a favorite of Napoléon III who had bought both his Naissance de Vénus (Figure 69) and his Nymphe enlevée par un faune. Damned with faint praise by the conservatives, Cabanel was damned outright by the progressives. Only conservatives, after all, were interested in providing an heir to the classical tradition of the French School; progressives couldn't care less and happily consigned it to oblivion. Yet conservatives who truly admired classical painting couldn't help but note the difference between the quality of Ingres and that of Cabanel. Chesneau, for example, wrote of Cabanel:

> Est-ce à dire que ce peintre, dont la fortune a été si heureuse et si prompte, soit un maître qui puisse nous faire oublier ceux que nous regrettons, les Ingres et les Delacroix? Je ne le croix pas, M. Cabanel ne le croit pas lui-même; mais il est vraiment à cette heure un des très-rares peintres qui ne reculent point

> devant une grande composition où le nu joue un rôle important. 21

Several critics mentioned him as a possible successor to Ingres, for who else was there? Fouquier, after noting that one had to leave the Exposition and visit Ingres' memorial show to find history painting, added:"C'est là une anomalie regrettable que nous ne nous expliquons pas, à moins qu'on ait tenu, en écartant Ingres, à être agréable à M. Cabanel."[22] His supporters praised his eighteenth century charm; Marius Chaumelin referred to him as "un Coypel tout pur."[23]

Cabanel's light n ing rise to fame could be attributed to his ability to appeal both to the lascivious tastes of his patrons (such as Napoléon III), and to the last ditch attempt of the Academy to preserve a semblance of the classical tradition. This winning combination was well described by Paul Mantz and Emile Zola. Mantz wrote in Gazette des Beaux-Arts:

> Un certain goût d'arrangement, une certaine recherche des lignes heureuses, demeurent visibles dans ces tableaux; mais les concessions aux appétits vulgaires y sont si nombreuses, le désir de complaire aux curiosités bourgeoises est si lisiblement écrit qu'on s'étonne un peu d'avoir vu réussir des oeuvres si mondaines et, au fond, si agréablement banales.... Il semble qu'il y ait en M. Cabanel deux peintres, l'un qui croit encore aux nobles créations qu'il a admirées à Rome, l'autre qui s'enquiète des gens du monde et qui penche vers l'art galant. 24

Zola frankly detested Cabanel:

> Prenez une Vénus antique, un corps de femme quelconque dessiné d'après les règles sacrées, et, légèrement, avec une houppe, maquillez ce corps de fard et de poudre de riz; vous aurez l'idéal de M. Cabanel. Cet heureux artiste a résolu le difficile problème de rester sérieux et de plaire. Aux gens graves, il dit: "Je suis élève du sage M. Picot, j'ai pâli sur les oeuvres des maîtres, à Rome; voyez mon dessin, il est sobre et correct." Aux gens d'esprit léger il dit: "Je sais sourire, je ne suis pas raide et guindé comme mes anciens collègues de Rome; j'ai la grâce et la volupté, les couleurs tendres et les lignes harmonieuses."
>
> Dès lors, la foule est conquise. Les femmes se pâment et les hommes gardent une attitude respectueuse. [25]

Théophile Thoré, who had been in exile from 1852 to 1859 because of his Republicanism and opposition to Napoléon III, could not help but see Cabanel as successor to Ingres, an official artist, representative of a destested regime. He reminded his readers that Cabanel's exhibition was composed of paintings belonging to the King of Bavaria and the Emperor of the French, and even included a portrait of Rouher, Ministre d'Etat: "On voit que la clientèle correspond au succès."[26] And what a success! "L'heureux homme que M. Cabanel! Quelle chance prodigieuse! douze années de triomphes sans interruption! En 1855, une médaille de 1re classe et un ruban rouge; en 1863, l'Institut; en 1864, la décoration d'officier; en 1865, la grande médaille d'honneur; en 1867, encore la médaille!"[27] The only item that Thoré didn't add was that Cabanel was one of the three professors of painting at the Ecole des beaux-arts. "Ce dernier titre lui assurait une des

médailles d'honneur" was Zola's acid comment.[28]

Historical Genre

One might assume that historical genre painting would supply a ready replacement for history painting, and yet it was particularly loathed by the conservatives who were, in any case, the only ones still interested in history painting. They preferred to see it dead rather than trivialized in works lacking the moral and didactic import of la Grande Peinture. Chesneau wrote: "Le genre historique a, donc, cette infériorité sur tous les autres genres, qu'il rapetisse une langue universelle aux mesquines proportions d'un idiome locale."[29] Charles Blanc thundered "L'antique est sacré: malheur à qui la profane!"[30] Paul Delaroche was the artist held responsible for this hybrid category; as Chesneau explained: "Il a substitué dans l'art l'anecdote historique à l'histoire. Il allait ainsi au-devant des prédilections de la majorité pour l'intérêt du sujet. L'accueil fait à cette tentative par le grand public fut tel que partout en Europe le même principe devait triompher. C'est ce qui est arrivé."[31] Among the Medal of Honor recipients, those who exhibited historical genre included Ussi (Italy), Leys (Belgium), Kaulbach (Bavaria) and Gérôme (France). Ussi was dismissed outright as a political rather than aesthetic choice, for it was widely known that he had ranked lowest in the voting.[32]

Léon Lagrange wrote of his Expulsion du duc d'Athènes (Figure 70): "En accordant à ce tableau une des huit médailles d'honneur de la peinture, le jury en a peut-être exagéré la valeur. Mais comment résister au facile plaisir de créer quelques grands hommes en Italie, pour l'honneur de la politique française?"[33] Chesneau was more tactful: "On conviendra cependant que le jury, qui a accordé une grande médaille d'honneur à M. Stefano Ussi, n'a point mesuré la récompense à la stricte valeur de l'oeuvre."[34] For Charles Blanc, as for most critics, he was "un Paul Delaroche de seconde qualité."[35] Certainly the painting was mediocre, but in truth no more than others so honored. Lagrange wrote for a Catholic review and was, of course, against Napoléon's War of Italian Unification of 1859-60 (as were all the French except the Republicans); it is understandable that he would impute a political motive to the Jury decision. Yet it would have been very difficult in 1867 to manipulate the Jury, as had been done in 1855, and the painting's success might more reasonably be attributed to the fact that it was famous in Italy and had already been successfully exhibited in London and Milan.[36] Italy had one of the largest exhibitions in 1867, was thus entitled to more Jurors than other countries, and loomed large in European consciousness because of the activities of Garibaldi and Cavour. It was only logical that the Jury would seek to honor the best known Italian contemporary

artist.

Leys, on the other hand, seems to have been genuinely popular in France, even being chosen by Maxime DuCamp as the best foreign artist.[37] His work had not changed appreciably since 1855 when he was also awarded a Medal of Honor. Belgian painting continued to be exempt from the criticism usually directed at historical genre painting, for it was considered to be in the Flemish tradition. Thoré could praise him for being nationalist enough to paint the history of his own country, as opposed to that of Greece and Rome: his major entry in 1867 was L'Archduc Charles, âgé de 15 ans (plus tard Charles-Quint) prêtant serment entre les mains des bourgmestre et échevins d'Anvers (Figure 71). Maxime DuCamp could praise his humanity and Paul Mantz the decorative richness of his color.[38] On the conservative side, Ernest Chesneau could praise him as a hedge against the "excesses" of the younger French painters (such as Manet): "Ce que nous admirons également chez M. Leys, c'est sa conscience d'artiste, son amour de la perfection, le respect scrupuleux de son oeuvre, sa haine des négligences qu'on dit affectées et qui le plus souvent servent trop bien à dissimuler l'ignorance...."[39] The only negative criticism Leys received was for his attachment to the past, a sign that he was evaluated more as a genre than a history painter.[40] If quality were the issue, there would be little to choose

between Leys and Ussi, but it was Ussi's misfortune to be practicing a form of genre painting in Italy, the home of the classical tradition. This was an unforgivable offense as far as French critics were concerned.

Kaulbach seems to have been honored more as a replacement for Cornelius than in his own right, in much the same way as Cabanel had replaced Ingres. In both cases, there was evidenced the same decline. Kaulbach's large cartoon L'Epoque de la Réformation (Figure 72) should have entitled him to the rank of history painter, but instead he was widely considered a painter of historical genre, his customary mode. Thoré wrote "Partout des cartons qui tous se ressemblent. On les ferait faire tous, dans une même fabrique, ce serait une économie."[41] It was a criticism particularly just in this case, for L'Epoque de la Réformation bore more than a passing resemblance to La Tour de Babel (Figure 49) which he had shown in 1855. His 1867 contribution represented Luther surrounded by Erasmus, John Huss, Zwingli, Shakespeare, and others, and was described by Ernest Chesneau (who as official critic always tried to be polite) as "un rébus colossal tourné en façon de poème épique par un élève de rhétorique."[42] Others were even less kind; the complaints were the same as had been voiced in 1855. Paul Mantz, for example, wrote "A en croire ces beaux discoureurs, la palette est matérialiste, le pinceau a des instincts grossiers."[43] In 1855 such minor flaws had been

overlooked as German painting was marshalled to the defense of the French Academy and Tradition. In 1867, the battle was over and lost. Only Ussi received fewer votes than Kaulbach, and his Medal of Honor was more a tribute to the past than a recognition of the present.

Historical genre painting might be accepted as being in the Flemish tradition but, Paul Delaroche notwithstanding, it was judged un-French by the critics, although the public loved it. Leys might be praised, but Gérôme was damned. He was attacked with particular viciousness because he had begun in the Grand Tradition--his Siècle d'Auguste (Figure 34) had been exhibited and rewarded in 1855--then had abruptly and ungratefully changed course in 1857 with his Sortie d'un bal masqué (Figure 59), abandoning the lofty heights for a popular success. Charles Blanc remembered and wrote in 1867: "Il descendit des hauteurs de l'histoire dans les familiarités de l'anecdote, et des peintures héroïques à l'ethnographie."[44] Léon Lagrange wrote: "M. Gérôme a réussi à réduire l'antiquité aux proportions mesquines de la peinture de genre."[45] Progressives and conservatives alike detested his historical genre paintings. Théodore Duret wrote:

> Mais si on est dénué de toute pensée véritablement élevée et de toute puissance pour idéaliser quoi que ce soit et qu'on fasse intervenir les souvenirs que rappellent les noms d'Athènes et de Rome pour en tirer des scènes

> drôlatiques, en réduisant les grands hommes qui ont fait la civilisation du monde à une troupe de vieux polissons en goguette ou de bouffons faits pour amuser le public, on est M. Gérôme, et alors on peint les Augures, Phryné devant le tribunal, Socrate chez Aspasie, le Roi Candaule, César et Cléopâtre.... Voici l'antiquité et ses grands hommes arrangés pour faire pendant aux créations auxquelles répond le nom de Guignol. 46

Of all of Gérôme's paintings, it was Phryné devant le tribunal (Figure 73) which drew the most fire: "On ne peut souhaiter une scène plus graveleuse que la Phryné devant l'Aréopage" wrote Marius Chaumelin.[47] The most biting critique came from Zola:

> D'abord, l'artiste choisira le coup de théâtre historique, l'instant où l'avocat, pour défendre Phryné, se contente de lui arracher son vêtement. Ce corps de femme, posé gentiment, fera bien au milieu du tableau. Mais cela ne suffit pas, il faut aggraver en quelque sorte cette nudité en donnant à l'hétaïre un mouvement de pudeur, un geste de petite maîtresse moderne surprise en changeant de chemise.
>
> Cela ne suffit pas encore; le succès sera complet, si le dessinateur parvient à mettre sur les visages des juges des expressions variées d'admiration, d'étonnement, de concupiscence; ces rangées de vieilles faces allumées par le désir seront la pointe suprême du ragoût, les épices qui chatouilleront les palais les plus blasés. Dès lors l'oeuvre est assaisonnée à point. 48

Gérôme's historical genre paintings, Phryné in particular, were attacked as pornographic, as burlesque, as vaudeville, as antiquity done by Offenbach and even compared--unfavorably--to Daumier's caricatures of antiquity. Thoré called it "Peinture comprimée, compressée, constipée, consternée, resserrée,

immobilisée."[49] Of all the artists exhibiting in 1867, it was Gérôme, not Manet or Courbet, who received the harshest criticism. And a Medal of Honor.

Genre

Had Ingres and Cornelius survived, their advanced age would probably have been overlooked and the old verities proclaimed anew. In their absence, a new topography was apparent: genre painting. In his official report, Ernest Chesneau wrote: "A plusieurs reprises, dans le cours de ce travail sur l'art européen à l'Exposition universelle, nous avons signalé l'importance que les écoles étrangères accordent à la peinture de genre. L'Ecole française témoigne des mêmes prédilections."[50] Paul de Saint-Victor noticed the same phenomenon: "Toutes les écoles européennes, comme on peut le voir au Champs-de-Mars, suivent la même pente. Elles descendent de la généralité du type aux particularités de l'individu, des compositions symboliques aux représentations de la vie privée, des modes larges et fiers de l'exécution aux finesses et aux minuties de détail."[51] Critics had noted the same preponderance of genre in the annual Salon, but there it could be dismissed, as it had been for a decade, as a temporary manifestation. At the Exposition Universelle, genre painting was accorded an international success, by a Jury which had a majority of foreign members. For genre was already the Northern

School, the traditional painting of Germany, Holland, Belgium, and England, countries which had escaped, according to Thoré, the pernicious influence of both Catholicism and the dead past.[52] In an attempt to explain this phenomenon, both Thoré and Chesneau discussed at length the concept of Northern vs Mediterranean art. Thoré, who had originated this theory, wrote:

> A la célèbre exhibition de Manchester--il y a dix ans--on imagina, pour la première fois, je pense, de séparer l'histoire des anciennes écoles en deux catégories: écoles du Midi, --écoles du Nord: d'un côté, l'art qui procède du génie antique, grec et latin, en y mêlant plus ou moins, son génie national; de l'autre côté, un art indépendant des traditions méridionales, dégagé des mystagogies païenne et catholique....
>
> En France et en Italie, on peint encore des sujets mythologiques ou des sujets de "sainteté." En Belgique, en Hollande, en Angleterre, dans l'Allemagne septentrionale, la vie courante impressionne les artistes et les dégage des vieilles routines du passé. En France, cette tendance moderne, représentée par Courbet surtout, est encore attaquée par les jurys, par les académies, par les institutions officielles, et même aussi par les critiques les plus autorisés dans la presse. La France semble encore demeurer latine, quand le monde est entraîné à des destinées nouvelles dont le caractère efficace doit être l'universalité.
>
> Les peuples du Nord y vont de bon coeur, et naïvement. Ils ont l'instinct du renouveau, et ils s'y abandonnent. Respecter les morts, mais étudier la vie, nature et humanité, c'est la loi des arts et des lettres, comme de la science, de l'économie sociale et de la philosopohie. 53

Chesneau, comparing Latin to Saxon art, arrived at a set of characteristics typical of each. Latin art, he wrote, is abstract in nature, general in form,

concentrating on the ideal as manifested in the harmony and unity of la Grande Peinture. Saxon art (which he identified with English genre painting) manifests an interest in the real as opposed to the ideal, in the particular, individual detail as opposed to the general form, and in the accidental as opposed to the eternal.[54] The only problem with this chart of national characteristics was that, as Chesneau himself had pointed out, genre was increasingly as popular in the Latin countries, France in particular, as it was in the North.

Underlying the whole discussion of "Northern" vs "Southern" art was the cyclical theory of history, comprising young rising and old declining nations. In the 1840s, Edgar Quinet had articulated the fear that France was among the latter: "La famille des peuples à laquelle nous appartenons étroitement par le sang et l'origine comprend l'Espagne, l'Italie, la France. De ces trois soeurs, les deux premières sont dans le tombeau."[55] In effect, it was a problem which could be discussed economically in terms of rapidly industrializing nations vs stagnant agricultural ones; one could also speak ethnically of Protestant Anglo-Saxon nations given over to "Modernity" and "Progress" vs Latin Catholic attachment to tradition and the past; or, as was done on the occasion of the 1867 Universal Exposition, art critics could analyze the growing importance of genre painting as opposed to the declining

classical tradition. As Thoré pointed out, in all cases the future was to the North.

English Genre

In 1855, English genre painting was seen as the product of the English Constitution, symbol of liberty and individualism, and praised or damned according to the politics of the viewer. By 1867 the French Empire itself had become liberal, the negative aspects of England's rapid industrialization, the vast urban slums, were well known in France, and the Crimean War was over. England receded from the forefront of French consciousness, and English art lost its special significance. The two veteran critics of 1855, Maxime DuCamp and Paul Mantz, now expressed a kind of bewildered disappointment; they could not figure out what had changed. Maxime DuCamp suggested that perhaps the 1867 British exhibition was inferior to that of 1855 (he wasn't quite sure), or perhaps the shock of the first encounter with British art was now gone. In truth, it was his perceptions which had changed. England for him was no longer the land of liberty as manifest in its genre painting; it had now become synonymous with the worst characteristics of the Bourgeoisie, reflected in its favorite art form, genre painting.

> L'école du Royaume-Uni ne peut parvenir à se dégager de préoccupations puériles; elle ressemble à la vie de la société anglaise, tout y est prévu, réglé, mesuré d'avance; elle n'ose

> s'écarter des très-étroites limites qu'elle s'est imposées et où elle étouffe. Nul entrain, nulle hardiesse, nulle folie; une platitude bourgeoise proprette et bien peignée, regardant la nature par le petit bout de la lorgnette et cherchant à la rendre par l'inconcevable fini du détail. Ces tableaux paraissent vus avec des verres de presbyte; tout est rapetissé, diminué, étudié brin à brin et jamais dans l'ensemble. 56

Paul Mantz wrote of the English School: "Considérée dans son ensemble, elle est, nous l'avons dit, moins satisfaisante qu'en 1855 et surtout moins originale."[57] The best he could do for an explanation was to suggest that England, like France, had lost its best artists; actually Mulready was the only loss among those who had been highly praised in 1855. Ernest Chesneau, who was not a veteran of 1855, was even more bewildered: "S'il est vrai, comme nous l'avons dit, que la peinture anglaise choque si fortement nos habitudes d'art par la violente crudité de son coloris, par le défaut d'équilibre en ses compositions, par le particularisme de ses motifs, comment donc expliquer la vogue dont elle fut l'objet en 1855 auprès de notre public français?"[58] Fortunately the question was rhetorical because, in fact, he couldn't answer it.

English art, as reflected in the 1867 Exposition, had not changed that much. If the sensation of 1855 had been Millais' Ophelia (Figure 55), that of 1867 was his Veille de la Sainte-Agnès. Most of the critics praised it, Thoré describing it as "un singulier mélange de réalisme et de poésie" and calling Millais "un grand artiste."[59] Thoré in

1867 was the most militantly political of critics and was, in fact, the only one who saw English art in terms reminiscent of 1855: "L'école anglaise a sur les autres écoles, cet avantage, qu'elle est jeune, que sa tradition nationale date à peine d'un siècle et demi, qu'elle n'est pas empêtrée comme les arts du continent, dans les vieilles théories gréco-latines, qu'elle est dégagée à la fois de la mythologie païenne et du mysticisme catholique."[60] The majority opinion, however, among Jury members as well as critics, was more accurately stated by Marius Chaumelin: "Le dédain de la manière académique, l'horreur des poncifs, la spontanéité, la franchise et l'originalité qui font de l'école anglaise une école si intéressante malgré ses écarts, toutes ces qualités se retrouvent chez la plupart des peintres belges et hollandais, jointes à une exécution plus agréable, à un sentiment plus intime et plus profond de la réalité."[61] Having lost the special significance it enjoyed in 1855, English genre painting in 1867 was perceived as no better or worse than that of other countries, and in fact, England received no Medal of Honor, and very few medals at all.[62] Genre painting had become an international phenomenon, and the long discussions of 1855 on English vs French art had developed into a more general analysis of Northern vs Southern art. English art in 1867 was swallowed up into the general concept of Northern or "Saxon" art. In France in the late 1860s, that meant

Germany.

German Genre

Germany was the only "country" besides France to receive more than one Medal of Honor in 1867, for both Kaulbach (Bavaria) and Ludwig Knaus (Prussia) were honored. Altogether Germany received more medals than any other nation, a total of eight, thus taking the place of England as France's chief aesthetic--and political--rival.[63]

The German exhibition of 1867, unlike that of 1855, was filled with little genre paintings. As incontrovertable proof that the old order had changed, Düsseldorf, once the home of history painting, was now the center of genre. Paul Mantz wrote: "Düsseldorf qui, dans l'origine, était le grand atelier des peintures symboliques, religieuses, légendaires, est devenu le centre d'une école spirituelle, attendrie et au besoin un peu pleurante, qui, sans trop se préoccuper des mythes, raconte la vie des paysans, des bourgeois, des gens de peu de conséquence.[64]

The preponderance of genre painting in Germany was not something that had happened abruptly since 1855. Here, as in France, the same generational process had been taking place, the history painters aging, younger painters turning

increasingly to genre. In both countries, the death of the most esteemed history painter had suddenly revealed the true state of contemporary art.

Thoré had divided German art into that of Bavaria in the South, the Munich School, influenced by the classical tradition, Kaulbach its pre-eminent artist, and Prussia in the North, Düsseldorf its capital, given over to genre scenes of contemporary life; Ludwig Knaus was its leading painter.[65] Since the 1866 Battle of Sadowa, Prussia had been perceived as the major political threat to France, and so it was logical for critics to declare genre painting the "real" German art. Charles Clément wrote:

> Les artistes allemands, cèdent-ils à un entraînement général, ou bien l'introduction du grand art, sous ce ciel ennemi, était-elle une tentative impossible? Il faut le dire, il y avait peut-être quelque-chose d'artificiel dans ce mouvement, et, en revenant au genre, il se pourrait que les peintres allemands ne méconnussent pas leur génie propre, mais qu'il revinssent purement et simplement à l'ordre de sujets qui convient le mieux à leur tempérament.[66]

In 1855, French critics were confronted with the same artists but had seen in German art the reflections of a different set of circumstances at home, and had arrived at the opposite conclusion, pronouncing the classical and philosophical painting of Southern Germany to be the only authentic German art.

Ludwig Knaus (Figure 74) was unanimously accepted, if

not praised, as the leader of the Düsseldorf School of genre painters. He was no stranger to the French public, for he had lived in France, and from the early 1850s he showed regularly in the Paris Salon. Considered in France an artist of secondary importance, lacking grand ambitions, his witty little genre paintings were enormously popular in Germany,[67] Thoré declaring him its most expensive painter. In France, however, it was necessary even for genre painting to preserve something of the elevated and universal: Breton and Meissonier were mentioned as examples Knaus would do well to emulate, and humor in art was definitely unacceptable.[68] Fortunately for Knaus, the Jury was not made up of French art critics; he was awarded a Medal of Honor.

Japanese Genre

Genre seemed to be everywhere in 1867, even in Japan. As part of its exhibition, the Japanese Government had sent fourteen sketchbooks of the Mangwa of Hokusai, presenting a veritable encyclopedia of human activities[69] (Figure 75). It was described thus by Chesneau:

> Pris au jour de jour, sur nature, dans le mouvement des villes et des ports, dans l'enceinte des théâtres, dans les arènes de lutteurs, au bord des fleuves, sur les rivages de la mer, dans les champs, dans les forêts, partout où le poussait son humeur aventureuse et voyageuse.... Les scènes de la vie privée y sont retracées et aussi celles de la place publique: toilettes de femmes, causeries intimes, petits concerts de famille, rixe entre gens du peuple,

> exercices acrobates, de jongleurs, d'archers, jeux d'enfants, caricatures, grotesques, etc. etc. 70

And what did this remind him of? "L'analogie est frappante, en effet entre ces peintures de l'extrême Orient et celles des écoles flamande et hollandaise; précisément elles rappellent l'humeur et en même temps la fidélité peu raffinée que Teniers, Ostade, Jean Steen apportaient à la représentation des scènes populaires." 71 The Japanese exhibition also included painted screens; Zacharaie Astruc described their reception as more enthusiastic than that accorded any other exhibition in 1867:

> Il y en a deux ici, qui servent de fond à nos Circés. L'un, d'une tonalité sombre, poudré d'or, peint des scènes familières; l'autre, un chef d'oeuvre, envié tour à tour par nos peintres, par les écrivains; par les plus enragés collectionneurs: Stevens; --Diaz; --le gothique Tissot; l'érudit M. Villot, du Louvre; --l'aimable aquarelliste Favard; --Alphonse Legros, venu de Londres pour se réjouir de la vue de ces princesses; --Chesneau, qui s'exclame et s'enthousiasme, emporté par cette fraîcheur d'imagination; --Champfleury, que sa passion pour les chats suffirait seule à conduire au Japon, leur pays de prédilection; --Solon, le prince de la céramique, l'érudit, le spirituel Athénien, dont le goût ne saurait pécher; --Bracquemond, qui élève un temple en faïence à ses maîtres orientaux; --Fantin, étonné de retrouver en eux le Delacroix de ses rêves; --Burty, admirateur passionné et savant, collectionneur infatigable; --les de Goncourt, profonds connaisseurs; Manet, qu'une telle personnalité transporte; --Lambron, rejoui par des originalités si primesautières; --Claude Monet, fidèle émule d'Hoksai; --et moi-même, qui, le premier à Paris (cette gloire me sera-t-elle au moins réservée?...) ai voulu écrire la grandeur et l'exquisité de leur production. 72

The formal influence of Japanese art has been widely discussed, as has the exoticism of its decorative art, admired by artists such as Stevens and Whistler.[73] Certainly 1867 marked its apogee but, at the same time, in the context of the Universal Exposition, artists and critics could not help but identify it with the European interest in scenes from everyday life, namely genre painting.

French Genre

Despite attempts to define genre painting as "un-French," it had, in fact, flourished in France with the art of the brothers Le Nain, Chardin and Greuze. In earlier periods, however, it existed and even thrived as a minor category in the hierarchy of painting. In 1867 it threatened to become a major one. Léon Lagrange wrote: "Il y a trente ans, qu'un ministre employât les deniers publics à l'achat d'un tableau de genre, on regardait comme un événement cette dérogation aux habitudes officielles. Aujourd'hui tout va là."[74] While it is impossible to give a simple answer to the complex question of why history painting declined and was replaced by genre, one must at least give credence to the opinions of the most thoughtful contemporary observers. Ernest Chesneau, a conservative, and Théodore Duret, a progressive, each cited as the cause

changes in the material conditions of life. They pointed to the growing number of both artists and collectors, and in particular the change from a small audience of highly cultivated collectors, the Aristocracy, to an enormous and relatively unsophisticated art-buying public who, with smaller fortunes and smaller living quarters, were not interested in large pictures or heroic themes.[75] Chesneau's Government report was, in fact, a polemic directed against the taste of this class, the Bourgeoisie, the most powerful economic class in nineteenth-century France. He wrote:

> La mélodie des contours, l'harmonie de la couleur lui échappent d'une façon absolue et sont pour lui lettre close. Etant donné ce défaut de préparation chez le public, étant connu le caractère de futilité qu'il apporte au jugement des oeuvres d'art, il n'est pas étonnant que ses prédilections s'adressent presque exclusivement à la peinture de genre. Ce qui leur plaît, ce qui a le don de les charmer, c'est uniquement l'anecdote gracieuse, aimable, quelquefois l'anecdote historique, parfois aussi une scène de moeurs anecdotique empruntée à la vie élégante de notre temps, ou à la vie cavalière et à la vie de cour des derniers siècles: mais toujours l'anecdote. [76]

Chesneau closed his discussion with a thundering condemnation: "En resumé: petits cadres, petits sujets, petite peinture."[77]

Théodore Duret devoted an entire chapter in his book Les Peintres français en 1867 to an attack on what he termed "L'Art bourgeois," whose distinguishing characteristics were vulgarity and mediocrity, a

narrow-minded outlook on life, and a range of emotions characteristic of the Bourgeoisie: "Toute production doit à la longue s'adapter exactement au goût des consommateurs, de ceux qui la font maître ou qui l'encouragent."[78] The preferred art of the Bourgeoisie, genre painting, Duret described thus:

> La seule raison d'être est une demande de petits tableaux destinés à servir d'objets d'ameublement et à figurer dans certains intérieurs au même titre que les potiches ou les chinoiseries. Il s'en fabrique, du reste, pour toutes les catégories d'acheteurs: il y a des scènes d'intérieur et des sujets familiers pour les personnes qui aiment les choses honnêtes d'aspect: des scènes égrillardes et des femmes nues pour ceux qui ont des goûts contraires; des animaux et des paysages pour les gens qui aiment la nature, ou qui, du moins, croient l'aimer et la comprendre. [79]

The attack on the Bourgeoisie as the corrupter of art originated in the first half of the ninetenth century with conservatives of all stripes who wished to demonstrate that, in the absence of Throne and Altar, art could not survive. By 1867 the attack had become general, embracing conservatives and progressives alike, for both groups demanded transcendent qualities of art. The "evidence" of Bourgeois decadence was no longer the ascent of Delacroix or Courbet, but the torrent of little pictures distinguished, as Duret said, chiefly by their vulgarity and mediocrity, which threatened to swamp French art. Among the legion of artists who devoted themselves to this category of painting, two stood out, Gérôme and Meissonier.

Gérôme

Condemned though he was for his historical genre painting, Gérôme's "ethnographic" painting was highly praised by the critics (Figure 76). Even conservative Charles Blanc could write "L'ethnographie, c'est là qu'il excelle."[80] La Peinture ethnographique was, of course, just a new name for l'orientalisme, the genre paintings of North Africa and the Near East that were the by-product of French colonial adventurism, and had been popular in France since Marilhat, Decamps and Delacroix.[81] As Romanticism gave way to Positivism, the romance and exoticism of far-off places was (supposedly) replaced by scientific observation of the customs of the natives. But this was a matter of semantics; the motifs had hardly changed at all.

Precisely because ethnographic painting did not tread on the sacred traditions of history painting, it could be highly praised by both progressives and conservatives: it offered subjects from modern life, but as exotic as any subject from literary sources, and it combined observation with research. Ernest Chesneau wrote: "L'art qui reproduit les sites et les types des contrées avoisinant les confins de notre Europe, soit au delà, soit en deça, la peinture ethnographique, est un genre absolument moderne, sans tradition, sans racines dans le passé, appartenant en propre à l'école française contemporaine, et ce ne sera pas

le rayon le moins brillant de notre couronne aux yeux de la postérité."[82] The most distinguished Orientalist in 1867, Gérôme, had overtaken even Fromentin, now that Decamps and Delacroix were both dead. Thoré wrote: "S'il est burlesque dans ses sujets grecs et romains, Alcibiade ou César, et dans ses sujets historiques, Rembrandt ou Molière, il a une certaine personnalité dans ses représentations de l'Orient moderne."[83] Léon Lagrange, his opposite in every way, agreed: "M. Gérôme a réussi à réduire l'antiquité aux proportions mesquines de la peinture de genre. Au contraire, lorsqu'il touche à la vie moderne de l'Orient, il la grandit par le style."[84]

Despite the reservations of the critics, Gérôme was enormously popular both with collectors who bought his paintings and the general public which purchased engravings of his genre paintings in various modes, historical, contemporary and ethnographic. Zola wrote:

> Ici, le sujet est tout, la peinture n'est rien: la reproduction vaut mieux que l'oeuvre. Tout le secret du métier consiste à trouver une idée triste ou gaie, chatouillant la chair ou le coeur, et à traiter ensuite cette idée d'une façon banale et jolie qui contente tout le monde.
>
> Il n'y a pas de salon de province où ne soit pendue une gravure représentant le Duel au sortie d'un bal masqué ou Louis XIV et Molière, dans les ménages de garçons on rencontre l'Almée et Phryné devant le tribunal; ce sont là des sujets piquants qu'on peut se permettre entre hommes. Les gens plus graves ont les Gladiateurs ou la Mort de César.

M. Gérôme travaille pour tous les goûts. [85]

Zola was, to be sure, a hostile witness to Gérôme's success, but Chesneau mentioned the same emphasis on anecdote that he detested in all genre painting, supplying an additional explanation in formalist terms: "En ce temps où l'on se contente facilement d'une ébauche rapide et de première impression, il est de ceux qui apportent encore une conscience extrême à leur travail, et n'abandonnent leur oeuvre qu'après y avoir mis toute la somme de talent qu'ils pouvaient y mettre."[86] These were the same terms in which he praised Cabanel, leaving no doubt that for him (and this was repeated by most of the critics), the primary aesthetic division was between sketch and fini. For in facture, if not in subject matter, genre had much in common with history painting, both being based on painstaking and detailed studies after nature, combined in the studio into synthetic and highly finished compositions.

Gérôme was indeed a genre painter such as Duret and Zola had described, working for all tastes. If he did not have the enormous success among critics that he had with the public, it was because conservatives could never forgive his treason of 1857, and progressives could never forgive his vulgarity.

Meissonier

Meissonier received the Medal of Honor with more votes

than anyone else. Not only the Jury loved him, but he was praised by the critics as well: this was a genre painter even a conservative could like. Marius Chaumelin wrote:

> A l'inverse de M. Gérôme, qui a commencé par être peintre d'histoire, suivant la haute acceptation du mot, et qui a fini par se renfermer dans la peinture de genre, M. Meissonier délaisse, depuis quelque temps, les petits sujets anonymes et légèrement insignifiants--joueurs, fumeurs, liseurs, musiciens, amateurs de tableaux--qui lui ont valu sa réputation, et aborde courageusement les grandes scènes historiques. 87

While it was not true that Meissonier had abandoned genre subjects (Figure 77), his larger battle paintings (Figure 78) served to make him acceptable both to those who hated genre (the conservatives) and those who criticized his exclusive concentration on subjects from the past (the progressives). With the exception of Thoré who, true to his politics, found the military paintings "souvenirs de chauvinisme" (the Republican criticism of Vernet in 1855) the critics roundly applauded them.[88]

It was his tiny genre paintings, however, which commanded enormous prices and brought him fame and fortune, not just in France, but in all of Europe and America. The double appeal Chesneau described, of form (the finely detailed, highly polished surface) and subject (the anecdote) was analyzed by Zola as attracting two different social classes. He presented them as admiring the "figurines" in a Meissonier painting:

Cependant, à côté de moi, deux amateurs, la loupe à la main, regardaient une des figurines. L'un d'eux s'écria brusquement: "L'oreille y est tout entière. Regardez donc l'oreille. L'oreille est impayable." L'autre amateur regarda l'oreille qui, à l'oeil nu, paraissait un peu plus grosse qu'une tête d'épingle, et quand il eut bien constaté que l'oreille existait dans son intégralité, ce furent des exclamations sans fin d'admiration et d'enthousiasme. Puis les deux amateurs étudièrent les autres morceaux de la figurine et déclarèrent ne jamais avoir rien vu de plus délicat, de plus vif, de plus fin, de plus spirituel, de plus fini, de plus ferme, de plus précis, de plus parfait.

Pendant que ces deux messieurs, qui avaient fait leurs classes et qui protégaient sans doute les arts, s'exclamaient à ma droite, un couple bourgeois, une grosse dame et un gros monsieur, sentant encore la canelle et la mélasse qu'ils avaient vendues pendant trente ans, se tenaient à ma gauche, muets de contentement. Enfin, ils comprenaient la peinture. Après avoir regardé quelques centaines de tableaux qu'ils avaient trouvés fort laids, sans oser le dire tout haut, ils rencontraient des images qui leur convenaient. La grosse dame murmurait: "Seigneur, que c'est joli, que c'est joli!" Et le gros monsieur répondait: "Oh! oui, c'est joli, c'est bien joli!"

Alors, le voile se déchira. Je compris tout d'un coup le talent, l'immense talent de M. Meissonier. L'admiration des amateurs et du couple bourgeois venait enfin de me faire juger sainement ce peintre qui a le don rare de plaire à tous, même--surtout, allais-je dire--à ceux qui n'aiment pas la peinture. 89

Zola concluded by announcing "Le tour consiste à être habile et à faire joli."[90]

Meissonier did both. While critics compared him to the seventeenth century little Dutch masters, collectors appreciated his painstaking facture, and the general public

loved the story. He was acclaimed the best genre painter in Europe and, now that Ingres was dead, the hope of the French School. Charles Blanc, partisan of le style, demonstrated the truth of Victor Cousin's thought that in troubled times room could be found in one's conscience for many more phenomena than previously admitted:[91] he managed to find a way of making Meissonier acceptable. On 12 April he wrote:

> Mais, dès à présent, nous avons le droit d'affirmer que la France laisse bien loin derrière elle toutes les autres nations, non-seulement parce qu'elle leur est supérieure dans la décoration murale et dans la grande peinture, mais encore parce qu'elle les surpasse dans l'art anecdotique, personne en Europe, ne pouvant s'égaler à Meissonier, par exemple, pour ce qu'on appelle les tableaux de genre, ou l'histoire en petit. [92]

On 5 June, after the Medals of Honor had been announced in the press, he wrote: "L'exposition de Meissonier n'a pas d'égale en son genre, ni en France, ni ailleurs.... Une qualité admirable de Meissonier, et capitale dans son art, c'est la finesse de l'observateur, la perspicacité étonnante du physionomiste.... C'est le dernier mot de l'art de peindre grandement en petit."[93] And he began his critique of French painting with Meissonier, an honor which, in 1855, critics had reserved for Ingres.

Other critics did the same. Paul Mantz wrote "Tout bien considéré, il n'y a qu'un Meissonier en Europe, et il est des nôtres," and he pronounced him "le héros de

l'Exposition française."[94] Within a few months of the death of Ingres, and after the awards decisions had become known, L'Artiste announced: "C'est Meissonier qu'on place maintenant à la tête de l'école française. On voit son nom venir toujours en première ligne. Le public français sait donc officiellement quels sont les premiers peintres officiels de la période actuelle. Ce n'est plus Ingres, c'est Meissonier."[95]

Only then, after he had already achieved a popular success, did the Government concur, promoting him to Commandeur de la Légion d'honneur.[96] He would eventually be the most decorated artist in nineteenth century France, for while Ingres was the first to be named Grand Officier de la Légion d'honneur, Meissonier would eventually outrank him as Grand Commandeur. Meissonier's canonization as the leader of the French School was, then, the result of international as well as French taste. His rise had been accelerated in 1855 by Prince Albert's choosing him over all other French artists; a majority of his collectors, listed in the Exposition catalogue, were foreign, particularly English, and in 1867 it was the international Jury which voted him the world's leading artist. This had particular influence in France during a time when a major French fear was that it was doomed to be part of the declining Mediterranean South as opposed to the modern and industrial North, Germany and England in particular.

Northern art was genre painting; the Protestant emphasis on "modern life" seemed to be the wave of the future more than the classicizing, backward looking, Catholic Southern tradition, so bitterly attacked by Thoré.

Genre painting in 1867 seemed to be the only area of art which could provide an international supremacy for France, equivalent to that previously enjoyed in history painting. Maxime DuCamp wrote: Il ne suffit pas d'être les plus forts, il faut être forts sans comparaison, au point de vue absolu."[97] Only genre painting, and only Meissonier, could provide that kind of victory. So much the better that it was already the preference of the Bourgeoisie and of a growing number of artists who could find in it a sure livelihood. So much the worse for critics such as Chesneau, who could see in it only "Petits cadres, petits sujets, petite peinture."

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVII

1. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 88.

2. Règlement fixant la nature des récompenses et organisant les jurys chargés de les répartir, 9 juin 1866, in 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 24, 173-78.

3. Ibid. Also see Arrêté nommant les membres français du jury des récompenses pour le premier groupe (oeuvres d'art), 4 mars 1867, Arrêté fixant la répartition détaillée des membres étrangers du jury des récompenses par pays, par groupe et par classe, 29 novembre 1866, Arrêté fixant la publication de la liste définitive du jury, 25 mars 1867; 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 26, 188-95. The list of members of the Jury des récompenses was published in the 1868 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., X-XII. Among those eliminated, Baudry, Breton, Brion were the youngest members of the Jury d'admission; Couture, Jalabert, Dauzats ranked lowest in the voting; Hébert was in Rome, Gleyre was Swiss.

4. 1867 Documents Officiels, N° 24, 9 juin 1866, 173-178. The Beaux-Arts as a whole received 17 Medals of Honor (Industry 66), 32 First Class Medals (Industry 1144), 44 Second Class Medals (Industry 4411), 46 Third Class Medals (Industry 7388); in addition, there were 6247 Honorable Mentions for Industry, none for Art; totals are from the 1867 Commission Impériale, Rapport, 207.

5. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 19 mai 1867, 158-59. For the Jury request, see the Archives du Louvre, Exposition Universelle de 1867, XU 2, "Extrait du procès verbal de la séance du 22 avril du Jury International de peinture." The refusal of the Imperial Commission to allow a reduction in the value of medals was reported in La Chronique, 28 avril 1867, 133.

6. See A. Louvrier de Lajolais, "Exposition Universelle," La Chronique, 14 avril 1867, 115. Emile Galichon referred to this disagreement in his article "Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle," GBA, 1 mai 1867, 409-414. There is a letter in the Archives du Louvre, Exposition Universelle de 1867, XU 20, from Nieuwerkerke to le Ministre d'Etat (Rouher), 28 avril 1867, asking for the letter "écrite par un certain nombre des Membres du Jury" on 14 April, but the letter itself has not been preserved.

7. Charles Blanc, "Exposition Universelle de 1867. Beaux-Arts," Le Temps, 15 mai 1867.

8. DuCamp, 1867, 296; also see Thoré, Salons, II: 349.

9. See "Petits Evénements," Le Figaro, 26, 29 avril 1867; Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 mai 1867, 325; La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 12 mai 1867, 148-49. The list of prize winners was published in Le Moniteur Universel, 5 juillet 1867, 871 and in the 1868 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages....

10. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury, I: 52.

11. Marc de Montifaud (Mme Léon Quivogne de Montifaud), "Salon de 1867. La Peinture historique," L'Artiste, 1 juin 1867, 456. Montifaud reviewed both the Universal Exposition and the Salon of 1867 together.

12. Blanc, Le Temps, 15 mai 1867.

13. Castagnary, "Philosophie du Salon de 1857," Salons, I-7.

14. Saint-Victor, La Presse, 9 mai 1867; Saint-Victor discussed both exhibitions together.

15. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury, I: 65; also see Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 216.

16. Duret, 1867, 18.

17. Henry Fouquier, "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts," L'Avenir National, 18 avril 1867.

18. Thoré, "Exposition Universelle de 1867," Salons, II: 350, 361.

19. Clément, Journal des Débats, 28 mars 1867; also see Paul Mantz, "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts," L'Illustration, 23 novembre 1867, 331, Blanc, Le Temps 19 juin 1867, Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1003.

20. Clément, Journal des Débats, 11 avril 1867.

21. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 171; Chesneau's unflattering comments on Cabanel were omitted from the official report.

22. Fouquier, L'Avenir National, 18 avril 1867; also see Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 997.

23. Marius Chaumelin, "Exposition Universelle de 1867," in his L'Art Contemporain, Paris, 1873, 101. Chaumelin's critique originally appeared in La Revue Moderne.

24. Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 323.

25. Zola, "Nos Peintres au Champ de Mars," Salons, 111.

26. Thoré, Salons, II: 350.

27. Ibid., II: 349.

28. Zola, Salons, 110.

29. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 101. This negative judgment on historical genre painting was omitted from the 1867 Rapports du Jury.

30. Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867.

31. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury, I: 49.

32. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité published the names of the Medal of Honor recipients as having recived votes in the following order: Meissonier, Cabanel, Gérôme, Leys, Knaus, Théodore Rousseau, Kaulbach, Ussi; 12 mai 1867, 148. Ussi's name was omitted entirely in the lists published in "Petits Evénements," Le Figaro, 26 April 1867 and by Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 mai 1867, 325.

33. Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1006.

34. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 159; omitted from the 1867 Rapports du Jury.

35. Blanc, Le Temps, 19 juin 1867; also see Clément, Journal des Débats, 27 octobre 1867; Mantz, GBA, 1 septembre 1867, 223-24; DuCamp, 1867, 299.

36. DuCamp, 1867, 299; Clément, Journal des Débats, 27 octobre 1867.

37. DuCamp, 1867, 346.

38. Thoré, Salons, II: 373; DuCamp, 1867, 315; Mantz, GBA, 1 juillet 1867, 9-12.

39. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 91-92.

40. Ibid.; also see DuCamp, 1867, 316.

41. Thoré, Salons, II: 416.

42. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 134; omitted from

the 1867 Rapports du Jury.

43. Mantz, GBA, 1 août 1867, 134.

44. Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867.

45. Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1012.

46. Duret, 1867, 72-73; also see Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 324.

47. Chaumelin, 103.

48. Zola, Salons, 112-13.

49. Thoré, Salons, II: 350-51; also see Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867; Chaumelin, 103-104; Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 324.

50. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury, I: 71; he stated it more forcefully in Les Nations rivales, 241.

51. Saint-Victor, Journal des Débats 9 mai 1867; also see Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1003.

52. Thoré, Salons, II: 371. Also see Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 156, 244; it is a theme which Chesneau reiterated throughout his study.

53. Thoré, Salons, II: 371.

54. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 5-6.

55. Edgar Quinet, 1815 et 1840. Deuxième édition, augmentée d'une préface, Paris, 1840; originally published 1840. Also see Koenraad W. Swart, The Sense of Decadence in Nineteenth Century France, The Hague, 1964, 213-57.

56. DuCamp, 1867, 312.

57. Mantz, L'Illustration, 2 novembre 1867, 283.

58. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 9.

59. Thoré, Salons II: 403; also see Mantz, GBA, 1 septembre 1867, 211.

60. Thoré, Salons, II: 400.

61. Chaumelin, 79.

62. The glaring omission was Millais who should have received a Medal of Honor; he probably refused to accept

anything less and so received nothing at all. A First Class medal went to Calderon, Second Class to Nicol, Third Class to Q. Orchadson and Walker.

63. Besides Kaulbach and Leys, First Class Medals went to Horschelt and Piloty (Bavaria); Second Class to Menzel (Prussia); Third Class to André Achenbach (Prussia), F. Adam, and Lenbach (Bavaria). Lagrange was horrified that even for Germany the medals had gone to genre and landscape rather than history painting; see Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1003.

64. Mantz, GBA, 1 août 1867, 144; also see Thoré, Salons, II: 425.

65. Thoré, Salons, II: 416.

66. Clément, Journal des Débats, 11 avril 1867.

67. Thoré, Salons, II: 427.

68. Blanc, Le Temps, 19 juin 1867; DuCamp, 1867, 324-25; Mantz, GBA, 1 août 1867, 194-95.

69. See Catalogue de produits et objets d'art japonais composant la collection envoyée du Japon pour l'Exposition Universelle de 1867, Paris, 1868; it is incomplete.

70. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 421.

71. Ibid., 441.

72. Zacharie Astruc, "Le Japon Chez Nous," L'Etendard, 26 mai 1868. Despite its late publication, the article was identified by Philippe Burty as having been written about the 1867 Exposition; see his "Bibliographique," La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 14 juin 1868, 95. Astruc contributed a series of unreadable critiques to L'Etendard in 1867 and was probably fired before he could inflict this last one on the public.

73. See Society for the Study of Japonisme in Art, Japonisme in Art. An International Symposium, Yamada Chisaburo, ed., Tokyo, 1980, and Cleveland Museum of Art, Japonisme. Japanese Influence on French Art, 1854-1910, Cleveland, 1975-76.

74. Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1010.

75. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury I: 71-73; he discussed this at greater length in his Les Nations rivales 168-71; Duret, 1867, 117-23.

76. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury I: 72-73, Les Nations rivales, 242-44.

77. Chesneau in 1867 Rapports du Jury I: 73, Les Nations rivales, 244.

78. Duret, 1867, 135.

79. Ibid., 139.

80. Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867.

81. On the significance of Orientalism, see Linda Nochlin, "The Imaginary Orient," Art in America, May 1983, 118-130, 187-91.

82. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 311; also see Chaumelin, 104C and Duret, 1867, 77.

83. Thoré. Salons, II: 351.

84. Lagrange, Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 1012.

85. Zola, Salons, 112.

86. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 220.

87. Chaumelin, 104D; also see Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867.

88. Thoré, Salons, II: 352; also see Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 246-47; Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 321.

89. Zola, Salons, 109.

90. Ibid.

91. Cousin, Oeuvres, I: 129.

92. Blanc, Le Temps, 12 avril 1867.

93. Blanc, Le Temps, 5 juin 1867.

94. Mantz, L'Illustration, 23 novembre 1867, 331, and GBA 1 octobre 1867, 322; also see Duret, 70.

95. Pierre Dax, "Chronique des Beaux-Arts," L'Artiste, 1 mai 1867, 325.

96. By the decree of 29 juin 1867, Meissonier was made Commandeur of the Légion d'honneur; AN Légion d'honneur 1818, d. 30: Jean Louis Ernest Meissonier.

97. DuCamp, 1867, 346.

CHAPTER XVIII

LANDSCAPE--THE PATH NOT TAKEN

In the eyes of most critics, the major division in 1867 was between works of le style, that is, classical in inspiration, and le naturalisme, a category which encompassed both genre and landscape. Yet despite the popularity and consequent triumph of genre, the major critics preferred landscape painting. In contrast to 1855, when there was general agreement among the public, the critics, the Jury, and the Government on the major artists, in 1867 the critics did not ratify the popular choices. Those choices may have accurately reflected popular taste, but that taste was now sufficiently divergent from that of the critics to result in a schism. This schism would be characteristic of the modern period.

Ernest Chesneau was a partisan of le style; nonetheless he wrote: "Si nous comparions entre elles ces diverses manifestations du sens artistique, c'est au paysage qu'il faudrait accorder, non la préférence peut-être, mais le prix d'excellence."[1] Throughout his critique of the Exposition, he repeated this judgment, albeit reluctantly:

> Aussi n'y a-t-il pas à s'en dédire, en dépit de nos réserves: le paysage sera pour l'avenir le titre de gloire le moins contesté, sinon le plus grand, de l'école française contemporaine.... C'est parmi les paysagistes que l'on compte le moins de médiocrités et le plus de talents; c'est dans le paysage surtout que nos peintres se montrent originaux, sincères, passionément épris de la vérité, curieux de tout effet pittoresque nouveau, cherchant sans rélâche à pénétrer les secrètes leçons de leur maître unique: la Nature.[2]

In conclusion he stated: "En effet, sauf d'illustres exceptions dans les autres genres, le paysage a trouvé la voie offerte à l'art moderne, celle de la sincérité."[3] Positive though he was about the future of landscape painting, these remarks were edited out of his official Government report. Nonetheless, his judgment was echoed by his fellow critics. Thoré, an admirer of Dutch painting, preferred genre, and yet he too had to confess "En conscience, c'est la peinture de paysage qui illustrera l'école française du dix-neuvième siècle."[4] And Théodore Duret, future defender of the Impressionists, didn't hesitate to praise the Naturalists, "où réside l'originalité la plus vraie et la plus tranchée de l'Ecole française moderne."[5]

If art critics had the power frequently attributed to them, landscape painting would certainly have acceded to the titular leadership of the French School in 1867. Although landscape at this time still meant the Barbizon painters, their successors, the Impressionists, might then

in turn have had an easier time of it. But while landscape painting had waited long enough for recognition--the generation of 1830 was still waiting in 1867--nonetheless it was genre and not landscape which had triumphed, carrying off the majority of prizes, Meissonier receiving more votes than anyone else.

Besides being the most vital movement at home, French landscape painting was unparalleled internationally, as the critics emphasized. Paul Mantz, for example, could write, quite truthfully: "Il suffit d'avoir parcouru un instant les galeries de l'Exposition universelle pour savoir que nous sommes absolument les maîtres dans ce genre, et les véritables initiateurs. Quelle école pourrait aujourd'hui nous montrer des paysagistes comme Théodore Rousseau, Corot, Daubigny, Millet et tant d'autres?"[6] And Maxime DuCamp could add: "Il est superflu de dire que notre peinture de paysage est sans rivale au monde, c'est un fait de notoriété publique et qui depuis longtemps n'a plus besoin de démonstration."[7] But the truth was that landscape painting was seen as a local, not an international, phenomenon. There was no other School of landscape painting represented in force at the Exposition: it may have been a victory without rival; it was also a victory without contestants.

Critics' preferences aside, landscape painting had the

great disadvantage in France that, from the 1830s, it had been considered politically suspect. The Barbizon painters were seen as the last remnant of Romanticism and the least acceptable remnant at that, for, unlike Delacroix, they did not interest themselves in Grand Painting. In addition, they were widely seen as responsible for Realism. Chesneau wrote:

> Sans doute, le Romantisme eut ses erreurs, ses excès; sans doute il fit souvent de l'audace à contre-sens et à contre-temps, mais il avait tenté un légitime effort, un retour à tout ce qui est le charme et l'attrait de la peinture dans sa technique, effort resté sans imitateurs, et que prolongent seuls, ou à peu près seuls, les derniers représentants d'une époque évanouie, les Théodore Rousseau, les Paul Huet...et encore n'est-ce que dans un seul genre, le paysage.... Ce paysage romantique fut donc en somme la première révélation et la plus éclatante de ce qu'on a appelé depuis le paysage réaliste. 8

To add to the problem, some of the best known of the landscape School, Courbet, Millet, Rousseau, were suspected of socialist leanings, hardly a trait endearing to either the Government or the Bourgeoisie. Another important factor, so obvious that it has been overlooked, is that landscape painters rarely took part in the incessant round of dinner parties and soirées characteristic of the nineteenth century Parisian art world. One has only to read the Journal of Delacroix, or the society columns of L'Artiste or La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité to be aware of the importance of these activities and the absence of the landscapists who preferred, naturally enough, to

live and work in the country. When, in 1867, Nieuwerkerke invited Millet to one of his famed Friday night soirées at the Louvre, just before the Jury des récompenses (of which he was President) was to meet, Millet promptly declined, then wrote to his friend Sensier: "Comment se fait-il que je reçoive cette invitation de M. le Surintendant? Je lui ai répondu dans le sens que vous m'avez indiqué d'éloignement de Paris pour ne pas accepter son invitation."[9] This was not the way for an ambitious artist to gain wealth, fame, and medals. Only Courbet managed to turn his distaste for the mondane life into an asset: through his flagrant contempt for the Government and society of the Second Empire, he achieved a succès de scandale. Most of the landscapists, however, lived on the fringe--both geographically and socially--of the Parisian, i.e. French, art world.

As late as 1867, landscape painting continued to be seen as an attack on entrenched power and aesthetics. In that year Edmond About wrote: "La théorie du paysage et celle de la politique est la même. On peut la résumer en un seul mot, qui est le plus fier et le plus doux de notre langue: liberté."[10] This freedom was apparent in the formal qualities as well as in the choice of subject, and was not pleasing to the new public, which preferred the slick finish of a Meissonier. Chesneau analyzed it well:

L'acquéreur, aujourd'hui, n'hésite point à

> payer une oeuvre d'art à des prix considérables; mais, --à moins qu'une immense réputation comme celle de Delacroix, qu'un concours de circonstances favorables, une vogue passagère, lui imposent la libre facture d'un talent spontané qui se contente de fixer une émotion fugitive en traits rapides et violents, --le public va rarement aux oeuvres énergiques et puissantes qui lui paraissent d'une exécution trop lâche et trop facile. Pour dire le mot crûment: il en veut pour son argent; il veut, le jour de son acquisition, pouvoir prendre le tableau sur ses genoux, l'étudier point par point à la loupe; et il estime d'autant plus le mérite de l'oeuvre qu'il pourra compter d'infimes détails de plus près. 11

The battle of Romanticism vs Classicism, sketch vs finish, was continued in the relationship of landscape vs genre painting. The criticism was full of references to the work of Gérôme and Meissonier as detailed and conscientious, well-researched and carefully painted. That of landscape, on the other hand, was full of references to freedom and liberty, spontaneity, passion--and sloppiness.

Chesneau praised Rousseau highly: "Mais nul n'a trouvé d'accents plus vrais, plus profonds pour rendre la vie intense et puissante de la nature, nul n'a été plus sincère que Théodore Rousseau."[12] Yet he had reservations:

> Eh bien! oui, cela est vrai, la facture n'est pas irréprochable; le nez sur la toile, vous apercevez des maigreurs inqualifiables, vous comptez des touches maillées et tricotées comme en un tissu grossier. Mais, mettez-vous à la distance nécessaire, et de ce point regardez, et admirez aussi, la justesse merveilleuse de l'impression, l'éclat de cette belle lumière tombant à profusion sur les arbres, sur les bâtiments rustiques. 13

The collector with a magnifying glass whom Zola described in raptures over a Meissonier, whom Chesneau described with his painting on his knees, carefully studying it, would clearly be horrified to examine a work of Rousseau and find its surface disintegrate on close inspection--exactly like a piece of shoddy merchandise. The criteria had obviously been taken over from a merchant economy. The aesthetic pleasures anticipated from art would be identical to those of purchasing an exquisitely detailed, well-crafted, hand-made object, at a time when early mass production had encouraged rampant shoddiness. As collectors were so often precisely those industrialists who had encouraged shoddiness and vulgarity in their quest for profits, one might assume that a "well-made" work of art would thus be all the more precious to them.

Landscapists were divided into two groups: the older generation, Huet, Rousseau and Corot, made both <u>études</u> and <u>tableaux</u>, that is, preliminary sketches done from nature and large finished paintings worked up in the studio. Chesneau explained this trilogy of artists thus: "Au principe poétique de Paul Huet, au principe de la réalité choisie, formulé par Théodore Rousseau, s'ajoute un troisième principe, celui du paysage composé. Son plus célèbre représentant est M. Corot. Corot est le dernier interprète vraiment supérieur du paysage historique."[14] As their working methods were similar to those of classical

painters, they were somewhat acceptable to conservative critics. The younger landscapists, on the other hand, Courbet, Millet, and Daubigny, were accused of painting ugly motifs or dangerous peasants or of attempting to pass off sketches as finished paintings.

There was the same problem for the critics in 1867 as in 1855: it was impossible to reach a consensus as to who was chef d'école. Chesneau chose Huet (Figure 79); Thoré, Rousseau (Figure 80); Castagnary, Courbet (Figure 64); and Silvestre, Millet (Figure 81).[15] The very "anarchy" of the movement--so many talents differing in image and style--differentiated it from genre or history painting, where there was a common anonymous facture. This quality also pointed to landscape's roots in Romanticism with its emphasis on individual sensibility. But it was, at the same time, a liability for, with so many worthy candidates for chef d'école, the critics' "vote" was split and all the landscapists came in second after Meissonier. Nonetheless, a number of landscapists did receive medals. Théodore Rousseau received the only Medal of Honor that went to a landscapist; First Class medals went to Daubigny, Millet, Jules Breton, François-Louis Français, and Eugène Fromentin; Second Class medals went to Rosa Bonheur, Corot, and Dupré. The awards to Daubigny and Millet were all the more impressive when one considers that, aside from Robert-Fleury, the Director of the Ecole at Rome, they were

the only prize-winners in the two highest categories who were not Jurors.

A brief survey of the landscape School will clarify the events surrounding Rousseau's Medal of Honor. Paul Huet and Jules Dupré by 1867 seemed to belong to another age. Both were associated with the group of landscapists who came to the fore in 1830. Huet, generally acknowledged by his contemporaries as the first French landscapist, was nonetheless never officially recognized as chef d'école, neither in 1855 nor in 1867. Chesneau acknowledged Huet's historical position in his Government report: "Le premier qui regarda la nature et la traduisit en petit-fils de Jean-Jacques Rousseau et de Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, est M. Paul Huet. Le premier aussi, il a compris et exprimé les tumultueuses émotions de la nature complice des émotions de l'homme, et a révélé cette complicité à chacun de nous par les moyens de l'art."[16] His "reward" was that the paintings he had sent to the Exposition were not hung until after Emile Galichon criticized this shabby treatment in Gazette des Beaux-Arts.[17]

Jules Dupré, like Rousseau, had been persecuted by the Academy and had been systematically refused at the Salon until eventually he ceased trying to exhibit and lived in seclusion in the forest of l'Isle-Adam. Thoré wrote of him: "Presque toujours campagnard et forestier, il ne s'est

jamais inquiété des intrigues qu'on fait à la ville, autour des administrations et de l'Etat."[18] The result, as Thoré noted, was that he had been all but forgotten. Thoré remembered him, however, and praised him highly: "Qui donc a le plus vaillamment contribué à la conquête de l'originalité dans le paysage? C'est lui vraiment."[19] It was probably his friend Rousseau, President of the Jury d'admission, who convinced him to exhibit in 1867. Rousseau couldn't work miracles, however, and after the Jury des récompenses had met, he wrote to Dupré:

> Notre lutte avec le scrutin étranger ne nous a laissé que huit des quinze premières médailles. L'augmentation de nombre que nous jugions nécessaire pour représenter notre premier rang ne nous a pas été accordé, malgré notre vive insistance, par la Commission impériale. Votre nom et quelques autres qui nous sont chers, s'offrent maintenant au concours de la seconde médaille. Je ne veux vous dire à ce sujet que ce qui me paraît pressé et important. Voulez vous suivre, ou bien retirer votre nom, officieusement (bien entendu) de ce concours. Cela se pouvant faire, je vous en avertis et vous prie de me répondre au plus vite.... Corot, Rosa Bonheur, Paul Huet, etc., ne sont pas sortis dans ce scrutin des premières médailles; s'ils restent, qu'aurai-je à faire pour vous? [20]

Dupré was apparently willing to accept a Second Class medal, while Paul Huet was not, but both were furious with Rousseau who, they felt, had betrayed them.[21] This was unfair to Rousseau, however, for, despite their quality as artists, neither painter was prominent in the milieu of contemporary French art, neither served on the Juries, and neither had a distinguished international following.

Rousseau may have been President of the Jury d'admission, but on the Jury des récompenses he was just a Juror. It is probable, moreover, that without his efforts neither would have been offered even a Second Class medal.

Orientalism was a hybrid category that encompassed both landscape and genre painting. Gérôme, for example, was usually discussed as a genre painter, for both the dryness of his execution and his anecdotal subjects emphasizing figures had affinities with that mode. Eugène Fromentin (Figure 82), however, was closer to the Romantics, particularly Delacroix, and his looser facture and picturesque (rather than anecdotal) subjects emphasizing landscape resulted in his type of Orientalism being considered a branch of landscape painting.[22] A member of the Jury, he received a First Class Medal.

Corot was probably offered an opportunity to withdraw rather than accept a Second Class medal; for him it was even more insulting than for the others, for in 1855 he had received a First Class Medal. Yet he accepted it. Corot seemed always to occupy an ambiguous position during this period. Chesneau could, quite accurately, call him "the last truly distinguished painter of historical landscape,"[23] but he was neither a member of the Academy nor even particularly admired by conservatives. Chesneau praised him, but also wrote: "M. Corot, au contraire, est,

comme Delacroix, un excentrique, et leur influence sur une école serait désastrueuse."[24] The same judgment was made on Rousseau, Courbet, Daubigny, Manet, all who substituted the real for the ideal, the feeling for the idea. Corot's "sin" was the latter; Duret wrote (with approval) "Il a pris le pinceau, non point tant pour reproduire ce qu'il voyait, que pour communiquer ce qu'il sentait."[25]

There is a quality of non-criticism about the writings on Corot. The same phrases reappear constantly: "son impression presque mystérieuse,"[26] "une nature essentiellement poétique,"[27] "la rêverie et l'interprétation idéalisée."[28] Neither in his life nor in his art did Corot take extreme positions. His painting diverged enough from tradition to be unacceptable to the conservatives, but not enough to cause a <u>succès de scandale</u> and be extolled by the progressives. He was somewhat honored, somewhat praised, and somewhat ignored.

François-Louis Français was a follower of Corot, in the tradition of classical landscape, but, whereas Corot was too poetic and mysterious for the conservatives, and did not participate in the social life of the art world, Français was both more conventional in his art (Figure 83) and more worldly in his life. In 1854, when he and Chenevard served as Nieuwerkerke's emissaries to obtain the <u>ralliement</u> of Courbet, Courbet had retaliated by calling

them "deux satisfaits et décorés." Since then Français had continued to build his career and was often elected to serve on Juries, as he was in 1867. His idyllic landscapes, more detailed, less "poetic" than those of Corot, eventually gained him membership in the Academy; he was the only major nineteenth century landscapist so honored.

Courbet himself was lavishly praised as a landscapist (Figure 64), at least in part as a attempt to encourage him to abandon his figure paintings, so often provocative and disturbing. He had found a way of avoiding the humiliation endured by Corot on being given a Second Class Medal: by setting up his own exhibition he had placed himself hors de concours, as it were, even though he also had four paintings in the official show. He had succeeded in beating the system.

Chesneau divided the animaliers into two categories, domestiques and fauves. Courbet, needless to say, was considered a fauve because he painted the wild animal "traqué, chassé, poursuivi par l'homme,"[29] Delacroix, and before him Rubens, had done the same. Rosa Bonheur, on the other hand, was in the tradition of Troyon, and painted more reassuring images.

Jean-François Millet (Figure 81) and Jules Breton (Figure 84) were usually discussed together, for they presented complementary--and diametrically opposed--views

of peasants. Thoré wrote that Millet made the viewer think: "Tiens, ces gens qui produisent tout n'ont pas déjà l'air si heureux, et ce bécheur a bien du mal." Breton, however, summoned up this sentiment: "Ah! que les prés sentent bon quand on vient de couper l'herbe et ces faneuses sont mieux là que dans un atelier industriel ou dans un salon bourgeois."[30] As a result, he noted, the majority of Millet's pictures were in Belgian, not French, collections. Chesneau, Thoré's political opposite, described the same phenomenon, stating of Breton's success: "Aussi ce public est-il fort heureux de rencontrer la paysannerie élégante de M. Breton, qui a un aspect de réalité suffisant pour être point taxée de paysannerie à la Boucher." Yet Millet's vision, which he called "la réalité brutale," he found so disturbing that he felt the need to use his Government report to defend his country against Millet's "charges:" "En eux nul sentiment; l'instinct seul, et l'instinct de la bête de somme. L'image est fidèle, mais fidèle seulement pour le très-petit nombre parmi les paysans, pour une minorité qui sans cesse et de jour en jour décroît."[31] This view of Millet dated back to the Second Republic; the idea that his peasants were plotting Revolution clung to him still in the closing days of the Second Empire. So it is all the more remarkable that he, without even benefit of Jury membership, should be awarded a First Class medal in 1867. Paul Mantz commented: "Cette

récompense est pour le moins aussi significative que celle qui a été accordée à M. Rousseau. Le temps n'est pas loin où M. Millet était traité comme un barbare."[32] Théophile Silvestre thought so highly of Millet that he devoted to him three out of four articles in Le Figaro, articles in which he was supposed to review the entire Universal Exposition of Art and the 1867 Salon.[33] It would not be an exaggeration to describe Millet's exhibition in 1867 as a triumph. There was even talk that he would be made Officier of the Légion d'honneur. But he wrote to Sensier: "Pour ce qui est de la croix, je vous assure que je ne me leurre point de cela, et n'imagine même pas que je sois fait pour l'avoir. Il ne manque d'ailleurs pas de gens plus pressés que moi et poussant à la roue plus fortement que je ne me sens disposé à le faire."[34] In fact, he did not receive this honor, for while the critics praised whom they liked, and the medals were voted by the Jury, the nominations to the Légion d'honneur were made by Nieuwerkerke.

Charles-François Daubigny (Figure 85), at fifty, was hailed as the leader of the Jeune Ecole, simply because no younger representative (with the exception of Courbet) had been admitted to the Exposition.[35] This was not entirely a compliment, for it was Daubigny who was held responsible for the younger artists' penchant for exhibiting études as finished works. The younger artists went even further than

he, however, for, in the conservative view, Daubigny at least chose his motifs fairly well, whereas his followers just stopped at the first motif they saw, worked too quickly, and didn't "compose" at all.[36] In contrast to the theatrics of the Barbizon painters, the poetics of Corot, and Courbet's virtuosity with the palette knife, Daubigny's paintings seemed so natural as to be almost self-effacing in subject and execution. As a result, the conceptual effort necessary to identify as a motif and make a painting of something that had up to then been ignored was overlooked, and Daubigny, though praised, was often dismissed, as by Chesneau: "Il est simple et simple avec sincérité."[37]

Rousseau's Fate

In many ways, Théodore Rousseau would have made a likely companion for Manet and Courbet in mounting a private exhibition. He too had had problems with Juries to the extent that, during the July Monarchy, he was known as Le Grand Refusé. Like Courbet, his politics were to the Left, and if Courbet suffered in certain quarters because of his friendship with Proudhon, Rousseau was widely known as an intimate of Thoré. That Rousseau did not organize a private exhibition either in 1855 or in 1867 may be attributed as much to financial as to personality differences, for Rousseau had neither a wealthy family like

Manet, nor a collector like Bruyas to foot the bill. Elected President of the Jury d'admission for both the Universal Exposition and the 1867 Salon, as well for the Salon Jury des récompenses, he had no problems in having his paintings accepted: he showed eight in the Exposition (Figure 80) and four in the Salon. Yet he too must have dreamed of the large retrospectives given by the Government in 1855, for he showed, at the Cercle des Arts, eighty painted études (Figure 86) and twenty-nine tableaux dating back to the beginning of his career. Organized by Brame and Durand-Ruel, with a catalogue written by Philippe Burty, the show was obviously a major bid for international recognition.[38] Rousseau's historical position can be seen from this gesture. As a member of the older generation, he knew enough not to send sketches to official Government Expositions; as an ally of the younger generation, he had enough esteem for them to exhibit them anyway. He had too much respect for authority to challenge it with a private exhibition, as did Courbet and Manet, and yet it was his exhibition at a private gallery which would provide the model for the future for, as artists turned away from official Government institutions, they would increasingly entrust their careers to private dealers. Few could afford gestures like that of Courbet and Manet, and even Bazille's attempt to finance a group exhibition, as we have seen, proved impossible in 1867.

Rousseau's exhibition at the Cercle des Arts must have been a magnificent show and was bound to have influenced the younger artists who embraced naturalism and the plein air method of working directly sur le motif, and whom Castagnary described as so disappointed with Ingres' memorial exhibition.[39] DuCamp wrote of it: "Il y avait là des chefs-d'oeuvre, non-seulement comme facture, mais aussi comme impression, comme vigueur de sensation, comme intimité, comme franchise et comme sincérité; je regrette vivement que cette exposition n'ait point trouvé place au Champ-de-Mars, elle eût puissamment servi M. Théodore Rousseau et l'eût consacré maître au premier chef."[40] Everything was in place for Rousseau to be canonized in 1867, as Delacroix had been in 1855. Charles Blanc saw it clearly, and wrote in Le Temps:

> Quelle révolution a dû opérer dans notre Ecole depuis trente ans pour qu'un paysagiste qui était le plus souvent refusé au Salon, soit devenu un des coryphées de cette même Ecole, et non-seulement les paysages de sa peinture, mais toute la peinture de paysage? Qui aurait prévu un tel revirement dans les idées, et qu'il suffirait à un amateur de vivre trente ans pour voir un peintre passer de la plus cruelle disgrâce à la plus haute faveur. [41]

As did Paul Mantz, writing in Gazette des Beaux-Arts: "Voilà qu'on lui rend aujourd'hui une éclatante justice: il y a vingt ans, M. Rousseau était indigne du nom de peintre; aujourd'hui, de par le jury international, il est le premier paysagiste de l'Europe, et du même coup le paysage,

qui était autrefois réputé pour un genre secondaire, est placé au même rang que la peinture d'histoire."[42] And Théophile Thoré, writing in L'Indépendance: "Théodore Rousseau va tout droit aussi à la postérité, en tête de la pléiade de nos paysagistes contemporains, car ils sont plusieurs qui, avec Rousseau, passionneront les amateurs futurs, de même que nous nous passionnons pour Ruisdael, pour Hobbema, pour Albert Cuijp."[43] Among the "followers" of Rousseau, Thoré listed Diaz, Dupré, Troyon, Corot, Courbet, Huet, Marilhat, Cabat, Daubigny, "et toute une génération nouvelle qui aime naïvement la nature."[44]

When critics discussed Rousseau's painting, they saw it in terms of both form and subject matter. Charles Blanc, for example, after reminiscing that an uncomprehending public had called Rousseau's pictures "les épinards," wrote:

> Je dis qu'il nous en donne l'impression; c'est bien le mot, et sous ce rapport, il redevient semblable à tous les paysagistes de son temps, qui ont, comme lui, substitué l'impression à l'imitation rigoureuse.
>
> Plus varié que les autres, Rousseau a osé peindre ce qui n'avait encore été représenté par aucun de ses contemporains, que je sache, les fraîches verdures du printemps, les arbres de la fin d'avril, les feuillages tendres, les gazons nouveaux. 45

Thoré wrote: "Rousseau excelle à représenter le caractère d'un site et les effets capricieux qui animent la terre et le ciel à certaines phases des saisons ou à certaines

heures du jour.... Quel contraste de ces drames sentis au coeur de la forêt de Fontainebleau avec les fraîches images du printemps ou d'une végétation arrosée par la pluie...."[46] Duret cited his greatest quality as "la puissance," his choice of motifs as "les grands aspects d'une nature âpre, inculte, et solitaire," and his formal gift "les grands jeux de la lumière."[47] Chesneau, who criticized the younger landscapists, nonetheless approved of Rousseau:

> Rousseau est un admirable témoin qui rapporte strictement ce qu'il a vu, mais qui savoir, qui ne peut voir que des spectacles dignes d'être fixés, et qui écrit ces fermes rapports avec une mâle éloquence.... Un voile de tristesse profonde recouvre tous ses paysages.... Il recherche de préférence les landes arides, les roches sauvages, les paysages de la Sologne, la saison déclinante, le soleil au couchant; le chêne est son arbre de prédilection; son oeuvre est toujours d'une gravité sévère. [48]

Despite this esteem, he found Rousseau's facture unacceptable, his all-too-apparent brushstrokes seeming like gross stitches in a crude fabric: "Je me résume d'un mot sur cette question: Théodore Rousseau est à mes yeux un maître; mais--c'est là ma seule réserve--un maître dangéreux. Je ne conseillerais à personne de l'imiter ni de s'autoriser des arguments qu'il peut moquer. Il est souverain, mais souverain dans une perfide exception."[49] One would expect such a conservative to disapprove of any painted surface lacking the Academic fini, but one would also expect the younger more progressive critics to be more

appreciative. But--and here is the tragedy of Rousseau--their attention was fixed on younger artists, compared to whom Rousseau seemed old-fashioned and full of studio tricks. Zola even included Rousseau in his satirical "Nos Peintres au Champ de Mars" although he could not infuse his diatribe with the scathing wit which distinguished his attacks on Cabanel, Gérôme and Meissonier.

> M. Rousseau ne vit pas ses toiles, il les veut. Là est toute la définition de son talent. Il ne se place pas en bon enfant devant la nature, comme certains autres paysagistes qui se contentent simplement de recevoir une impression et de la traduire. Il aborde la nature en esprit despotique, en tyran dont les caprices sont des lois; il a dans chaque main une bonne petite théorie et il regarde ses horizons à travers des verres préparés qui les lui montrent tels qu'il les désire. La raison seule travaille....
>
> Il a, au Salon annuel, un tableau, une Vue du lac de Genève qui est bien le paysage le plus étonnant qu'on puisse voir.
>
> Je ne parle pas de ce triomphant coup de soleil qui éclaire une moitié du tableau et laisse l'autre dans l'ombre. Mais je voudrais qu'un des admirateurs de M. Rousseau me dît si les petits tas de verdure qui sont symétriquement rangés sur les pentes, sont des chous, des arbres, ou autre chose. 50

"Les effets capricieux" that Thoré admired, "les grands jeux de la lumière" praised by Duret, were simply cheap--and incomprehensible--theatrics to Zola. For Rousseau was, in the end, more a Romantic than a Naturalist painter; he looked at nature not as a scientist but to find reflected there human passion, drama, and moods.

Rousseau's official recognition, and that of the entire Barbizon School, had been delayed long enough to overlap with the rise of the young Naturalists. As a result, in 1867, the year of his triumph, he was still considered dangerous and avant-garde by conservatives such as Chesneau, while either attacked or ignored by progressives such as Zola, Silvestre, Castagnary. A strong Government spokesman could have canonized him, as Prince Napoléon had done for Delacroix in 1855, but the Government, as we have seen, had taken a back seat in the administration of the 1867 Exposition. In part, the Barbizon movement has never recovered from this unfortunate chronology; it fell between the slats. What would have been, at best, a delayed official recognition, was swallowed up in the cross-currents, and these artists, Rousseau in particular, have received less attention than any other major artists of a major modern School.

Even politically Rousseau fell between the slats. In his youth, Le Grand Refusé, had seen his paintings refused by Academic Juries year after year during the July Monarchy. His friend and biographer Sensier attributed this to Rousseau's participation in the foundation of the journal La Liberté in the 1830s which had attacked the Academy.[51] Other biographers have pointed to his friendship with Thoré, an avowed Socialist.[52] In any case, Rousseau

only began exhibiting again in the Salon after the 1848 Revolution and the establishment of the Second Republic. When Diaz instead of Rousseau was made Chevalier of the Légion d'honneur in 1851, Rousseau decided not to exhibit in 1852, the first Salon of the Second Empire. So solicitous was the new regime for the ralliement of all--especially those persecuted under Louis Philippe--that Nieuwerkerke paid him a personal visit, promising reparations if he would exhibit. Rousseau did and was promptly made Chevalier of the Légion d'honneur.[53] Rousseau's fortunes improved during the Second Empire, even including an invitation to Compiègne in 1865. And in 1867 he was a member of all four Juries, President of three of them. Le Grand Refusé had become, in turn, the Judge. His old ally, Thoré, was not pleased:

> Nous nous en expliquerons une autre fois avec notre ami Rousseau, comme aussi de la présidence d'un jury qui a dépassé les injustices des anciens jurys de l'Académie.
>
> S'il vous plaît, quel est l'artiste qui fut le plus persécuté par les institutions officielles, alors qu'une jeune école, dite romantique, luttait contre les vieux potentats de l'art dit classique? Quel est le peintre dont le nom revenait sans cesse, quand on reprochait au jury académique la proscription des hommes de talent? La notoriété de Théodore Rousseau commença par les protestations réitérées que la critique écrivit en sa faveur. Il était devenu célèbre avant qu'on eût pu voir ses oeuvres. Durant quinze années, la publicité des salons lui avait été refusée! N'était-ce pas odieux? et que gagnèrent à cela les Bidauld de l'Institut?
>
> Il est donc inexplicable--et bien triste--que l'ancien paria devienne à son tour le

> proscripteur de la jeunesse qui cherche ce qu'elle veut. J'espère que Rousseau lui-même n'a pas voté les proscriptions, mais encore la loyauté et sa propre dignité lui commandaient d'abdiquer la présidence et de refuser son concours aux messieurs décorés et patentés qui, sans doute, ont leurs raisons pour écarter de nouveaux producteurs et peut-être un art nouveau. 54

Zola was also attracted to the idea of le Grand Refusé, but noticed the same contradiction:

> J'avoue que j'ai cru très naïvement au génie de M. Théodore Rousseau, sur ce qu'on me racontait des débuts de ce peintre. Il a été, me disait-on, persécuté longtemps par l'Académie, qui le considérait comme un romantique de la plus dangereuse espèce et qui lui fermait au nez la porte de chaque Salon.... D'autre part, le persécuté de la veille n'a pas tardé à devenir le triomphateur du lendemain. Bien que M. Rousseau ne soit pas encore membre de l'Institut, il ne tardera pas à avoir autant de croix et de médailles que MM. Cabanel et Meissonier.
>
> Par un revirement inexplicable, tandis que les peintres autorisés, les artistes chargés de la distribution des honneurs et des récompenses, semblent tenir rancune à M. Corot, M. Rousseau est accepté par eux comme un des leurs et est traité tout comme le serait un adepte fervent du paysage classique. 55

Rousseau, on the other hand, saw his Jury membership not only as a chance to advance his own career, but also as an opportunity to obtain long-overdue honors for all he considered worthy of recognition. That he felt his first loyalty to be towards his fellow Barbizon painters and not to the younger generation is evident; it is to his credit that so many medals did go to landscape painters. Sensier stated that he took his position very seriously, agonized

over Jury decisions, and kept his friends, such as Dupré, posted on the results.[56] Millet asked him to get Les Glaneuses into the Exposition and he succeeded.[57] He seems to have been very active behind the scenes, but he was a man caught in a slip tide between the rising seas of old and new injustices.

Zola's charge that Rousseau was acceptable as a classical landscape painter was untrue: he made a mediocre showing in the voting, placing sixth out of eight, behind the other French winners. Meissonier, Cabanel and Gérôme were the first three, and, considering that France had the largest bloc of votes, almost half, the fact that two foreigners placed next (Leys and Knaus) indicated a massive defection of French votes. Philippe Burty wrote unequivocally "Les artistes étrangers lui avaient d'enthousiasme décerné une grande médaille."[58] In truth, Rousseau and Barbizon painting in general was more popular abroad than at home. Collectors in England, Holland, Germany, and America sought after his work, and the Academy of Fine Arts in Amsterdam had made him an honorary member.[59] Even today there is surprisingly little of Rousseau's work in France, a surprising quantity of it in Northern Europe and, especially, America. Rousseau's triumph at the Universal Exposition thus owed more to foreign than to French esteem for his art.

In order to make his success complete, Rousseau awaited one more honor. Sensier wrote: "L'artiste s'attendait enfin à une distinction bien légitime, à être promu au grade d'officier de la Légion d'honneur; l'honneur était pour Rousseau le champ de toutes ses batailles, et jamais ni l'homme ni l'artiste n'y avaient forfait."[60] Like his predecessor Delacroix and his successor Manet, Rousseau longed with his whole being for the respectability of official recognition.

Artists were nominated to or promoted in the Légion d'honneur for many reasons: as a mark of official favor, in recognition of services rendered, even--almost by accident, it seems--for artistic excellence. For Rousseau, considering his Medal of Honor and his extensive Jury duty and Presidency, promotion should have been automatic. And yet, at the solemn distribution of awards on 1 July (Figure 87), Rousseau's name was not called to receive this honor. Among his fellow Medal of Honor winners, Meissonier was made Commandeur, Gérôme, Kaulbach, Leys, and Knaus were made Officiers, a rank Cabanel already held. Among the First Class medallists, Breton, Français, and Corot were named Officier. The names of Rousseau, Daubigny, Millet and Dupré, the "sloppy" landscapists, politically suspect as well, were conspicuously absent.[61] For Rousseau, more than the others, the humiliation was overwhelming, for he was a member of two Juries, President of the French Jury

d'admission and the only French Medal of Honor winner not so honored; even worse, he was part of the official delegation at the awards ceremony.

Sensier wrote that "une main occult" was responsible; by that, he meant Nieuwerkerke.[62] In 1855 such nominations had been made by the Juries; in 1867 there was no such provision and they were made through regular channels. As President of the Jury du Groupe for the fine arts, the task would thus fall to Nieuwerkerke. He had already pronounced his opinion of Barbizon painting some years ealier when he stated: "C'est de la peinture de démocrates, de ces hommes qui ne changent pas de linge, qui veulent s'imposer aux gens du monde; cet art me déplaît et me dégoûte."[63] His aversion had not mellowed with time.

An undated letter to Thoré was probably written at this time and gives some idea of Rousseau's state of mind:

> Mon cher Thoré
>
> J'ai le plus grand regret de ne pas te trouver. Il faut absolument que je te voie aujourd'hui <u>mercredi</u> à quelque heure que ce soit. Si donc tu rentrais tard, viens quand même me trouver. Viens, entends-tu, j'ai à te causer de choses très sérieuses et qui ne peuvent attendre. Je suis venu pour cela, avec Millet. Il y a urgence que nous causions. Ne me fais pas passer une mauvaise nuit en trouvant légèrement qu'à la rentrée s'il se fait tard il n'y a plus lieu de venir me trouver. Toute heure est bonne jusqu'au jour--ainsi donc je t'attends.
>
> Je te serre la main.
>
> Th. Rousseau, Cité Malesherbes, 9 rue des

> Je préviendrai mon concierge qu'il t'ouvre à quelque heure que ce soit.
>
> Encore un coup. Il est absolument urgent que tu viennes à une heure ou à une autre qu'il soit 3h ou 4h du matin n'importe.
>
> J'y compte tout à fait. 64

Soon after the Awards cemermony, Rousseau began to exhibit the symptoms of a cerebral hemorrhage.[65] He wrote whole journals about his pain on being thus publicly humiliated, and blamed it on "la préciosité, le pédantisme et l'intrigue." He wrote a mémoire to present to the Emperor; his friends Thoré, Sensier, and Silvestre acted on his behalf.[66] Eventually the resulting scandal produced results. Vaillant demanded an explanation from Nieuwerkerke who made a lame excuse, saying: "Les hautes distinctions de la Légion d'honneur ne sauraient être, comme le réclamant paraît le croire, la récompense forcée des récompenses décernées par le jury.... On a dû, en conséquence, donner à mérite égal, la préférence aux candidats en faveur desquels militaient à la fois l'âge et l'ancienneté."[67]

On 1 August, Rousseau suffered a massive stroke. On 10 August, La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité announced that he was paralyzed.[68] Sensier stated that Rousseau became very depressed on reading of his condition in the press.[69] Napoléon III, however, ran true to form,

and, to make amends and avoid further scandal, he signed a special decree naming Rousseau Officier of the Légion d'honneur.[70] On 12 August, Millet wrote to Sensier from Paris: "Alfred Stevens est venu ce matin avec Puvis de Chavannes pour annoncer à Rousseau qu'il est nommé officier. Nous les avons reçu, ma femme et moi, dans l'escalier, les priant de ne pas monter pour que le calme de Rousseau soit point troublé. Je le lui ai dit moi, et il a paru bien content."[71] This honor was announced at the Salon of 1867 Awards Ceremony, 13 August, a much less prestigious event, lacking the international lustre of the Universal Exposition.[72]

Rousseau did not attend. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité reported that, at the announcement of Rousseau's promotion to Officier, there was a burst of applause, after which Nieuwerkerke explained that Rousseau was ill and could not attend. Commented La Chronique: "On assure que cette promotion serait due à des représentations parvenus à l'Empereur par une voie autre que celle de l'administration des Beaux-Arts."[73] The next day, Rousseau sent an open letter to the press, published in Le Figaro and La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité:

> Monsieur le directeur.
>
> Avant hier, à la distribution des récompenses faite au Louvre, M. le comte de Nieuwerkerke, surintendant des beaux-arts, a cru devoir ajouter quelques paroles flatteuses pour moi à sa lecture du décret qui me nomme officier

de la Légion d'honneur.

Si ma santé m'avait permis d'assister à cette séance et d'entendre ces compliments, j'aurais gardé pour l'Empereur seul toute ma gratitude.

L'Empereur, dans sa haute équité, n'a point permis que le verdict du jury international, en partie oublié à mon égard dans la séance impériale du 1er juillet dernier, restât plus longtemps sans effet.

Soyez assez bon, monsieur le directeur, pour publier ma lettre, et veuillez agréer d'avance tous mes remerciements.

Th. Rousseau 74

But this was virtually Rousseau's last public act. His health broken, he lingered several months longer, and died at Barbizon, 22 December 1867. Millet wrote to the collector Chassaing several days later, recounting the events leading up to Rousseau's death:

Au commencement de juillet dernier, et sans pour cela éprouver de souffrance, il s'est trouvé que son bras gauche ne pouvait plus supporter sa palette et que la jambe, du même côté, fonctionnait péniblement. Après quelques jours de cet état, il a fait venir son médecin qui lui ordonna le répos le plus complet, c'est-à-dire toute expression de travail, de quitter Paris (où cela est arrivé), au plus vite, pour aller à Barbizon. J'ai été bien étonné en le voyant arriver ainsi éclopé. Il m'a raconté ce que je vous dis là; mais il m'assura qu'il n'était pas inquiet et que son médecin lui avait dit que ce serait fini au bout d'un mois. Il est resté quelque temps ainsi, avec son bras impotent et sa jambe traînante. Un matin, on accourut de chez lui pour me dire qu'il souffrait horriblement. Il venait d'avoir une crise horrible (1er août), de grandes souffrances dans le bras et la tête. Après cela, il a été plus mal. Son médecin a voulu l'envoyer en Suisse, mais le voyage qui a été commencé n'a pu être effectué. Il a été forcé de rester à Paris où une nouvelle crise l'a

pris. Puis, quand le médecin l'a cru transportable, il l'a envoyé à Barbizon où il est resté, allant de crise en crise jusqu'à la fin.[75]

The funeral was held in Barbizon on 24 December, and Théophile Silvestre wrote his obituary for Le Figaro of 26 December 1867.[76]

Nieuwerkerke did not arrange a memorial exhibition.

* * *

In retrospect it is clear why, at the crossroads of 1867, France officially took the high road of genre and not the low road of landscape. It was a decision fateful in consequences for the younger Naturalist generation, which would be forced thereby to continue this new tradition of the disenfranchised avant-garde. As the new arbiter of the nation's cultural life, the Bourgeoisie had succeeded, with the help of Nieuwerkerke and Napoléon III, in derailing the French School from the track of history, and left us, as the official artists of the Second Empire, Cabanel, Gérôme, Meissonier.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII

1. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 369.

2. Ibid., 304.

3. Ibid., 369.

4. Thoré, Salons, II: 354.

5. Duret, 1867, 21.

6. Mantz, GBA, 1 juin 1867, 538.

7. DuCamp, 1867, 343.

8. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 366, Rapports du Jury, I: 82.

9. Jean-François Millet to Alfred Sensier, 7 avril 1867, Cabinet des dessins, Louvre. Also see Millet's letter to Nieuwerkerke of 5 avril 1867 declining the invitation; Ibid.

10. About, Le Temps, 22 juin 1867.

11. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 220.

12. Ibid., 276.

13. Ibid., 279.

14. Ibid.; also see 284-85 and Rapports du Jury, I:83.

15. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 262, 284-85; Thoré, Salons, II: 353; Castagnary, "Exposition des oeuvres de M. Gustave Courbet," La Liberté, 11 juin 1867; Théophile Silvestre, "Les Artistes vivants au Champ-de-Mars et aux Champs-Elysées," Le Figaro, 14, 15, 21 mai 1867.

16. Chesneau, in Rapports du jury, I: 81; also see Les Nations rivales, 262.

17. Galichon, GBA, 1 mai 1867, 441; also see Pierre Miquel, Paul Huet, De l'aube romantique à l'aube impressioniste, Sceaux, 1962, 235-38.

18. Thoré, Salons, II: 357.

19. Ibid., II: 356; also see Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 338.

20. Théodore Rousseau to Jules Dupré, undated, published in Alfred Sensier, Souvenirs sur Th. Rousseau, Paris, 1872, 342.

21. Several letters are published in Pierre Miquel, Le Paysage français au XIXe siècle 1824-1874. L'Ecole de la nature, 3 vols., Maurs-la-Jolie, 1975, II: 243-45 for Huet and II: 389 for Dupré.

22. Chesneau, in Rapports du Jury, I: 88; also Duret, 1867, 50-51.

23. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 279; Rapports du Jury, I: 83.

24. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 281.

25. Duret, 1867, 26.

26. Thoré, Salons, II: 357.

27. Duret, 1867, 26.

28. DuCamp, 1867, 344.

29. Chesneau, Rapports du Jury, I: 86.

30. Thoré, Salons, II: 361-62; also see Duret, 48, 56-57.

31. Chesneau in Rapports du Jury, I: 87; Les Nations rivales, 306-307.

32. Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 327-28.

33. On 21 avril 1867, Le Figaro published a letter from Silvestre to its editor, H. de Villemessant, saying he was going to review both the Universal Exposition and the Salon by concentrating on about twenty of the best artists. There followed one general article (4 mai) and three articles on Millet (14, 15, 21 mai). There were no more articles. Silvestre provided the explanation himself in his 21 avril letter in which he stated "Ce que vous voulez de moi, c'est un résumé net et vite de l'Exposition annuelle et de l'Exposition universelle des Beaux-Arts. La crainte d'ennuyer le lecteur étant pour vous le commencement de la sagesse, vous me préférerez le télégraphe...."

34.Jean-François Millet to Alfred Sensier, 26 mars 1867, Cabinet des dessins, Louvre.

35. Chesneau, Rapports du Jury, I: 84-87.

36. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 284-88.

37. Ibid.; also see Rapports du Jury, I: 84-85, and Duret, 35.

38. See Philippe Burty, Notice des Etudes peintes par M. Théodore Rousseau exposées au Cercle des Arts, Paris, juin 1867; it was reprinted in his Maîtres et petits-maîtres, Paris, 1877, 71-93. The Cercle des Arts was also called Galerie du cercle de la rue de Choiseul.

39. Castagnary, "Exposition des Oeuvres de M. Ingres," La Liberté, 2 mai 1867.

40. DuCamp, 1867, 344.

41. Blanc, Le Temps, 19 juin 1867.

42. Mantz, GBA, 1 octobre 1867, 326.

43. Thoré, Salons, II: 353.

44. Ibid., II: 353-54.

45. Blanc, Le Temps, 19 juin 1867.

46. Thoré, Salons, II: 354.

47. Duret, 1867, 31.

48. Chesneau, Les Nations rivales, 270.

49. Ibid., 279.

50. Zola, Salons, 114.

51. Alfred Sensier, Souvenirs sur Th. Rousseau, Paris, 1872, 44-45.

52. See John W. Mollett, The Painters of Barbizon, 2 vols., London, 1890, I: 47-85. Also see the Louvre 1967-68 exhibition catalogue Théodore Rousseau, 1812-1867, which has a year by year chronology of Rousseau's career by Marie-Thérèse de Forges.

53. Sensier, 208-209.

54. Thoré, Salons, II: 355-56.

55. Zola, Salons, 113-14.

56. Sensier, 340-43.

57. Jean-François Millet to Alfred Sensier, 25 février 1867, Cabinet des dessins, Louvre.

58. Burty, Maîtres et petits-maîtres, 121. For the Jury results, see La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 12 mai 1867, 148.

59. Rousseau's popularity outside France was often noted; see Sensier, 229, 350; Albert Wolff, Notes upon Certain Masters of the XIX Century, N.Y., 1886, 57-62; Mollett, I: 47-85.

60. Sensier, 350.

61. The Légion d'honneur nominations were printed in the 1868 catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., XVIII-XX.

62. See Sensier, 348-69, for an account of Rousseau's omission and the results.

63. Nieuwerkerke's statement is legendary, and, although possibly apocryphal, accurately represented his sentiments; here quoted from Jean Bouret, L'Ecole de Barbizon et le paysage français au XIXe siècle, Paris, 1972, 19.

64. Théophile Rousseau to Théophile Thoré, undated, B.N., Département des manuscrits, 11955, N° 118.

65. See Sensier, 354; Burty, Maîtres et petits-maîtres, 121; Jean-François Millet to Chassaing, 25 décembre 1867, published in Miquel, Le Paysage français, III: 481. All three contemporaries of Rousseau dated the first symptoms at the beginning of July.

66. Sensier, 352; also see Miquel, Le Paysage français, III: 480, and the chronology by Marie-Thérèse de Forges in the 1967-68 Louvre catalogue Théodore Rousseau 1812-1867. Both seem to have had access to documents in the Archives du Louvre that I have not been permitted to see.

67. Marie-Thérèse de Forges stated that Vaillant demanded an explanation from Nieuwerkerke on 22 juillet 1867 as to the omission of Millet and Rousseau from the promotion lists for the Légion d'honneur; see the 1867 chronology in the 1967-68 Louvre catalogue Théodore Rousseau 1812-1867 where the relevant correspondence is cited as being in the Archives du Louvre. Miquel quoted a few sentences from Nieuwerkerke's response; see his Le Paysage français, III: 480, also cited as being in the Archives du Louvre. Mme Besson of the Archives du Louvre

has assured me that the same unfortunate typographical error has slipped into these two texts and that the documents are in fact not in the Louvre collection. Lightning, it appears, can strike twice in the same place. Mme de Forges assures me that she has lost both her notes and her memory on this point.

68. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 10 août 1867, 215.

69. Sensier, 352.

70. The decree was dated 7 août 1867; AN, Légion d'honneur 2402, d.2: Théodore Rousseau.

71. Jean-François Millet to Alfred Sensier, 12 août 1867, Cabinet des dessins, Louvre.

72. See Le Moniteur Universel, 14 août 1867, 1107.

73. La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 20 août 1867, 220-21.

74. "Correspondance," Le Figaro, 16-17 août 1867, and La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 20 août 1867. A copy of the letter in Le Figaro was sent to Nieuwerkerke by the Ministre de l'Intérieur, 17 août 1867; see Archives du Louvre, P30: Théodore Rousseau. The letter was misinterpreted by Marie-Thérèse de Forges in the chronology for 1867 of the 1967-68 Louvre catalogue Théodore Rousseau 1812-1867 as being a statement of gratitude towards Nieuwerkerke as well as Napoléon III.

75. Jean-François Millet to Chassaing, 25 décembre 1867, published in Miquel, Le Paysage français, III: 481. Although Miquel cited this letter as being in the Cabinet des dessins, Louvre, it can no longer be located there.

76. Théophile Silvestre, "Funérailles de Th. Rousseau à Barbizon," Le Figaro, 26 décembre 1867.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TRIUMPH OF GENRE

> L'histoire achevait le mouvement de conversion par lequel elle s'achemine au genre; et le genre, c'est-à-dire les usages, les costumes, les personnages, les caractères, les moeurs, toutes les réalités visibles du monde présent, le genre si décrié, si maudit, si persécuté, se développait, grandissait, sortait de ses anciennes limites, montait à la hauteur de l'histoire, s'attaquait à l'universalité de la nature et de la vie, devenait enfin toute la peinture du présent, comme il sera, je l'espère, toute la peinture de l'avenir.
>
> --Castagnary, "Salon de 1868" 1

The Government in the 1860s was like someone trying to stamp out brush fires before a general conflagration ensued. In art, each forceful episode of criticism resulted in some reforms, halfhearted as they might be. When Nieuwerkerke proved too reactionary, as happened quite often, artists would appeal directly to Vaillant or to the Emperor himself, and, on occasion, the fear of public protests would suffice.

1867 had been a year of extraordinary protests by artists as a result of the severity of the Juries for both the Universal Exposition and the Salon. In order to avoid an 1867 Salon des refusés, Nieuwerkerke promised a more

lenient Salon in 1868.[2] This postponed the protest from a year when Paris was the center of international attention to a time when, the distinguished foreign visitors having left, France could cope with domestic problems in relative privacy. The Salon of 1868 was, then, a pendant to the Universal Exposition of 1867; many of the forces set in motion the one year came to fruition the next. The same phenomenon had taken place after the 1855 Exposition when attention turned from international to national events, only to find that, in the world of art, irrevocable changes had taken place. In 1855 the movements of the first half-century were canonized and in 1857 the birth of Naturalism was proclaimed. In 1867 history painting was interred with Ingres, and 1868 signaled the triumph of genre, its successor. Both Expositions marked the end of an epoch; both Salons signaled the beginning of another. An analysis of the Salon of 1868 will, then, indicate the direction art would take under the Third Republic, just two years away. Such an analysis must examine both the institutional structure and the aesthetic content of the Salon, for, in both aspects, it showed marked differences from its predecessors.

The 1868 Règlement, as Nieuwerkerke had promised, specified a Jury two-thirds elected by artists who had exhibited in any Salon except that of 1848, and one-third appointed by the Government.[3] It was thus the most

democratically constituted of all the Juries of the Second Empire, and achieved in art what had been achieved in politics twenty years earlier, namely Universal Suffrage.

To prepare for the elections, the artists held meetings, formed parties, and proposed slates of candidates. The most interesting party was that organized by Castagnary, Courbet, and Manet, which called itself "Le Comité des artistes non-exempts," that is, artists who were not members of the Légion d'honneur, and had not won medals at previous Salons. Their slogan was "La Liberté dans l'art," and their platform, no rejections except by unanimous vote of the Jury. Daubigny and Gleyre were elected on this ticket, Courbet himself not receiving enough votes. A second group elected Cabat, and a third group Robert-Fleury, Français, Bida, Gérôme, and Baudry, all of whom had been regularly elected under the old, more restrictive Règlement.[4] The only major change produced by Universal Suffrage was the election of Daubigny who had not placed at all in 1867 and now obtained more votes than anyone else. Cabanel dropped from first to seventh place, Gérôme from third to twelfth, and Meissonier from tenth to fifteenth; all three resigned.[5] As finally constituted, the Jury consisted primarily of genre and landscape painters and was decidedly liberal; it accepted 4213 works, as opposed to 2745 in 1867.

Among the beneficiaries of this liberalism was the group of young Naturalists around Bazille who had fared so badly in 1867. If that was the year of their worst across-the-board rejection, 1868 was the year of their first taste of success. Renoir, Monet, Sisley, Pissarro, all except Cézanne, were now represented in the Salon.[6] Courbet, who had been almost acceptable in 1867, now outraged critics and the public by reopening his own exhibition while sending L'Aumône d'un mendiant à Ornans to the Salon. Chesneau claimed that, for Courbet and his friend Proudhon, the painting was "un symbole de la France à venir."[7] Zola wrote of him "Le maître est loin d'être accepté; on le tolère au plus; on se défie de lui, on semble toujours redouter une mauvaise plaisanterie de sa part."[8] And often enough Courbet did play a joke, with the result that he was always regarded with suspicion, never wholly accepted. Millet, on the other hand, received, in 1868, his belated ribbon of the Légion d'honneur. In the wake of Rousseau's death and his friends' success at the Salon, Castagnary wrote: "il est temps d'arracher à l'école romantique ce beau fleuron du paysage moderne, qui nous appartient." Henceforth, he declared, the landscape School should be linked to Naturalism and no longer to Romanticism: a new generation had arrived.[9]

The real beneficiary in 1868 was Manet. He exhibited at the Salon his Portrait de M. Emile Zola and Une jeune

femme (Woman with a Parrot); Castagnary wrote of him "Cette année lui a valu un véritable succès."[10] To be sure, there were still many critics who had nothing but harsh words, but Zola felt that the tide had turned, that if the public didn't understand, at least it no longer laughed: "Le public s'habitue, les critiques se calment et consentent à ouvrir les yeux, le succès vient."[11] In this sense, 1868 was for Manet what 1857 had been for Courbet; having successfully challenged the Government and taken their fate into their own hands, they could not but be admired in a society in which all values were now open to question and only self-made men seemed to know the answers.

The swift turn-about in official favor between 1867 and 1868 elicited from Théophile Gautier his famous avowal which, fittingly enough, stands at the threshold of the next epoch in art:

> ...l'on pense à l'antipathie, à l'horreur qu'inspiraient, il y a une trentaine d'années, à des gens qui ne manquaient ni l'esprit, ni de talent, ni de goût, ni de largeur d'idées, les premières peintures de Delacroix, de Decamps, de Boulanger, de Scheffer, de Corot, de Rousseau, si longtemps exilés du Salon. Ingres lui-même eut bien de la peine à se faire accepter.... Et pourtant ces artistes si honnis, si conspués, si persécutés sont devenus des maîtres illustres, reconnus de tous, et ils avaient alors autant de talent qu'ils en eurent jamais, peut-être même davantage, car ils donnaient la fleur de leur génie. Les scrupuleux se demandaient, en face de ces exemples frappants et encore tout voisins de nous, si vraiment l'on ne peut comprendre autre chose en art que les oeuvres de la génération dont on est contemporain, c'est-à-dire avec laquelle on a eu vingt ans. Il est probable que

> les tableaux de Courbet, Manet, Monet, et tutti quanti renferment les beautés qui nous échappent à nous autres anciennes chevelures romantiques, déjà mêlées de fils d'argent, et qui sont particulièrement sensibles aux jeunes gens à vestons courts et à chapeaux écimés. Pour notre part, nous avons fait en conscience tous nos efforts pour nous accoutumer à cette peinture, et quand nous avons eu l'honneur de faire partie du jury, nous ne l'avons pas repoussé. 12

The anguish Gautier expressed was similar to the anonymous cry of 1855 "Hélas! dans les arts, comme dans la politique, l'erreur d'aujourd'hui n'est-elle pas presque toujours la vérité de demain?"[13] The issue was not that an older generation was incapable of understanding youth, but that, since the 1789 Revolution, the rate of change had accelerated, differences between generations becoming profound. The Second Empire established this pattern of rapid and radical change as the norm, in art as well as well as in other spheres of life. The security offered by tradition was giving way to the anxiety of the present, characteristic of our Modern period.

Nieuwerkerke did not share Gautier's insight, however, and was personally responsible for the rejection of one of Monet's paintings.[14] He blamed Daubigny for the liberalism of the Jury. Castagnary defended him:

> M. de Nieuwerkerke s'en prend à Daubigny. Si le Salon de cette année est ce qu'il est, un Salon de nouveaux venus; si les portes en ont été ouvertes à presque tous ceux qui se sont présentés; s'il contient 1378 numéros de plus que le Salon de l'année dernière; si, dans ce débordement de la peinture libre, la peinture d'Etat fait une assez pauvre figure, c'est à

Daubigny la faute....

> Je ne sais pas si Daubigny a fait tout ce que M. de Nieuwerkerke lui attribue. Je le croirais volontiers, car Daubigny n'est pas seulement un grand artiste, c'est encore un brave homme qui se souvient des misères de sa jeunesse, et qui voudrait épargner à la jeunesse des autres les rudes épreuves qu'il a subies lui-même. Aussi suis-je sûr d'être d'accord avec tout le public en lui votant au nom de ceux que son influence a affranchis désormais, une adresse de remerciements. 15

Still sensitive to the protests of 1867, the Art Administration took additional measures to protect itself from charges of favoritism by setting up a special committee to award the two Grand Medals of Honor. Under the Presidency of Nieuwerkerke, the committee would include the elected Presidents of each of the Juries (Robert-Fleury, Dumont, Duban, and Henriquel) plus two members from each Jury drawn by lot on the day the committee would meet. With eight of fourteen members drawn by lot and the four Jury Presidents elected, the committee would then, in principle, be above reproach.[16] The installation of the Salon was also intended to be above reproach, for it was hung alphabetically; this did not prevent Nieuwerkerke, however, from seeing to it that Manet's paintings were placed near the ceiling, and that, at the revision, Renoir, Bazille, and Monet had their paintings taken down and badly hung in the dépôtoir.[17]

Nonetheless, the result of all these changes in the Salon made 1868 the year of Universal Suffrage in art.

Paul Mantz wrote in L'Illustration: "C'est, on le voit, le suffrage universel substitué au suffrage restreint. Quel a été le résultat de ce retour aux vrais principes? N'hésitons pas à le dire, il a été excellent."[18] Pierre Petroz wrote in Revue moderne:

> Quelques esprits chagrins, quelques privilégiés mécontents de n'être plus seuls à jouir du droit de vote en ont gémi; mail il y a lieu de s'en féliciter. La liberté des Expositions largement comprise et pratiquée est assurément plus favorable au développement, au progrès de l'art, qu'elle n'est compromettante ou dangereuse pour sa dignité. D'ailleurs il en est des décisions du jury d'admission comme des arrêts de la justice ordinaire: mieux vaut acquitter dix coupables que de condamner un seul innocent. [19]

But these were Republicans and thus could be expected to sympathize with such a reform. Conservatives were less enthusiastic. Charles Clément, for example, writing in Le Journal des Débats, was not convinced of the advantages of Universal Suffrage. Pointing out that most artists were mediocrities, he expressed no surprise that they had elected a Jury of mediocrities: "La démocratie a donc envahi le domaine des arts, comme elle a envahi ou comme elle envahira tout le reste."[20] It seems to have escaped him that the Juries of the Academy were at least as mediocre, and what is more, of a mediocrity unrepresentative of the mediocrity of most artists. The extreme conservative position was represented by Charles-Ernest Beulé, Secrétaire perpétuel of the Academy,

who, in an article entitled "Du Danger des Expositions," stated that the problem had begun in 1789: "Le droit d'exposer est réclamé par les peintres et par les sculpteurs aussi impérieusement que le droit au travail a été revendiqué par les ouvriers."[21] Without an Academic Jury to uphold the highest standards, he felt, art had slipped into decadence: "Enfin, l'éclectisme, source de jouissances si vives pour les critiques ou les amateurs, est un danger pour l'art, comme le panthéisme pour les réligions."[22] In a series of pamphlets, a fellow-traveller of the Academy named Lazerges suggested that the Salon ought to be triennial with the Academy recalled to serve as jury.[23]

By the late 1860s, the debate over the organization of the Salon had become so polarized that two contradictory positions had evolved. Academicians and conservatives wanted the Salon to be held infrequently, if at all, to be didactic and edifying, encompassing only the loftiest aspirations of the French School, as defined by themselves. To this end they constantly criticized the Salons as picture shops, as bazaars, and the Juries as too lenient. Most artists, and progressives in general, wanted the Salon to be even more of a picture shop; they needed it in order to find their public and sell their works and they resented the restrictions imposed by the Juries. They suggested, at every opportunity, that the Salon should be

permanent and open to all.

Various solutions were proposed to this problem, the Salon des refusés being the most notorious. The proposal by the Commission des Beaux-Arts in 1850 to have two exhibitions, one permanent, the other at longer intervals, became more and more popular.[24] The painter Alexis-Joseph Pérignon, Director of the Museum and Ecole des beaux-arts at Dijon, wrote several pamphlets much discussed in 1868 setting forth this idea.[25] The annual Salon can't satisfy everybody, he wrote, because it has two contradictory purposes. It seeks to be an exhibition of works of the highest quality, and at the same time to serve the material interests of artists, introducing them to their public, letting them show and sell their work. This is why there have always been two camps; one wants the Jury to be more severe, the other wants to suppress it altogether. The only solution is to have two exhibitions. One would be permanent with no Jury; all artists who wanted to exhibit could bring their work and pay a fee. The public would not pay an admission fee because the works would be for sale and one cannot charge admission to a marché. The other exhibition, which he called l'Exposition Impériale would take place less often, perhaps every five years. It would have a severe Jury which would choose only distinguished work and, as nothing would be for sale, the public would have to pay an admission fee.

Pérignon's idea was particularly important in 1868 because the juxtaposition of severe Juries for the Universal Exposition and Salon of 1867 and an extremely liberal Jury for the Salon of 1868 had again emphasized the fallibility--and vacillation--of the Administration. Charles Blanc was in the conservative camp and thus stated of exhibitions in general "Plus elles sont fréquentes, d'ailleurs, plus elles sont faibles."[26] He also was influenced by Pérignon's plan, and wrote in Le Temps:

> Oui, il y a là une contradiction fondamentale et constante qui ne pourra se résoudre, comme tant d'autres problèmes, que par la liberté.
>
> D'une part, liberté aux artistes de s'associer ainsi qu'ils l'entendront, pour ouvrir soit des Expositions partielles où se grouperaient les talents similaires, soit une exhibition générale et payante....
>
> D'autre part, liberté pour l'Etat d'organiser, à de plus longs intervalles, et à ses heures, un salon gratuitement ouvert à tous les visiteurs...où tout enfin serait arrangé pour le plus grand honneur de l'art français. [27]

The first he called an exhibition of "tableaux à vendre" (the English word in French still retained its pejorative connotation of "exhibitionism"); the second he called an exposition of "tableaux à voir" (the word exposition in both languages still has a didactic significance). Blanc has rearranged Pérignon's ideas to conform to conservative sensibilities. For him, artists' exhibitions were a form of (low) entertainment and thus should charge admission, as

did theatres. Government Salons, on the other hand, were a form of education and therefore must be free, as were churches, libraries, and universities. He had reversed Pérignon's reasoning.

The two Universal Expositions, coupled with ideas of "Progress," had resulted in a sense of the history of contemporary art. The French School was no longer conceived as static, defined by the Academy; it could now be defined only by an examination of the art currently being produced. The qualities of "timeless and eternal," associated with Ingres and history painting, had definitely been replaced by the "here and now" of contemporary life. Even a conservative such as Clément was infected by this line of reasoning. Of Pérignon's proposed quinquennial Exposition Impériale he wrote:

> Elle permettrait à établir de temps en temps, au moyen d'élémens suffisans d'appréciation, le bilan, la situation de notre Ecole, d'étudier sa marche, de marquer avec précision ses progrès ou sa décadence. Avec les Expositions annuelles, tout jugement d'ensemble est impossible, et les pas en avant ou en arrière sont trop peu sensibles pour frapper le grand nombre, pour indiquer qu'il faut changer de route ou persévérer, pour démontrer la nécessité d'une réaction dans un sens ou dans un autre. A cet égard, l'Exposition universelle de l'an dernier, qui réunissait une grande partie des ouvrages de nos artistes exécutés depuis dix ans, a offert un grand intérêt et a déjà permis de contrôler une idée que je crois juste et féconde. 28

Pérignon's proposal proved influential, and, although not adopted in all its particulars, was again circulated in

1881, the year that the Government finally abandoned control of the Salon, turning it over to the Société des artistes français, as Chennevières had suggested in 1863.[29] Pérignon's general idea corresponds to the modern system in which entrance to gallery exhibitions is free as the work is for sale, but one pays for museum admission as for other forms of leisure time amusement. Charles Blanc's attempt to keep art on the elevated plane of churches, libraries, and universities failed, for art did not maintain its role as didactic inspiration, but became instead a form of entertainment, economically aligned with theatres and sporting events.

The Triumph of Genre

> Le Genre! Partout le genre! Le genre dans le portrait, le genre dans le paysage!
> --Etienne Palma, "Le Salon de 1868" [30]

As in 1857, the Salon following the restrictive Universal Exposition was distinguished by its liberalism, the most striking aspect of which was the predominance of genre. While in 1857 this could be attributed to the temporary absence of the major artists, in 1868 it was the major artists who were exhibiting. Because genre was considered a foreign style, the foreign painters who, now more than ever, were exhibiting in the Salon had become quite conspicuous. Maxime DuCamp stated categorically that

this phenomenon had begun in the wake of the 1855 Exposition.[31] Ernest Chesneau pointed this out immediately in his first article on the 1868 Salon, then devoted his first four articles to discussing their work, singling out Alfred Stevens (Belgium), Alma-Tadema (Netherlands), and Adolf Menzel (Prussia), all of whom showed genre.[32] Paris had retained its supremacy as the international capital of art; the price was that it had to accept what was already the international style in art.

Nor was the popularity of genre confined only to contemporary art, as Marius Chaumelin pointed out:

> Ne voyons-nous pas, dans les ventes, les Flamands et les Hollandais, --ces faiseurs de magots, --atteindre et dépasser même les prix des maîtres italiens, --ces dieux de la peinture? Et, pour ne parler que de la France, cette école du dix-huitième siècle, si dédaignée, si méprisée, il y a quarante ans, n'a-t-elle pas complètement détroné, dans les galeries des amateurs, l'école solennelle de David? 33

As each age rewrites the past to explain and justify the present, the grand shift of taste characteristic of the second half of the nineteenth century, the shift from large public to small private images, had brought with it a concomitant shift in taste for the art of the past. The classicism of the Italian Renaissance, so esteemed by Academicians, the seventeenth century French masters, so eloquently praised by Cousin, were being replaced by the elegance and intimism of eighteenth century works and a

taste for the little Dutch masters.[34]

If it was acknowledged that genre had come to replace history painting, it was equally understood that genre painting came in two categories; Ferdinand de Lasteyrie called them "des études des moeurs religieuses ou mondaines."[35] They might also be called sacred and profane, the one extolling (often hypocritically) the virtues of religion and the merits of the Bourgeois family, the other, either overtly or covertly, depicting worldly pleasures and vices. Charles Marchal succeeded in cornering the entire genre market, as thus defined, by exhibiting a pair of paintings in 1868 entitled Penelope and Phryné. Each showed a modern miss appropriately attired; they proved very popular with both critics and public. Marchal notwithstanding, the Salon of 1868 contained many excellent paintings, among them Renoir's Lise, Manet's Portrait de M. Zola, Pissarro's Coté de Jallais, Hermitage. Yet the special Jury, this Jury for which such pains had been taken to ensure its "objectivity," awarded the Grand Medal of Honor for painting to Gustave Brion for his La Lecture de la Bible: intérieur protestant en Alsace (Figure 88).[36] This medal, traditionally reserved for a history painter, had never before been given to a painter of genre. Here was final proof that the old order had definitively changed. History painting had been dethroned and would never again regain its former authority.

The award of the Grand Medal of Honor to a genre painter met with a variety of responses. By 1868, the eclecticism set in motion in 1855 had reached a point at which the critics were not only incapable of seeing or appreciating a taste different from their own (that was an old phenomenon) but the hierarchical structure which had rationalized the whole system had irrevocably broken down. It was like an orchestra, all of whose members were playing a different tune, the conductor (established authority) having been deposed. Castagnary wrote: "Nous nous trouvons tous pêle-mêle sur le même terrain obscur, sans carte et sans guide, nous pressant confusément dans l'ombre, criant chacun de notre côté à la moindre lueur apparue: Voici l'étoile, suivez-la!"[37] This response was qualitatively different from the praise or criticism directed at Ingres, for example, for underlying that there was always the recognition that he did, in fact, represent the French School as defined by the Institut de France. By 1868 the entire system had been thrown into question, and Brion represented no more or less than the quite fallible choice of a group of Jurors who held their office at the whim of the electorate, and were replaced year by year. The critics who associated the death of Ingres with the beginning of aesthetic anarchy were right, but the same process was taking place on all levels of society, and not just in France: the principle of unquestioned authority was

giving way to that of popular choice. A brief investigation of the response to Brion will show the scope of this change in art.

There were, first of all, those who were completely unprepared for the choice of Brion. Several of the critics who published their reviews before the awards didn't even mention him, apparently not realizing that he would be a strong contender for the Medal of Honor.[38] Others were frankly bewildered by the choice. Ernest Chesneau, for example, always supported authority, yet called Brion's picture "un tableau intéressant, mais que le jury a singulièrement grandi en le jugeant digne de la médaille d'honneur."[39] Castagnary called Brion "le lauréat imprévu" and wrote:

> La foule avait passé devant la Lecture de la Bible, sans la voir; la critique n'y avait trouvé qu'un petit tableau de genre, patiemment exécuté par un artiste soigneux de sa brosse, qui essaye de suppléer par le travail aux qualités natives que la nature lui a refusées: le jury y reconnaît une grande peinture, digne d'être tout à la fois proposée comme modèle aux contemporains et recommandée comme chef-d'oeuvre à la postérité. Pour n'être pas nouveau, le phénomène est curieux. [40]

Others expressed stronger viewpoints. Louis Auvray wrote that his fellow painters were astonished at the award because Brion's painting was inferior even to his own general level.[41] L'Illustration published an entire page of caricatures by Bertall entitled "Tout pour l'Alsace.

Considérations sur les médailles à l'Exposition de 1868," the centerpiece of which was Brion's painting captioned "Grande Médaille d'Honneur":

> L'intérieur du charbonnier alsacien ou le charbonnier maître chez lui, par M. Brion.
>
> Quelques personnes ont paru étonnées de voir attribuer la médaille d'honneur à ce tableau! Hommes légers, ils n'ont pas compris que dans un moment où la guerre pourrait menacer nos frontières de l'Est, il est de bonne politique de faire quelque chose à Alsace. Honneur à Erckmann-Chatrian et Cie. Honneur à Brion, à ses charbonniers et à ses charbonnières. 42

And yet the structure of the awards Jury made this sort of manipulation unlikely.

A more probable explanation is that the key to Brion's success was his mediocrity, a quality described by Duret as the necessary ingredient of Bourgeois Art. Zola wrote of him "Je crois, pour ma part, que le jury a voulu faire une manifestation en faveur de la médiocrité de l'Ecole. C'est très médiocre, il est vrai, mais c'est récompensé. Donc faites comme cela."[43] Auguste de Belloy wrote of him: "M. Brion n'avait guère jusqu'à ce jour scandalisé ni édifié personne. A égale distance de ces deux extrêmes, il se bornait depuis longtemps à amuser et à émouvoir doucement; avec ces scènes de moeurs alsaciennes qui ont fait sa réputation, une réputation discrète comme son talent."[44] Brion represented the juste milieu of the 1860s. He was a genre painter, true, but elevated enough for Charles Blanc

to compare him to Greuze.[45] He represented peasants, true, but, as Louis Auvray commented, they had about them "un aspect élevé qui n'a rien de la vulgarité et de la grossièreté du réalisme de M. Millet."[46] His painting would never inspire violent passions, wrote Chaumelin, and neither, it seemed, would his peasants, who were praised for their honesty, tranquillity, piety, and patriarchal values, all qualities dear to the Bourgeoisie.[47] He could even be praised as the best of the new young Naturalists; he was certainly the least controversial.[48] He seems to have been a genuinely popular choice, possibly a compromise among candidates each objectionable to a different section of the Jury. At the Awards Ceremony, "Des applaudissements bruyants et prolongés ont prouvé que le choix de MM. Brion et Falguière pour les grandes médailles d'honneur avait l'assentiment général."[49]

True to Second Empire art politics, however, the Government was not pleased with the very results it had done so much to bring about. At the Awards Ceremony, Maréchal Vaillant presided, and explained that the Jury had not found any history painting sufficiantly worthy to receive the Grand Medal of Honor and so had awarded it to a painting of genre:

> Sans aucun doute, les membres du jury ont voulu, dans cette circonstance, consacrer, par la première des récompenses, une direction de l'art dans laquelle notre école réalise chaque jour des merveilles de bon goût, d'observation, de finesse

et d'esprit.

> Je m'associe à cette pensée; mais, en même temps, je dois vous recommander de ne pas perdre de vue que la peinture de genre ne saurait occuper le premier rang parmi les manifestations du sentiment artistique, et que le tableau de genre le plus brillant et le mieux réussi restera toujours une page anecdotique et, pour ainsi dire, une oeuvre d'intimité. 50

Time was running out for the Second Empire Art Administration; the liberalism of the 1860s had set in motion a train of events which had resulted in the loss of authority of all aesthetic directives proceeding from both Government and Academy. The preferences of Vaillant or Nieuwerkerke, Government or Academy were irrelevant; the triumph of genre was complete.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIX

1. Castagnary, "Le Salon de 1868," in his Salons, II: 254; Castagnary's critique was originally published in Le Siècle, an opposition journal.

2. See La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 28 avril 1867, 134, 5 mai 1867, 142.

3. The Règlement for the 1868 Salon was issued 5 novembre 1867 and printed in the 1868 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., XXXI-XXXVIII.

4. See Louis Auvray, Le Salon de 1868 suivi d'une réfutation de la brochure de M. Hip. Lazerges, Paris, 1868, 11-21. Auvray was Director of La Revue artistique where his critique first appeared.

5. The lists of Jurors were published by Auvray and also reprinted in the 1868 Salon catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., CXII-CXVI. Auvray gave the number of votes each received; the totals were also published in La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 29 mars 1868, 51.

6. See Rewald, Impressionism, 185.

7. Ernest Chesneau, "Salon de 1868," Le Constitutionnel, 16 juin 1868; on Courbet's 1868 exhibition, see "Nouvelles," La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 24 mai 1868, 83, and the letters from Courbet to Bruyas, 7 février 1868 and 10 septembre 1868, BN, Cabinet des estampes, Yb3 1739(8): Lettres de Gustave Courbet. His pavillion had to be taken down after his exhibition.

8. Emile Zola, "Quelques bonnes toiles," L'Evénement Illustré, 9 juin 1868.

9. Castagnary, Salons, II:265.

10. Ibid., II: 213-14.

11. Emile Zola, "Edouard Manet," L'Evénement Illustré, 10 mai 1868.

12. Théophile Gautier, "Salon de 1868," Le Moniteur Universel, 11 mai 1868.

13. See "Chronique," La Revue Universelle des Arts (1855: I): 240.

14. Rewald, Impressionism, 185.

15. Castagnary, Salons, II: 254.

16. See the Règlement for the Salon of 1868 published in the 1868 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., XXXIII-XXXVIII; also Auvray, 1868, 6; Edmond About, "Le Salon de 1868," Revue des Deux-Mondes, 1 juin 1868, 717.

17. Auvray, 1868, 33; for the installation, also see Chesneau, Le Constitutionnel, 12 mai 1868.

18. Paul Mantz, "Le Salon de 1868," L'Illustration, 2 mai 1868, 283.

19. Pierre Petroz, "Salon de 1868," Revue Moderne, 10 mai 1868, 357-58; also see About, RDM, 1 juin 1868, 718.

20. Charles Clément, "Exposition de 1868," Journal des Débats, 1 mai 1868.

21. See Charles-Ernest Beulé, Causeries sur l'art, Paris, 1867, 23.

22. Ibid.; 6.

23. Jean-Raymond-Hippolyte Lazerges, Beaux-Arts. Questions du Jour. De l'Institut, de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts et des Expositions, Paris, 1868, 33; also see his Beaux-Arts. Questions du Jour. Des Associations artistiques, Paris, 1868, 5-7.

24. See "Mouvement des Arts," L'Artiste, 15 mars 1850, 156-57; also Chapter V of this study.

25. Alexis-Joseph Pérignon, Deux Expositions des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1866; Lettre de M. Pérignon sur la nécessité de transformer l'organisation de l'exposition des beaux-arts, Paris, juillet, 1866; this and and number of similar proposals are contained in the Archives du Louvre X: Salon de 1866.

26. Charles Blanc, "Salon de 1868," Le Temps, 12 mai 1868.

27. Ibid.

28. Clément, Journal des Débats, 1 mai 1868.

29. See Chennevières, "Les Expositions Annuelles et La Société des artistes français," Souvenirs, Part IV, 69-118; Pérignon's Deux Expositions was reprinted in 1881.

30. Etienne Palma, "Le Salon de 1868," Revue de Paris

n.s. 11 (15 mai 1868): 222.

31. See DuCamp, Salons, 334; DuCamp stated this in his review of the 1867 Exposition.

32. Chesneau, Le Constitutionnel, 5, 12, 19, 26 mai 1868.

33. Marius Chaumelin, "Salon de 1868," in his L'Art contemporain, 106; Chaumelin's critique was originally published in La Presse.

34. See Petra ten Doesschate-Chu, French Realism and the Dutch Masters, Utrecht, 1974; Francis Haskell, Rediscoveries in Art. Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France, Oxford, 1976.

35. Ferdinand de Lasteyrie, "Salon de 1868," L'Opinion Nationale, 13 juin 1868.

36. The awards for the 1868 Salon were listed in the 1869 Salon catalogue Explication des ouvrages...., XVI-XVII. The Grand Medal of Honor for sculpture was given to Falguière.

37. Castagnary, Salons, II: 250.

38. Among those who did not mention him were Pierre Petroz in Revue Moderne, Firmin Boissin, "Salon de 1868," Etudes Artistiques, Paris, 1868, Paul-Pierre (Paul Pierre Casimir-Périer), Un Chercheur au Salon 1868, Paris, 1868.

39. Chesneau, Le Constitutionnel, 30 juin 1868.

40. Castagnary, Salons II: 280; also see Lasteyrie in L'Opinion Nationale, 13 juin 1868, and Tony Révillon, "Le Salon de 1868," La Petite Presse, 21 juin 1868.

41. Auvray, 1868, 44.

42. Bertall, "Tout pour l'Alsace. Considérations sur les médailles à l'Exposition de 1868," L'Illustration, 20 juin 1868, 397. Erckmann-Chatrian was a team of popular novelists, Emile Erckmann and Alexandre Chatrian, who specialized in tales of popular life in Germany; they had a major success in 1868 with Histoire d'un paysan.

43. Zola, L'Evénement Illustré, 9 juin 1868.

44. August de Belloy, "Promenade à l'Exposition des beaux-arts," Le Correspondant, 10 juin 1868, 902; also see Chaumelin, 148.

45. Blanc, Le Temps, 26 mai 1868.

46. Auvray, 1868, 62-63.

47. Chaumelin, 148; also see Clément, Journal des Débats, 3 juin 1868; Paul de Saint-Victor, "Salon de 1868," La Liberté, 29 mai 1868; Gautier, Le Moniteur Universel, 26 mai 1868.

48. J. Grangedor (Jules Joly), "Le Salon de 1868," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 juillet 1868, 6.

49. Chaumelin, 180.

50. Vaillant's speech was reprinted in the 1869 Salon catalogue, Explication des ouvrages...., VIII-XII.

CHAPTER XX

THE END

In the Spring of 1868, the laws on censorship of the press were relaxed; it was a reform that, once the Universal Exposition was over, could no longer be delayed by a Government that called itself liberal.[1] The immediate result was a barrage of criticism of every aspect of the regime; the Art Administration was not neglected. The rancor left by years of mismanagement led to a frankness in the 1868 Salon critiques that made several of them read like diatribes, recounting in detail every failing of the Administration. The most comprehensive ones were written by Edmond About for Revue des Deux-Mondes and Pierre Petroz for Revue Moderne, both opposition journals. Not to be outdone, Emile Zola wrote a short polemic for La Tribune which appeared after the Salon had closed. Their main charge was the same, that the Second Empire had no art policy, decisions being made on the basis of political expediency or personal greed. Nieuwerkerke as Surintendant des beaux-arts was the principal object of the attack. About wrote:

> Les hommes agréables et de bonne famille qui administrent par droit de conquête le département du beau ne sont pas, à proprement parler, les

ennemis de la chose publique. On ne peut dire qu'ils soient tout à fait incompétens, car ils ont travaillé la peinture ou la sculpture en amateurs avec quelque succès. S'ils font beaucoup de mal et peu de bien, la faute en est à certain dandysme renouvelé du comte d'Orsay, à la prédominance de l'esprit mondain sur le sentiment artiste, à je ne sais quelle indifférence souriante et triomphale qui serait à peine excusable chez des parvenus, à certain parti-pris de laisser dire et de n'en faire qu'à sa tête, par où la préfecture des beaux-arts se rapproche de la surintendance Haussmann. M. le préfet de la Seine a un plan; nous savons ce qu'il nous en coûte. L'administration des beaux-arts n'en a point. Elle fait et défait, juge et déjuge, prend les arrêtés qui lui plaisent et les déchire quand ils ont fait leur temps, c'est-à-dire d'une année à l'autre. C'est un petit état dans l'état, et le pouvoir personnel y est également illimité sans y être également réfléchi. Les dieux galans de cet olympe secondaire n'ont pas de prétentions à l'infaillibilité; l'omnipotence leur suffit, mais ils y tiennent. S'ils ne dédaignent pas de varier souvent, ils entendent que leur dernière décision soit sacrée jusqu'à ce qu'ils la condamnent eux-mêmes, incapables de souffrir la contradiction, mais se contredisant à toute heure.

Ce pouvoir, mobile comme l'onde et pourtant ferme comme un roc, est en possession de publier quand et comme il lui plaît les ouvrages de nos artistes. 2

Pierre Petroz extended the attack beyond Nieuwerkerke personally to include the entire Administration and its policies:

Elle suit l'opinion, elle ne l'inspire pas. N'ayant pas de doctrine déterminée qui lui soit propre, elle a une irrésistible propension à accepter celle des corps constitués tels que la quatrième classe de l'Institut, même lorsqu'elle se les subordonne. Ce que les uns ont appelé la réorganisation, les autres la désorganisation de l'enseignement à l'Ecole des beaux-arts, semble le démontrer. Mais les moyens dictatoriaux qu'elle a employés dans son essai de réforme de l'éducation artistique ne seraient pas de mise

> avec des artistes plus ou moins arrivés, et ceux qu'elle a à sa disposition, les achats et les récompenses, sont d'une efficacité douteuse.
>
> ....Quant aux médailles distribuées par elle à titre de récompenses, elles sont enviables, puisqu 'elles exemptent ceux qui les obtiennent de passer devant le jury; mais elles ont le tort d'avoir quelque analogie avec les prix décernés dans les concours des collèges, et il est difficile de supposer que l'espoir d'être traités comme des élèves studieux ou des forts en thème suffise jamais pour pousser aux nobles entreprises et aux grandes choses des artistes définitivement sortis de l'école. 3

And on it went. Commissioned works were so badly chosen that the Administration didn't dare exhibit its purchases before they were dispatched to the provinces. Once there, they were often immediately put in storage and never seen again. Public commissions were given by short-sighted administrators who paid as little as possible, imposed impossible deadlines, and as a result got hasty botched work. The Salon itself, formerly an event of dignity and prestige held in the Louvre, had deteriorated: "Aujourd'hui, dans le coin d'une bâtisse à plusieurs fins, qui n'est ni une serre ni une halle, mais qui participe des deux, on improvise une exhibition simultanée des beaux-arts et des beaux légumes, entre un concours de carrossiers et une exposition des fromages sans doute." [4] With all of this, where did one look for aesthetic leadership?

> Dans le témoignage des journaux? C'est l'anarchie, la fantaisie, la camaraderie et la réclame portées au plus haut point qui se puisse concevoir. Dans les distinctions officielles? Rien n'est plus capricieux ni plus arbitraire: si l'on dressait la liste des peintres français par

> ordre hiérarchique, selon le nombre et l'importance des prix que ces éternels collégiens ont reçus du ministère, vous ririez trop. Le public amateur et spéculateur n'a donc qu'une ressource, c'est de régler son fanatisme sur la cote de l'hôtel Drouot et d'acheter les talens qui se vendent le mieux. La mode fait les prix, sans acception de mérite. 5

Zola started off the same way, by saying "Notre ministère des Beaux-Arts est un des plus incapables qu'on ait vus."[6] He wasted no time on details, however, but went right to the heart of the matter:

> En matière de gouvernement, il n'y a que deux voies possibles: le despotisme le plus absolu ou la liberté la plus complète. Qu'elle choisisse, et promptement.
>
> J'entends par le despotisme le plus absolu le règne autocratique de l'Académie des beaux-arts. On a eu tort de retirer le pouvoir de ses mains pour le confier aux mains d'un jury électif dont les jugements peuvent varier chaque année....
>
> Les demi-mesures sont dangereuses, elles tuent les gouvernements. Un despotisme bien organisé, surtout en art, est préférable à une liberté restreinte. Du moment où l'administration avouait que le jury académique ne valait rien, il lui fallait couper dans le vif, détruire l'institution, créer des expositions libres. Elle n'a pas eu ce courage; aussi, à cette heure, doit-elle être dans un cruel embarras, en face des ennuis que lui ont causés et que lui causeront encore les décisions à demi libérales qu'elle prend.... L'administration aura beau reculer, elle sera forcée tôt ou tard de rappeler l'Académie ou d'ouvrir les portes toutes larges. 7

It is as though, finally freed of censorship, these critics totalled up the art policies of the Second Empire and found it bankrupt. Many of their charges could be

traced to Napoléon III who was, at best, ignorant in matters of art and simply tried to please the greatest number, or to his Surintendant, Nieuwerkerke, whose taste was so accurately described by About as a mixture of the socially prominent and the politically expedient. There were also the aspects of the age which would have progressed regardless of the personalities involved. Duret and Chesneau understood well the social and economic changes that governed the major shift in style which separated the first half of the century from the second, from large public works to small intimate easel paintings. Whatever regime spanned the third quarter of the century would have been faced with the same economic and social forces that affected the entire world. Rapid industrialization, concepts of Progress, theories of democracy and liberalism, the rise of the Bourgeoisie with its own culture, all were factors operative throughout Europe and America. The shift in taste described in this study was the cultural concomitant of the political and economic shift begun by the French Revolution. As culture follows political and economic factors, almost another century was required for the triumph of Bourgeois art.

In this study we have traced the parallel and coexistent traditions of art and craft in France, from their origins in the guild system through the conflicts which followed the establishment of the Académie des

beaux-arts. We have seen that exhibitions themselves served, from the beginning, the ends of Government, and met with resistance on the part of Academicians. In the era of Universal Expositions, the two traditions of Art and Craft--by now Art and Industry--converged and clashed, for the aesthetic sphere, which had maintained an uneasy and contradictory coexistance with the commercial sector, was increasingly rationalized on the same terms. Industrial expositions provided a framework for this assimilation of art into a commercial context; in an early and symbolic skirmish the annual Salon was displaced from its traditional and prestigious location in the Louvre to be installed in the Palais de l'Industrie, sharing space with agricultural and industrial expositions.

During the Second Empire, the art world in France changed irrevocably, and the two Universal Expositions served as catalysts for many of the changes. The major transition, from large public to small private works, was accomplished in two stages. The eclecticism established in 1855 dismantled the classical system of the hierarchy of categories by implicitly placing all of them on the same level; the immediate effect was an unstable co-existence among all styles which, in the absence of strong direction from Government or Academy, had to then compete for public favor. By 1867 this temporary equilibrium had given way to the supremacy of genre painting, for, in the intervening

years, the Academy had been replaced by the Bourgeoisie as the arbiter of taste, and history painting had yielded to genre. As Universal Expositions were the chief vehicle for the introduction of foreign art into France, the triumph of genre painting, already the preferred style of Northern Europe, was the major result. The group of painters later known as Impressionists must be seen as part of this overall movement away from the heroic and towards small intimate scenes from everyday life. In fact, they were genre painters, despite Modernist attempts to define genre painting in a pejorative sense by first eliminating from this category the work of its best artists.

The retrospective exhibitions given to major artists in 1855 can be seen as the outcome of the Romantic emphasis on the Individual, with the implication that every artist has a particular development and style, a separate history. The ideology of the retrospective exhibition, emphasizing an individual self-referential "development"--the concept of "Progress" redefined in aesthetic terms--proved to be a valuable Modernist tool for understanding art apart from its political and social milieu. In this new setting, official medals and honors began to lose their significance, for art was increasingly divorced from the public arena. As conservatives so often, and so correctly, charged, the absence of institutional authority had resulted in a kind of aesthetic anarchy in

which individual histories and styles came to replace that of the French School.

The arbitrary quality of the awards given by the Second Empire Art Administration and its Salon and Exposition Juries aggravated the situation, and the contradictory directives contained in official pronouncments on art implied in the end that there were no longer any absolute values, all was relative. As Pierre Petroz stated, the only certainty lay in commercial value. One result was the rise of alternate institutions during this period, the growing importance of art dealers and gallery exhibitions as an alternative to the vacillation of the Art Administration. Careers were increasingly made outside the system, the commercial backing of the Bourgeoisie becoming more important than empty honors from the State. As the careers of Decamps and Meissonier had shown, the Government would, in any case, eventually ratify a popular success. In the late 1860s, critics and artists often referred to the once cherished medals as Collegians' prizes: the Government had vacillated too often (and changed too often) to preserve any authority in art. The shock of the 1855 canonization of Delacroix had provoked the realization that nothing was eternal, that everything, even aesthetic values, could change. Thus confidence was undermined in all future judgments, and critics began the modern custom of citing, like litanies, the names of

artists once scorned, later praised.

Another result of the collapse of the traditional art system was the increasing determination by artists to play an active role in their own fate. Courbet's successful challenge to the Government in 1855 was of the utmost importance, for he showed that artists could organize their own exhibitions and successfully establish their careers without official sanction from either Government or Academy. The first Impressionist show in 1874, originally planned by Bazille and his friends in 1867, was the direct result of Courbet's and, later, Manet's example.

Zola had correctly stated in 1868 that, once embarked on a path of liberalism, the Government had no choice but to follow it out to the end. Despite minor vicissitudes, the Government, after having wrested control of art institutions from the Academy, was forced to make greater and greater concessions until, in 1881, it was obliged to abandon the Salon entirely, turning it over to the Société des artistes français, as Chennevières had proposed in 1863, and as Zola had predicted as inevitable five years later.[8]

The Second Empire marked the end of the traditional world of art as it had existed in France for two centuries. By 1868 the transition to our modern period was virtually complete and, in two years, the Second Empire

itself would have ceased to exist. Nonetheless, the Second Empire had established, in large part through its Universal Expositions, the attitudes and institutions of our modern art world.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XX

1. See Claude Bellanger et al., eds. Histoire générale de la presse française, 5 vols., Paris, 1969, II: 345-46.

2. About, RDM, 1 juin 1868, 716-17.

3. Petroz, Revue Moderne, 10 mai 1868, 356-57.

4. About, RDM, 1 juin 1868, 718-20.

5. Ibid., 727.

6. Emile Zola, "Causerie," La Tribune, 20 décembre 1868.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.; Chennevières, "Les Expositions Annuelles et La Société des artistes français," Souvenirs, Part IV, 69-118.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many works cited in the text have not been included in this bibliography, in particular, short newspaper articles, monographs on individual artists, and works of tangential interest to my main thesis; in such cases the footnotes include the full reference. In series of exhibition reviews by a single critic, the title often varied from week to week; I have included only the principal title and, where there were three or more, either the page numbers or the dates.

I. ARCHIVES

London. The Victoria and Albert Museum. Collection of Printed Documents and Forms used in Carrying on the Business of the Exhibition of 1851. 6 vols.

Paris. Archives Nationales. Fêtes, expositions industrielles:

ADVIII-18
ADXI-67
ADXVIII A 60
ADXVIII C 468
ADXIXD 1/3
AD F1C I 84/89
FIC III-Seine 25
F12 985/991
F12 5005
F13 1024
F21 717

_____. Expositions de Londres en 1851 et 1862:

ADXIX 4/5
ADXIXD 20/34
F12 3164/3167C
F21 525

_____. Exposition Universelle, 1855:

ADXIX 6/19
F12 2919
F12 2926
F12 3035
F12 3182/3184
F12 2892/2917
F12 5005
F12 *5793/*5813
F12 70619-5
F21 519/520
F21 521A/B
F21 1465/1472
F21 1491/1497
F21 *2793/*2797
F70 43/46

_____. Exposition Universelle, 1867:

ADXIXD 38/69
Reg. *3150-*3161B
F12 2918/3161A
F12 3185/7
F12 5006/7
F21 522/523
F80 1774

_____. F21 527/530. Salons annuels. An III-1868.

_____. F21 559/60. Budgets des beaux-arts. 1811-1871.

_____. Travaux d'art. Commandes et acquisitions:
F21 61/112. 6e Série, 1851-1860.
F21 113/189. 7e Série. 1861-1870.

_____. LH1/2793. La Légion d'honneur. Dossiers des légionnaires à 1953.

_____. ADXIXD 256. Circulaires 1841-1851. Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Commerce.

Paris. Archives de la Seine 6A 2855, pièce 34. Lettre. Eugène Delacroix au Prince Napoléon, 11 avril 1855.

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale. Cabinet des estampes:
Exposition Universelle, 1855.
Exposition Universelle, 1867.
Yb3 1739. Sept cartons. Courbet.
Yb3 1739(8). Lettres de Gustave Courbet.

_____. Cabinet des manuscrits 11955, N° 118.
Lettre. Théodore Rousseau à Théophile Thoré, s.d.

Paris. Institut de France. Archives de l'
Académie des beaux-arts. Procès-verbaux. 1850-1870.

Paris. Musée du Louvre. Archives:
Série P 30: Alexandre Decamps. Jean-François Millet. Théodore Rousseau.
Série X: Salons de 1855, 1857, 1866, 1867, 1868.
Exposition Universelle de 1867.

_____. Cabinet des dessins:
Correspondance: Gustave Courbet. Eugène Manet. Jean-François Millet. Théodore Rousseau.

Paris. Musée d'Orsay. Documentation: Jean-Baptiste Clésinger.

II. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS: FETES, SALONS, INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITIONS.

1673. Paris, Le Livret de l'exposition faite en 1673 dans la Cour du Palais-Royal. Anatole de Montaiglon, ed. 1852.

1699. Paris. Liste des tableaux & des ouvrages de sculpture, exposez dans la grande gallerie du Louvre.

1792-1871. Paris. Explication des ouvrages. . . . Salon catalogues; exact title varied from year to year.

1798. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française. Catalogue des produits industriels qui ont été exposés au Champ-de-Mars. Procès-verbal du Jury. Vendémiaire, an VII (1798).

1798. Paris. France. Le Ministre de l'Intérieur François de Neufchâteau. Fête de la Fondation de la République. Programme. 1er Vendémiaire, an VII. Fructidor, an VI (1798).

France. Ministère de l'Intérieur. Recueil des lettres circulaires, instructions, programmes, discours et autres actes publics, émanés du citoyen François de Neufchâteau pendant ses deux exercices du Ministère de l'Intérieur. 2 vols. Paris, an VII-VIII (1798-1800).

1799. Paris. France. Le Ministre de l'Intérieur Quinette. Fête de la Fondation de la République. 1er Vendémiaire, an VIII. Programme. Fructidor, an VII (1799).

1801. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française. Catalogue des productions industrielles exposées dans la grande Cour du Louvre. Fructidor, an IX (1801).

_____. Procès-verbal. Vendémiaire, an X (1801).

1802. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française. Catalogue des productions industrielles exposés dans la grande Cour du Louvre. Fructidor, an X (1802).

_____. Procès-verbal. Vendémiaire, an XI (1802).

France. Ministère de l'Intérieur. Recueil des lettres circulaires, instructions, arrêtés et discours publics, émanés des Citoyens Quinette, LaPlace, Lucien Bonaparte et Chaptal, Ministres de l'Intérieur depuis le 16 Messidor, an VII, jusqu'au 1 Vendémiaire, an X. Paris, an X (1802).

France. Ministère de l'Intérieur. Recueil des lettres circulaires et autres actes publics émanés en l'an XI du Ministère de l'Intérieur. Paris, an XIII (1804-1805).

1806. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française. Notice sur les objets exposés

à 1'Exposition des produits de 1'industrie française.

_____. Rapport du Jury sur les produits de 1'industrie française.

1819. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue indiquant le nom des fabricants avec la désignation sommaire des produits de leur industrie.

_____. Rapport du jury central sur les produits de 1'industrie française par M. L. Costaz.

1823. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue des produits de 1'industrie française, admis à 1'exposition publique dans le palais du Louvre.

_____. Rapport sur les produits de 1'industrie française, présenté, au nom du jury central, par L. Héricart de Thury et P. H. Migneron. 1824.

1827. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue des produits de 1'industrie française, admis à 1'exposition publique dans le palais du Louvre.

_____. Rapport sur les produits de 1'industrie française, présenté, au nom du jury central, par L. Héricart de Thury et P. H. Migneron. 1828.

1834. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue des produits de 1'industrie française, admis à 1'exposition publique, sur la Place de la Concorde, en 1834.

_____. Rapport du jury central sur les produits de 1'industrie française exposés en 1834, par le Baron Charles Dupin. 3 vols. 1836.

1839. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue officiel des produits de 1'industrie française, admis à 1'exposition publique dans le Carré des Fêtes aux Champs-Elysées.

_____. Rapport du jury central. 3 vols.

1844. Paris. Exposition publique des produits de 1'industrie française. Catalogue officiel.

_____. Rapport du jury central. 3 vols.

1849. Paris. Exposition nationale des produits de l'agriculture et de l'industrie française. 1849. Catalogue Officiel.

_____. Rapport du jury central sur les produits de l'agriculture et de l'industrie exposés en 1849. 3 vols. 1850.

1851. London. Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations. Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue. 3 vols. + supp.

_____. Reports by the Juries on the subjects in the thirty classes into which the exhibition was divided. 1852.

_____. France. Commission française sur l'industrie des nations, Londres, 1851. Travaux de la Commission française sur l'industrie des nations. 8 vols. Paris. 1856-1873.

_____. France. Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Commerce. Exposition Universelle de Londres en 1851. Liste des Médailles et mentions honorables décernées aux exposants français. Paris. 1851.

1853. Dublin. Exhibition of Art and Art-Industry. Official Catalogue of the Great Industrial Exhibition.

1853. New York City. Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations. Official Catalogue of the Pictures contributed to the Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations in the Picture Gallery of the Crystal Palace.

1855. Paris. Exposition Universelle de 1855. Atlas descriptif. Dressé par ordre de S.A.I. le prince Napoléon, Président de la Commission Impériale.

_____. Catalogue officiel publié par ordre de la Commission Impériale.

_____. Explication des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, lithographie et architecture des artistes vivants étrangers et français exposés au Palais des beaux-arts, avenue Montaigne, le 15 mai 1855. 1 vol. + 4 supps.

_____. Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. MDCCCLV. Avenue Montaigne. Album de 18 photographies.

_____. Commission Impériale. Visites et études de S.A.I. le prince Napoléon au Palais des beaux-arts. 1856.

_____. Rapports du jury mixte international publiés sous la direction de S.A.I. le prince Napoléon. 2 vols. 1856.

_____. Commission Impériale. Rapport sur l'Exposition Universelle de 1855 présenté à l'Empereur par S.A.I. le prince Napoléon. 1857.

1857. Manchester, England. Art Treasures Exhibition. Catalogue of the art treasures of the United Kingdom collected at Manchester, 1857. London.

1862. London. International Exhibition. Official catalogue of the Fine Art Department. rev. ed.

_____. Exposition Universelle de 1862 à Londres. Section Française. Catalogue officiel publié par par ordre de la Commission Impériale.

_____. Rapport des membres de la Section Française du Jury International sur l'ensemble de l'Exposition et documents officiels publiés sous la direction de Michel Chevalier. 6 vols.

1867. Paris. Exposition Universelle de Paris en 1867. Belgique. Catalogue des oeuvres d'art. Bruxelles.

_____. Catalogue général publié par la Commission Impériale. 2 vols.

_____. Documents Officiels.

_____. Catalogue de produits et objets d'art japonais composant la collection envoyée du Japon pour l'Exposition Universelle de 1867. 1868.

_____. Commission Impériale. Rapport sur l'Exposition Universelle de 1867 à Paris. 1869.

_____. Rapports du Jury International publiés sous la direction de Michel Chevalier. 13 vols. 1868.

1878. Paris. Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1878 à Paris. Rapports du Jury International publiés sous la direction de Jules Simon. 56 vols. 1879-82.

1889. Paris. Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1889 à Paris. Rapport général par M. Alfred Picard. 10 vols. 1891-92.

III. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

About, Edmund. Voyage à travers l'Exposition des Beaux-

Arts. Paris, 1855.

_____. Nos Artistes au Salon de 1857. Paris, 1858.

_____. "Salon de 1867." Le Temps, 22, 29 mai, 4, 13, 22, 26 juin 1867.

_____. "Le Salon de 1868." Revue des Deux-Mondes, 1 juin 1868, 714-45.

Académie des beaux-arts, Paris. Rapport sur l'ouvrage de M. le comte de Laborde intitulé: De l'Union des arts et et de l'industrie. Paris, 1858.

_____. Procès-verbaux de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture 1648-1792. Anatole de Montaiglon, ed. 10 vols. Paris, 1875-81.

Académie française, Paris. Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise. 2 vols. Paris, 1694.

_____. Le Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise. 2 vols. Paris, an VII (1798).

Allwood, John. The Great Exhibitions. London, 1977.

France. Almanach Impérial. 19 vols. Paris, 1852-1870.

Amaury-Duval. L'Atelier d'Ingres. Paris, 1924.

Ambly, Paul (Paul Boiteau). "Critique." L'Artiste, 1 juin 1854, 138.

Andral, Paul. "Chronique Judiciaire." La Propriété littéraire et artistique 1 (1855): 178, 265-80, 372-73.

Angrand, Pierre. "L'Etat Mécène--Période autoritaire du Second Empire (1851-1860)." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, mai-juin 1868, 303-48.

L'Art à Paris en 1867. Album Autographique. Paris, 1867.

L'Artiste. Regular columns: "Chronique," "Le Monde Parisien," "Mouvement des Arts," 1850-1868.

Artz, Frederick B. Reaction and Revolution, 1814-1832. N.Y., 1963.

Astruc, Zacharie. "Le Salon des Champs-Elysées." L'Etendard, 3, 19, 26 juin, 23, 28, juillet, 11 août 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1868 aux Champs-Elysées," L'Etendard, 19, 26, 29, mai, 27 juin, 7, 29, 31 juillet, 2, 5, 6, 7 août 1868.

_____. "Le Japon Chez Nous." L'Etendard, 26 mai 1868.

Auvray, Louis. Exposition des Beaux-Arts. Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

_____. Salon de 1867 et les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle. Paris, 1867.

_____. Le Salon de 1868 suivi d'une réfutation de la brochure de M. Hip. Lazerges. Paris, 1868.

Babou, Hippolyte. "Les Dissidents de l'Exposition. Revue Libérale II (1867): 284-89.

Baroche, Mme Jules. Second Empire, Notes et souvenirs. Paris, 1921.

Bast, Amédée de. Merveilles du génie de l'homme. Paris, 1852.

Barrault, Alexis and G. Bridel. Le Palais de l'Industrie. Paris. 1857.

Baudelaire, Charles. "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts." Le Pays. Journal de l'Empire, 26 mai, 3 juin 1855.

_____. "Beaux-Arts. Ingres." Le Portefeuille. Revue critique, historique et littéraire, 12 août 1855. 130-31.

_____. Correspondance. Claude Pichois and Jean Ziegler, eds. 2 vols. Paris, 1973.

Baudrillart, Henri. "Les Expositions Universelles." Journal Officiel de la République Française, 16 mai 1878, 5284-87, 19 mai 1878, 5462-64.

Bazin, Germain. "Le Salon de 1830 à 1900." Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Lionello Venturi. 2 vols. Rome, 1956. II: 117-23.

Beaumont, Edouard de. "Les Armes. Préface du catalogue en préparation de la collection de M. le comte de Nieuwerkerke." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 novembre 1868, 373-389.

Bellanger, Claude; Jacques Godechot, Pierre Guiral, Fernand Terrou. Histoire générale de la presse

française. 5 vols. Paris, 1969. II: 1815 à 1871.

Bellet, Roger. Presse et journalisme sous le Second Empire. Paris, 1967.

Belloy, le marquis Auguste de. "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle." L'Assemblée Nationale, 31 mai, 10, 24 juin, 2, 25 juillet, 18, 25 août, 7, 20 septembre, 6, 24 octobre, 6, 22, 27 novembre 1855.

_____. "Promenade à l'Exposition des beaux-arts." Le Correspondant, 10 juin 1868, 882-911.

Benevolo, Leonardo. History of Modern Architecture. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1977.

Bénézit, E. Dictionnaire Critique et Documentaire de Peintres, Seculpteurs, Dessinateurs et Graveurs de Tous les Temps et de Tous Pays. Paris, 1924.

Benjamin, Walter. "Paris--The Capital of the Nineteenth Century." Charles Baudelaire. A lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism. Quentin Hoare, trans. London, 1973.

Berger, H. Georges. Les expositions universelles internationales (leur passé, leur rôle actuel, leur avenir). Paris, 1902.

Bertall (Albert d'Arnoux). "Le Salon dépeint et dessiné." Journal Pour Rire, 18 août, 3 novembre, 1 décembre 1855.

_____. "Les Dessus de Panier." Le Journal Amusant, 12 janvier 1856.

_____. "Le Salon dépeint et dessiné." Le Journal Amusant, 18 juillet, 1, 15 août, 19 septembre 1857.

_____. "Promenade au Salon de 1868." Le Journal Amusant, 23 mai 1868.

_____. "Tout pour l'Alsace. Considérations sur les médailles à l'Exposition de 1868." L'Illustration, 20 juin 1868, 397.

Beulé, Charles-Ernest. Causeries sur l'art. Paris, 1867.

Beutler, C. Weltaustellungen im 19. Jahrhundert. Staatliches Museum für angewandte Kunst, Munich, 1973

Binkley, Robert C. Realism and Nationalism, 1852-1832. N.Y., 1963.

Bitard, A. Histoire des expositions et des beaux-arts. Rouen, 1884.

Blanc, Charles. "Au Secrétaire de la Rédaction." La Presse. 30 octobre 1855.

_____. "Exposition Universelle de 1867. Beaux-Arts." Le Temps, 12 avril, 15 mai, 5, 19 juin, 18, 27 août, 2, 16, 23, 24 octobre, 6, 7, 20 novembre 1867.

_____. "Exposition Ingres." Le Temps, 28 avril 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1868." Le Temps, 12, 19, 26 mai, 3, 17, 23, 30 juin 1868.

_____. Ingres, sa vie et ses ouvrages. Paris, 1870.

_____. Les Artistes de mon temps. Paris, 1876.

Blanchard de La Musse. De l'Influence des arts sur le bonheur et sur la civilisation des hommes. Paris, an X (1801).

Boileau, Etienne. Le Livre des Métiers. René Lespinasse and François Bonnardot, eds. (Histoire Générale de Paris) Paris, 1879.

Boime, Albert. "The Salon des Refusés and the Evolution of Modern Art." The Art Quarterly 32 (1969): 411-26.

_____. The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century. N.Y., 1971.

_____. "The Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France." The Art Quarterly n.s. I (Autumn 1977): 1-39.

_____. "The Second Empire's Official Realism." in Gabriel P. Weisberg, ed. The European Realist Tradition. Bloomington, Indiana, 1982. 31-123.

Boissin, Firmin. "Salon de 1868." Etudes Artistiques. Paris, 1868.

Boiteau d'Ambly, Paul (Paul Boiteau). "Salon de 1855." La Propriété littéraire et artistique I (1855): 316-18, 354-60, 410-415, 439-43, 468-73, 493-98, 543-47.

23 mars 1868. Paris. Catalogue d'une collection d'antiquités par M. Frohner, conservateur-adjoint des musées impériaux. (Sale catalogue of Prince

Napoléon Bonaparte)

17-21 mai 1904. Galerie Georges Petit, Paris. Collection de S. A. I. Madame la Princesse Mathilde. Catalogue des tableaux anciens, tableaux, modernes, objets d'art et d'ameublement. (Sale catalogue of Princesse Mathilde Bonaparte)

Bonnin, A. Etudes sur l'art contemporain. Les Ecoles française et étrangères en 1867. Paris, 1868.

Boucher de Perthes, J. Exposition publique des produits de l'arrondissement d'Abbeville, 1833. Abbeville, 1834.

Bouret, Jean, L'Ecole de Barbizon et le paysage français au XIXe siècle. Paris, 1972.

Boyer d'Agen. Ingres d'après une correspondance inédite. Paris, 1909.

Bradshaw's Handbook to the Paris International Exhibition 1867. London, 1867.

Brisse, Baron Léon and Paul Gage. Album de l'Exposition Universelle Impériale. 3 vols. Paris, 1857-59.

France. Bulletin des lois de l'Empire Français. 46 vols. Paris, 1848-70.

Burat, Jules. L'Exposition de l'industrie française, 1844. Description méthodique. 2 vols. Paris, 1845.

Burty, Philippe. "Le Salon de 1857." Le Moniteur de la mode, Journal du grand monde, juillet-août 1857: 111-12, 122-24, 135-36; août: 147-49, 159-61, 171.

_____. Maîtres et petits-maîtres. Paris. 1877.

Cahn, Walter. Masterpieces. Chapters on the History of an Idea. Princeton, N.J., 1979.

Calonne, Alphonse de. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." Revue contemporaine 20 (1855): 491-515, 695-715; 21 (1855): 107-37, 660-700.

_____. "Exposition des Beaux-Arts de 1857." Revue contemporaine 32 (juin-juillet 1857): 592-629.

Campbell, Stuart L. Second Empire Revisited: A Study in French Historiography. New Brunswick, N.J. 1978.

Camus. "Notes sur l'exposition publique des produits de l'industrie française, qui a eu lieu dans les jours

complémentaires de l'an 6 et de l'an 9, lues à la séance publique de l'Institut national, le 15 nivôse an 10." Gazette Nationale, 17 nivôse, an X (5 jan. 1802).

Carpenter, Kenneth E. "Industrial Exhibitions before 1851 and their Publications." Harvard Business School, Kress Library of Business and Economics Bulletin 7 (April 1971). Reprinted in Technology and Culture 13 (July 1972): 465-486.

Castagnary, Jules-Antoine. "Exposition des Oeuvres de M. Ingres." La Liberté. 2, 4, 15, 18 mai 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1867." La Liberté, 2, 4, 15, 18, 25, 28 mai, 7 juin 1867.

_____. "Exposition des oeuvres de M. Gustave Courbet." La Liberté, 11 juin 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1868." Le Siècle, 10, 12, 15, 22, 29 mai, 5, 12, 19, 26 juin 1868.

_____. Salons 1857-1870. 2 vols. Paris, 1892.

Castillon du Perron, Marguerite. La Princesse Mathilde. Paris, 1963.

Challemel-Lacour, Paul-Armand. "Ouverture du Salon." Le Temps, 16 avril 1867.

Cham (Amédée-Charles-Henri, comte de Noé). Revue comique de l'Exposition de l'Industrie. Paris, 1849.

_____. Promenades à l'Exposition. Paris, 1855.

_____. Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

_____. Cham au Salon de 1867. Paris, 1867.

_____. L'Exposition charivarisée. Paris, 1867.

_____. La Comédie de l'Exposition. Prologue. Paris, 1867.

_____. La Comédie de l'Exposition. 1er Acte. Paris, 1867.

_____. Bouffonneries de l'Exposition. Paris, 1868.

_____. Salon de 1868. Album de 60 caricatures. Paris, 1868.

Champfleury (Jules Husson). "Du Réalisme, Lettre à Madame Sand." L'Artiste, 2 sept. 1855, 1-5.

Chaptal, Jean-Antoine Claude. De l'Industrie française. 2 vols. Paris, 1819.

_____. Mes Souvenirs sur Napoléon. An. Chaptal, ed. Paris, 1893.

Chaumelin, Marius. L'Art Contemporain. Paris, 1873.

Chennevières, Philippe de. Souvenirs d'un Directeur des Beaux-Arts. Paris, 1883-89.

Chesneau, Ernest. Les Nations rivales dans l'art. Paris. 1868.

_____. "Salon de 1868." Le Constitutionnel. 5, 12, 19, 26 mai, 3, 12, 16, 30 juin, 1 juillet 1868.

Chevalier, Michel. Exposition universelle de Londres considérées sous les rappports philosophiques, techniques, commercials et administratifs au point de vue français. 2 vols. Paris, 1851.

_____. "Exposition Universelle." Journal des Debats, 15 mai 1855, 1-2.

La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité. 1861-1868.

Clark, Timothy J. The Absolute Bourgeois. Artists and Politics in France 1848-1851. London, 1973.

_____. Image of the People. Gustave Courbet and the Second French Republic 1848-1851. Greenwich, Conn., 1973.

Clément, Charles. "Exposition annuelle des Champs-Elysées." Journal des Débats, 24, 30 avril, 4, 10, 17, 31 mai, 5, 15 juin 1867.

_____. "Exposition universelle des beaux-arts." Journal des Débats, 28 mars, 11 avril, 1 juillet, 1, 28 août, 4, 9, 21, 27, 31 octobre 1867.

_____. "Exposition de 1868." Journal des Débats, 1, 9, 18, 27 mai, 3, 13, 19, 20 juin 1868.

Clément de Ris, Comte L. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." Le Palais de l'Exposition. Revue hebdomadaire illustrée, 26 mai, 9 juin 1855.

1867. Paris. Catalogue des oeuvres inédites

de sculpture, peinture et dessins de J. Clésinger, exposées au rue Royale No. 9.

1975-76. Cleveland Museum of Art. Japonisme. Japanese Influence on French Art, 1854-1910.

Cobban, Alfred. A History of Modern France. 4 vols. Baltimore, Md., 1973.

Cole, Arthur H. and George B. Watts. The Handicrafts of France as Recorded in the Descriptions des Arts et Métiers, 1761-1788. Boston, 1952.

Cole, Sir Henry. Fifty Years of Public Work. 2 vols. London, 1884.

Collins, Irene. The Government and the Newspaper Press in France 1814-1881. London, 1959.

Colmont, Achille de. Histoire des expositions de l'industrie française. Paris, 1855.

Comité français des expositions. Cinquantenaire 1885-1935. Asnières, 1935.

Compiègne. Musée National de Compiègne. Le Second Empire. 1959.

Corley, T.A.B. Democratic Despot, a Life of Napoleon III. London, 1961.

Costaz, Claude Anthelme. Mémoire sur les moyens qui ont amené le grand développement de l'industrie française à Paris depuis vingt ans. Paris, 1816.

_____. Histoire de l'administration en France. 2 vols. Paris, 1832.

1855. Paris. Exhibition et vente de 40 tableaux et 4 dessins de l'oeuvre de M. Gustave Courbet. Avenue Montaigne, 7, Champs-Elysées, Paris.

1867. Paris. Oeuvres de M.G. Courbet. Rond-Point du Pont de l'Alma, Paris, 1867.

_____. "Lettres inédites." L'Olivier, Revue de Nice 8: (septembre-octobre 1913): 485-90.

_____. Lettres de Gustave Courbet à Alfred Bruyas. Pierre Borel, ed. Geneva, 1951.

1977-78. Grand Palais, Paris. Gustave Courbet (1819-1877.

Cousin, Victor. Du Vrai, du beau et du bien. 2e édition augmentée d'un appendice sur l'art français. Paris, 1854.

_____. Oeuvres de Victor Cousin. 3 vols. Bruxelles, 1840-41.

Daumas, Maurice. Les Instruments scientifiques aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Paris, 1953.

1799. Paris. Le Tableau des Sabines, exposé publiquement au palais national des sciences et des arts, salle de la ci-devant académie d'architecture, par le Citoyen David. Paris, an VIII. (Exhibition catalogue of Jacques-Louis David)

Decamps, Alexandre-Gabriel. "Notice biographique écrite par lui-même." In Dr. Louis-Désiré Véron, Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris. 6 vols. Paris, 1853-55. VI: 264-74.

Delaborde, Henri. "Peintres modernes de la France. Jean-Dominique Ingres, sa vie et ses oeuvres." Revue des Deux-Mondes, 1 avril 1867, 545-81.

_____. Ingres, sa vie, ses travaux, sa doctrine. Paris, 1870.

Delacroix, Eugène. Correspondance Générale d'Eugène Delacroix. André Joubin, ed. 5 vols. Paris, 1926-38.

_____. Journal, 1822-1863. André Joubin, ed. Paris, 1980.

Delécluze, Etienne J. Les Beaux-Arts dans les deux mondes en 1855. Paris, 1856.

_____. "Exposition de 1857." Journal des Débats, 15, 20 juin, 2, 10, 16, 26 juillet, 11, 20, 29 août, 15 septembre 1857.

Delord, Taxile. "Le Jury de Peinture." Charivari, 17 avril 1855.

_____. "Exposition des Beaux-Arts." Charivari, 26, 29 juin, 2, 4, 13, 15, 24 juillet, 5 novembre 1855.

_____. Histoire du second Empire, 1848-1869. 6 vols. Paris, 1869-75.

Delteil, Loys. Le Peintre-Graveur Illustré. 31 vols. Paris, 1906-26. 28: Daumier.

Démy, Adolphe. Essai historique sur les Expositions Universelles de Paris. Paris, 1907.

Depping, Guillaume. La Première Exposition des produits de l'industrie française en l'an VI (1798). Paris, 1893.

Desnoyers, Fernand. "Du Réalisme." L'Artiste, 9 décembre 1855, 197-200.

Desnoyers, Louis. "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle." Le Siècle, 1 juillet, 1 août, 11 octobre, 1, 9 novembre 1855.

Le Diable à Paris. Paris et les Parisiens. 2 vols., Paris, 1845-46.

Doesschate-Chu, Petra ten. French Realism and the Dutch Masters. Utrecht, 1974.

Doré, Gustave. "A Propos de l'Exposition." Le Journal Pour Rire, 23 juin, 27 juillet, 1, 15 septembre 1855.

Dowd, David Lloyd. Pageant-Master of the Republic. Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1948.

Dubos, Jean-Baptiste. Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et la peinture. Paris, 1719.

DuCamp, Maxime. Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855. Paris, 1855.

_____. Le Salon de 1857. Peinture. Sculpture. Paris, 1857.

_____. Les Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle et aux Salons de 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867. Paris, 1867.

_____. Souvenirs Littéraires. 2 vols. Paris, 1882.

_____. Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle. 2 vols. Paris, 1949.

Dumas, Alexandre. "Exposition Universelle de 1855." Le Mousquetaire. 3, 10 juin 1855.

_____; Théophile Gautier, Arsène Houssaye, Paul de Musset, Louis Enault, Du Fayl. Paris et les Parisiens au XIXe siècle. Moeurs, arts et monuments. Paris, 1856.

Dunham, Arthur. Industrial Revolution in France

1815-1848. N.Y., 1955.

DuPays, Augustin-Joseph. "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle." L'Illustration, 2, 23, 30 juin, 7, 14, 21, 28 juillet, 4, 18, 25 août, 1 septembre 1855.

Durande, Amédée. Joseph, Carle et Horace Vernet, Correspondance et biographies. Paris, 1863.

Duret, Théodore. Les Peintres français en 1867. Paris, 1867.

_____. Manet et son oeuvre. Paris, 1902.

Duval, Charles L. Exposition Universelle de 1855. L'Ecole française au palais Montaigne. Paris, 1856.

_____. Beaux-Arts. Le Salon de 1868. Meaux, 1868.

"Ecole Impériale et spéciale des beaux-arts." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 décembre 1863, 563-572.

Enault, Louis. "Exposition Universelle." Le Figaro, 15 avril, 6 mai, 27 mai, 3, 10, 17 juin, 1 juillet 1855.

Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers par une société des gens de lettres. 35 vols. Paris/Neufchastel, 1751-1765.

Endrei, Walter G. "The First Technical Exhibition." Technology and Culture 9 (April 1968): 181-83.

Estignard, A. Clésinger, sa vie, ses oeuvres. Paris, 1900.

Etex, Antoine. Essai d'une revue synthétique sur l'Exposition Universelle de 1855, suivi d'un coup d'oeil sur l'état des beaux-arts aux Etats-Unis. Paris, 1856.

"Exposition des Ouvrages de Mrs de l'Académie de Peinture et de Sculpture." Le Mercure Galant, septembre 1699, 206-27.

Exposition Populaire Illustrée. 60 livraisons. Paris, 1867.

"Exposition Universelle de Londres en 1851." Magasin Pittoresque XIX (1851): 139-42, 265-67, 303-304, 337-44, 371-74.

"Exposition Universelle de 1855." Magasin Pittoresque (1855): 169-70, 209-16, 337-42, 369-70, 389, 401; (1856): 21-22, 41-44.

L'Exposition Universelle de 1867 Illustrée. Publication internationale autorisée par la commission impériale. 1867.

"L'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts at Paris." The Art Journal (1855:I): 201-203, 229-32.

Ferguson, E.S. "Technical Museums and International Exhibitions." Technology and Culture 1 (Winter 1965): 30-46.

Ferry, Gabriel. "Notre Première exposition de l'industrie au XIXe siècle." Revue politique et littéraire, Revue Bleue. 4e Série: XIII (1900): 464-68.

ffrench, Y. The Great Exhibition, 1851. London, 1951.

Le Figaro. Regular columns: "Chronique Parisienne," "Petits Evénements." 1855, 1867.

Finkelstein, Louis. "On the Unpicturelikeness of Our Seeing." Perception and Pictorial Representation. Calvin F. Nodine and Dennis F. Fisher, eds. N.Y., 1979.

Flachat, Stéphane. L'Industrie, Exposition de 1834. Paris, 1834.

Flandrin, Louis. Hippolyte Flandrin, sa vie et son oeuvre. Paris, 1902.

Fleury, Comte and Louis Sonolet. La Société du Second Empire. Paris, 1911.

Le Follet, Journal du Grand Monde, Fashion, Polite Literature, Beaux-Arts, etc.. 1867.

Fontaine, André. "L'Origine des Salons." Revue Politique et Littéraire, Revue Bleue, 14 mai 1910, 625-30.

Fortoul, Hippolyte. Journal d'Hippolyte Fortoul, Ministre de l'Instruction public et des cultes (1811-1856. 1er janvier 1855 - 4 juillet 1856). Tome I: 1er janvier - 30 juillet 1855. Geneviève Massa-Gille, ed. Geneva, 1979.

Fouquier, Henry, "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts." L'Avenir national, 18, 26 avril, 16 mai 1867.

Fournel, Victor. "Salon de 1857." Le Correspondant XLI (juillet 1857): 532-41; (août 1857): 735-52.

Les Français peints par eux-mêmes, encyclopédie morale

du dix-neuvième siècle. 9 vols. Paris, 1841-42.

Fremy, Arnould. "M. Prudhomme à 1'Exposition. La Peinture Française." Charivari, 25 octobre 1855.

Galichon, Emile. "La Mort de M. Ingres." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 février 1867, 105-106.

_____. "Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 mai 1867, 409-14.

_____ and Edouard de Beaumont. "Collection de M. le Cte de Nieuwerkerke." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 mai 1868, 409-30.

Gautier, Théophile. "Avant 1'ouverture." Le Moniteur Universelle, 29 mars 1855.

_____. Les Beaux-Arts en Europe, 1855. 2 vols. Paris, 1855-56.

_____. "Eugène Delacroix à 1'Institut." L'Artiste, 18 janvier 1857, 81-83.

_____. "Salon de 1857." L'Artiste, 14, 21, 28 juin, 5, 12, 19, 26 juillet, 2, 9, 16, 23, 30 août, 6, 13, 20 septembre, 4, 25 octobre, 1, 8, 15, 22 novembre 1857.

_____. "Salon de 1867." Le Moniteur Universel, 3 juin 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1868." Le Moniteur Universel, 2, 3, 9, 11, 25, 26 mai, 1, 2, 4 juin, 8, 19 juillet 1868.

Gazette Nationale ou Le Moniteur Universel. An V - an XI (1797-1802).

La Gazette Pittoresque de 1'Exposition Universelle, de 1'industrie, des lettres et des arts. 1855.

Gebaüer, Ernest. Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855. Paris, 1855.

Gérault, Georges. Les Expositions Universelles, envisagées au point de vue de leurs résultats économiques. Paris, 1902.

Gerdts, William H. "Art and the Crystal Palace." Paper presented at the symposium "Crystal Palace/42 Street/ 1853-54," C.U.N.Y. Graduate Center, 1974.

1972. Dayton Art Institute, Dayton, Ohio. Jean-Léon Gérome (1824-1904).

Gervais, A. "Les Expositions nationales et universelles, 1799-1889." Revue Politique et Littéraire, Revue Bleue, 24 août 1889, 238-46.

Gibbs-Smith, C.H., ed. The Great Exhibition of 1851. A Commemorative Album. The Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1950.

Giedion, Siegfried. Space, Time and Architecture. Cambridge, Mass. 1944.

Gigoux, Jean. Causeries sur les artistes de mon temps. Paris, 1885.

Goncourt, Edmund and Jules de. La Peinture à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855. Paris, 1855.

_____. Journal. Mémoires de la vie littéraire 1864-1878. Robert Ricatte, ed. 4 vols. Paris, 1956.

La Grande Encyclopédie, Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts par une Société de savants et de gens de lettres. 32 vols. Paris, 1886-1902.

Grand Album de l'Exposition Universelle, 1867. 150 dessins par les premiers artistes de la France et de l'étranger. Paris, 1868.

Grangedor, J. (Jules Joly) "Le Salon de 1868." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 juin, 1 juillet 1868.

Gréard, M.O. Jean-Louis Ernest Meissonier. Ses Souvenirs, Ses Entretiens. Paris, 1897.

"The Great Exhibition." Illustrated London News. Exhibition Supplement, 24 May, 5 July, 11 Octobre, 9, 23 August 1851.

Gros, Aimé. François-Louis Français. Causeries et souvenirs par un de ses élèves. Paris, 1902.

Grothe, Gerda. Le Duc de Morny. Raymond Albeck, trans. Paris, 1967.

Guénée; Ch. Potier and Eug. Mathieu. Dzing! Boum! Boum! Revue de l'Exposition en 3 actes et 16 tableaux. Paris, 1855.

Guénot, Georges. "Le Jury des Beaux-Arts de l'Exposition Universelle. Envois et Refus." Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 137-42.

_____. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 157-60, 177-80, 429-34, 449-57.

Guiffrey, Jules. Livrets des expositions de l'Académie de Saint-Luc à Paris pendant les années 1751, 1752, 1753, 1756, 1762, 1764 et 1774, avec une notice bibliographique et une table. Paris, 1872.

_____. Les Membres de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts de 1796 à 1910. Notes Bibliographiques. Paris, 1911.

_____. Histoire de l'Académie de Saint-Luc. (Archives de l'Art Français, Nouvelle Période IX). Paris, 1915.

Guiral, Pierre. Prévost-Paradol 1829-1870. Pensée et action d'un libéral sous le second empire. Paris, 1955.

Gunzburg, Minda. "La Peinture française et la critique à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855." Thèse de l'Ecole du Louvre, Paris, 1870.

Hahn, Roger. The Anatomy of a Scientific Institution. The Paris Academy of Sciences 1666-1803. Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1971.

Halévy, Ludovic. Carnets. Daniel Halévy, ed. 2 vols. Paris, 1935.

Hamilton, George Heard. Manet and his Critics. N.Y., 1969.

Hanson, Ann Coffin. Manet and the Modern Tradition. New Haven, Conn., 1977.

Haskell, Francis. Rediscoveries in Art. Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France. Oxford, 1976.

_____. "Enemies of Modern Art." N.Y. Review of Books, 30 June 1983, 19-25.

Hautecoeur, Louis. "Delacroix et l'Académie des Beaux-Arts." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1963, 349-64.

Hemmings, F.W.J. Culture and Society in France, 1848-98. Dissidents and Philistines. N.Y., 1971.

1974. Emily Lowe Gallery, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y. Art Pompier: Anti-Impressionism, 19th Century French Salon Painting.

Hennequin, Amédée. "Coup d'oeil retrospectif sur l'exposition universelle de 1855." Le Correspondant, 25 février 1856.

Henriet, Frédéric. "Le Comte de Nieuwerkerke." Le Journal des Arts, 21, 23 janvier 1893.

Herbert, Robert L. Barbizon Revisited. Boston, 1962.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. Idées sur la philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité. Edgar Quinet, trans. and ed. 3 vols. Paris, 1827-28.

Hersey, George L. "Delacroix's Imagery in the Palais Bourbon Library." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes XXXI (1968): 383-403.

Hobhouse, Christopher. 1851 and the Crystal Palace. London, 1950.

Hobsbawm, E.J. The Age of Revolution 1789-1848. N.Y., 1962.

_____. The Age of Capital 1848-1875. N.Y., 1979.

Hofmann, Werner. The Earthly Paradise. Art in the Nineteenth Century. Brian Battershaw, trans. N.Y., 1961.

_____. "Poesia und Prosa, Rangfragen in der neueren Kunst." Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen 18. Hamburg, 1973, 173-92.

Holt, Edgar. Plon-Plon: The Life of Prince Napoléon. 1822-1891. London, 1973.

Holt, Elizabeth Gilmore. The Art of All Nations 1850-1873. The emerging role of exhibitions and critics. N.Y., 1981.

Horsin-Déon, Simon. Rapport sur l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts lu le 17 juin 1855 à l'Assemblée Générale annuelle de la Société libre des Beaux-Arts. Paris, 1855.

Hudson, Derek and Kenneth Luckhurst. Royal Society of Arts 1754-1854. London, 1954.

L'Illustration. 1851, 1855, 1867.

1867. Paris. Catalogue des tableaux, études peintes, dessins et croquis de J. A. D. Ingres, Peintre

d'Histoire, Sénateur, membre de l'Institut, exposés dans les galeries du palais de l'école impériale des beaux-arts.

L'Institut de France. Lois, Statuts et Règlements concernant les Anciennes Académies et l'Institut de 1635 à 1889. Léon Aucoc, ed. Paris, 1889.

Isaac, Maurice. Les Expositions en France et dans le régime international. Paris, 1928.

_____. Les Expositions Internationales. Paris, 1936.

Isay, Raymond. Panorama des Expositions Universelles. Paris, 1937.

Ivoy, Paul d' (Charles de Leutre). "Exposition Universelle de 1855. Exposition des Beaux-Arts." La Gazette Pittoresque de l'Exposition Universelle, de l'industrie, des lettres et des arts, 24 juin 1855.

Jacquemart, Albert. "Les Cabinets d'amateurs à Paris. La Galerie de M. le duc de Morny." Gazette des Beaux-Arts XIV (janvier-juin 1863): 289-306, 385-401.

Janin, Jules. "Les Représantants de la Presse Parisienne à Londres." The Illustrated London News en Français, 10 mai 1851, 19.

J. E. "L'Exposition de 1806." Revue Retrospective XI (1890): 97-114.

Jerrold, W. Blanchard. "The History of Industrial Exhibitions." The Illustrated London News, 21 June 1851, 372-73.

Journal des Débats. An VI - an XI (1798-1802).

Jouy et Jay. Salon d'Horace Vernet. Analyse historique et pittoresque de quarante-cinq tableaux exposés chez lui en 1822. Paris, 1822.

Journal des Arts, des Sciences et des Lettres de l'Exposition Universelle, 1855.

Jullien, Amédée. Le Jury des Beaux-Arts et le Règlement du 14 août 1863. Paris, 1867.

Kelder, Diane. Aspects of "Official" Painting and Philosophic Art, 1789-1799. N.Y., 1976.

Koch, Georg Friedrich. Die Kunstausstellung. Berlin,

1967.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics." Journal of the History of Ideas XII (October 1951): 496-527; XIII (January 1952): 17-46.

Kurtz, Harold. The Empress Eugènie 1826-1920. London, 1964.

Laborde, Léon. Application des arts à l'industrie. See: France. Commission française sur l'industrie des nations, Londres 1851. Travaux de la Commission française sur l'industrie des nations. Paris, 1856, Vol. 8.

Lacroix, Paul. "M. Ingres à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855." Revue Universelle des Arts (1855:2): 202-14.

_____. "Académie de Saint Luc." Revue Universelle des Arts 13 (1861): 322-335; 14 (1861-62): 172-96, 361-71; 15 (1862): 185-97, 309-18; 16 (1862-63): 108-109, 253-69, 297-315.

La Forge, Anatole de. La Peinture contemporaine en France. Paris, 1856.

La Gorce, Pierre de. Histoire du second Empire. 7 vols. Paris, 1894-1905.

Lagrange, Léon. "Bulletin Mensuel. La Mort de M. Ingres." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 février 1867, 206.

_____. "Ingres." Le Correspondant 55 (mai 1867): 33-76.

_____. "Les Beaux-Arts en 1867. L'Exposition Universelle. Le Salon." Le Correspondant 55 (août 1867): 992-1024; 56 (septembre 1867): 84-114.

Landes, David S. The Unbound Prometheus. Technological Change 1750 to the Present. Cambridge, Mass., 1969.

Langer, William. Political and Social Upheaval, 1832-1852. N.Y., 1969.

Lapauze, Henry. Ingres, sa vie et son oeuvre, 1780-1867. Paris, 1911.

La Rochenoire, Julien de. Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. Le Salon de 1855 apprécié à sa juste valeur pour UN franc. Paris, 1855.

Larousse, Pierre. Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe siècle. 15 vols. + 2 supp. Paris, 1865ff.

Lasteyrie, Ferdinand de. "Salon de 1868." L'Opinion Nationale. 11, 18, 29 mai, 8, 13, 20, 21, 26 juin 1868.

Laurent-Jan. "M. Ingres, Peintre et Martyr." Le Figaro, 30 décembre 1855, 2-7.

Lavergne, Claudius. Exposition Universelle de 1855: Beaux-Arts. Paris, 1855.

Lazerges, Jean-Raymond-Hippolyte. Beaux-Arts. Questions du Jour. De l'Institut, de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts et des Expositions. Paris, 1868.

_____. Beaux-Arts. Questions du Jour. Des Associations artistiques. Paris, 1868.

LeComte, Florent. "Description des Peintures, Sculptures & Estampes exposez dans la grand Gallerie du Louvre dans le mois de Septembre 1699." Cabinet des singularitez d'architecture, peinture, sculpture, et graveure. 3 vols. Paris, 1699-1700. III: 241-73.

Lee, Rensselaer W. Ut Picture Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting. N.Y., 1967.

Leger, Charles. Courbet selon les caricatures et les images. Paris, 1920.

Leith, James A. The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France 1750-1799. Toronto, 1965.

Leroi, Paul. "Le Musée de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique." L'Art LIX (1894-1900) 2e Série IV: 893-905.

Leroy, Alfred. L'Impératrice Eugènie. Paris, 1964.

Leroy, Louis. "Salon de 1857." Journal Artistique, 5, 12, 26 juillet, 16, 30 août 1857.

Lespinasse, René de, ed. Les Métiers et corporations de la ville de Paris, XIVe-XVIIIe siècle (Histoire Générale de Paris). 3 vols. Paris, 1886.

Lethève, Jacques. "La Connaissance des peintres Préraphaelites Anglais en France (1855-1900)." Gazette des Beaux-Arts 53 (mai-juin 1959): 315-28.

_____. Impressionistes et Symbolistes devant la Presse. Paris, 1959.

Levey, Michael and Wend Graf von Kalnein. Art and Architecture of the Eighteenth Century in France. Harmondsworth, England, 1972.

Lewis, W. H. The Splendid Century. Life in the France of Louis XIV. Garden City, N.Y., 1957.

Links, J. G. Townscape Painting and Drawing. N.Y., 1972.

Loudun, Eugène, (Eugène Balleyguier). Le Salon de 1855. Paris, 1855.

_____. Le Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

Louvrier de Lajolais, A. "Exposition Universelle." La Chronique des arts et de la curiosité. 14 avril 1867, 115.

Luckhurst, Kenneth W. The Story of Exhibitions. London/ N.Y., 1951.

La Lune. 1867.

Maglin, E. "Le Palais de l'Industrie." La Nature 1897 (II: 183-86).

Mainardi, Patricia. "Gustave Courbet's Second Scandal: Les Demoiselles de Village." Arts Magazine 53 (January 1979): 95-109.

_____. "Edouard Manet's 'View of the Universal Exposition of 1867'." Arts Magazine 54 (January 1980): 108-115.

_____. "The Eiffel Tower and the English Lighthouse." Arts Magazine 54 (March 1980): 141-44.

_____. "The Death of History Painting in France, 1867." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1982, 219-26.

_____. "French Sculpture, English Morals: Clésinger's Bacchante at the Crystal Palace, 1851." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, décembre 1983, 215-220

_____. "Report from Paris. Eighty-Nine Eighty-sixed." Art in America, February 1984, 33-37.

Malitourne, Pierre. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts. Le Sculpture." L'Artiste, 21, 28

octobre, 11 novembre 1855.

_____. "Sculpteurs contemporains; Le Comte Emilien de Nieuwerkerke." L'Artiste, 3 août 1856, 57-60.

1867. Paris. Catalogue des tableaux de M. Edouard Manet exposés avenue de l'Alma en 1867, Paris.

Manet raconté par lui-même et par ses amis. 2 vols. Geneva, 1953.

1982. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. Manet and Modern Paris.

1983. Grand Palais, Paris. Manet, 1832-1883.

Mantz, Paul. "Salon de 1855." La Revue Française II (1855): 21-29, 69-80, 122-34, 165-77, 219-29, 257-68, 358-71, 457-66, 510-21, 598-608.

_____. "Salon de 1857." La Revue Française IX (1857): 422-31, 491-501, 558-69; X (1857): 43-55, 118-28, 178-89.

_____. "Exposition de Manchester." La Revue Française IX (1857): 357-75.

_____. "L'Enseignement des Arts Industriels avant la Revolution." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 mars 1865, 229-47.

_____. "Le Salon de 1867." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 juin 1867, 513-48.

_____. "Les Beaux-Arts à 1'Exposition Universelle." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 juillet, 1 août, 1 septembre, 1 octobre 1867.

_____. "Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts." L'Illustration, 2, 16, 23 novembre 1867.

_____. "Le Salon de 1868." L'Illustration, 2, 7, 16, 23, 30 mai, 6, 13, 20, 27 juin 1868.

Marcel, Pierre. "Notes sur le 6 Expositions du règne de Louis XIV." Chronique des arts et de la curiosité, 9 janvier 1904, 10-13; 16 janvier 1904, 19-20.

Marcelin. "Le Public à 1'Exposition. Types, impressions et menus propos." Le Journal Pour Rire, 17 novembre 1855.

Marx, Karl. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.

N.Y., 1964.

Mathiez, A. La Théophilanthropie et la culte décadaire, 1796-1801. Essai sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution). Paris, 1904.

Mazade d'Avèze. Idée première de l'Exposition de l'Industrie française, an V de la République (1797). Paris, 1845.

Menard, Jules. Les Merveilles de l'Exposition. Paris, 1868.

Mercey, Frédéric Bourgeois de. "L'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts en 1855." Revue Contemporaine 31 (1857): 466-94.

_____. Etudes sur les Beaux-Arts depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours. 3 vols. Paris, 1855-57.

Mérimée, Prosper. Correspondance Générale. Maurice Parturier, ed. 16 vols. Paris, 1941-61.

Merson, Olivier. Ingres, sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris, 1867.

Miquel, Pierre. Le Paysage français au XIXe siècle 1824-1874. L'Ecole de la nature. 3 vols. Maurs-la-Jolie, 1975.

Mireaux, Emile. "Le Coup d'état académique du 14 avril 1855." Vol. 28 of Institut de France, Académie des sciences morales et politiques. Paris, 1963.

Mitchell, P. "Success of Alfred Stevens at the Exposition Universelle of 1867." The Connoisseur, April 1970, 263-64.

Moléon; Cochaud and Paulin-Desormeaux. Musée Industriel. Description complète de l'Exposition des produits de l'industrie française faite en 1834. 4 vols. Paris, 1835-38.

Mollett, John W. The Painters of Barbizon. 2 vols. London, 1890.

Le Monde Illustré. janvier-décembre 1867.

Montaiglon, Anatole de, ed. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Académie Royale de peinture et de sculpture depuis 1648 jusqu'en 1664. 2 vols. Paris, 1853.

_____. "Salon de 1857." Revue Universelle des Arts 5 (30 août 1857): 533-58.

Montifaud, Marc de (Mme Léon Quivogne de Montifaud). "Le Salon de 1867." L'Artiste, 1 mai, 1 juin, 1 juillet, 1 août 1867.

31 mai - 12 juin 1865. Paris. Galerie de M. le duc de de Morny. Tableaux et objets d'art. (Sale cat.)

Mosby, Dewey F. Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps 1803-1860. 2 vols. N.Y./London, 1977.

Musée Français-Anglais. Journal d'illustrations mensuelles. janvier-décembre 1855.

Muther, Richard. The History of Modern Painting. 3 vols. London, 1895-96. Rev. ed., 1907.

Nadar (Gaspard-Félix Tournachon). "Revue du Trimestre." Journal Pour Rire, 14 avril, 13 octobre 1855, 5 janvier 1856.

_____. "Salon de 1855." Le Figaro, 19, 26 août, 9, 16, 23 septembre, 14 octobre, 4 novembre 1855.

_____. Nadar Jury au Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

Raoul de Navery (Marie de Saffron). Le Salon de 1868. Paris, 1868.

Niel, Georges. Le Paysage au Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

Nochlin, Linda. Realism. Baltimore, Md., 1971.

_____. "The Imaginary Orient." Art in America, May 1983, 118-30, 187-91.

Norma, Ch. "Le Salon." Le Hanneton illustré, satirique et littéraire, 21, 28 mai, 18, 25 juin 1868.

Ogg, David. Europe in the Seventeenth Century. N.Y., 1972.

Ozouf, Mona. La Fête revolutionnaire, 1789-1799. Paris, 1976.

Ory, Pascal. Les Expositions Universelles de Paris. Paris, 1982.

Le Palais de Cristal. Journal Illustré de l'Exposition de 1851. 1851.

Le Palais de l'Exposition. Revue hebdomadaire illustrée. 1855.

Pailleron, Marie-Louise. François Buloz et ses amis: les écrivains du Second Empire. Paris, 1924.

Palma, Etienne. "Le Salon de 1868." Revue de Paris n.s. 11 (1868): 219-43, 412-38, n.s. 12 (1868): 78-100.

1683. Paris. Explication des modeles des machines et forces mouvantes, que l'on expose à Paris dans la rüe de la Harpe, vis-à-vis Saint Cosme, Paris.

1838. Paris. Notice sur l'origine et les travaux de la manufacture royale des tapisseries des Gobelins et des tapis de la Savonnerie.

1974. Grand Palais, Paris. Le Musée du Luxembourg en 1874.

1974-75. Grand Palais, Paris, Detroit Institute of Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art, N.Y. French Painting 1774-1830. The Age of Revolution. Detroit, 1975.

1983. Musée des arts décoratifs, Paris. Le Livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989.

Paris dans sa splendeur. Monuments, vues, scènes historiques, descriptions et histoire. 3 vols. Paris, 1863.

Paris-Guide, par les principaux écrivains et artistes de la France. 2 vols. 1867.

Parturier, Maurice. Morny et son temps. Paris, 1969.

Paul-Pierre (Paul Pierre Casimir-Périer). Un Chercheur au Salon. 1868. Peinture. Les Inconnus. Les Trop peu connus. Les Méconnus. Les Nouveaux et les Jeunes. Paris, 1868.

Peisse, Louis. "Beaux-Arts. Exposition Universelle." Le Constitutionnel, 29 avril, 25 mai, 14, 17, 26 juin, 17 juillet, 13, 27 novembre, 11 décembre 1855.

Pelletan, Eugène. "Exposition de peinture." Courrier de Paris, 10, 19, 24 juillet, 1, 7, 18, 29 août, 4, 6, 20, 24, 25 septembre 1857.

Pellison and d'Olivet. Histoire de l'Académie Française. 2 vols. Paris, 1858.

Pelloquet, Théodore. "A Travers le Salon de 1857." Gazette de Paris, 21 juin, 5, 19, 26 juillet, 2, 9, 16, 23 août 1857.

_____. "Exposition Universelle de 1867. Beaux-Arts." Le Monde Illustré, 13, 20, 27 juillet, 3, 10, 17, 24 août, 7, 14, 21 septembre, 12, 19, 26, octobre, 9 novembre 1867.

Pérignon, Alexis-Joseph. A Propos de l'Exposition de peinture. Paris, 1856.

_____. Lettre de M. Pérignon sur la nécessité de transformer l'organisation de l'exposition des beaux-arts. Paris, juillet 1866.

_____. Deux Expositions des Beaux-Arts. Paris, 1866.

Perrier, Charles. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." L'Artiste, 13, 20, 27 mai, 3, 10, 17, 24 juin, 1, 8, 15, 22, 29 juillet, 5, 12, 19, 26 août, 9, 16, 23, septembre, 28 octobre, 4 novembre 1855.

_____. "Du Réalisme. Lettre à M. le Directeur de L'Artiste." L'Artiste, 14 octobre 1855, 85-90.

_____. L'Art français au Salon de 1857. Paris, 1857.

Petroz, Pierre. "Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." La Presse, 2, 7, 30 mai, 5, 11, 19, 26 juin, 4, 9, 16, 23, 31 juillet, 7, 13, 21, 27 août, 3, 10, 17 septembre 1855.

_____. "Salon de 1868." Revue Moderne, 10 mai 1868, 353-63, 25 mai 1868, 535-49.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. Academies of Art Past and Present. Cambridge, England, 1940.

Philadelphia Museum of Art, Detroit Institute of Arts, Grand Palais, Paris. The Second Empire 1852-1870. Art in France under Napoleon III.

Pigéory, Félix. "Envois à l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." Revue des Beaux-Arts 6 (1855): 97-100, 116-120.

Pinkney, David H. Napoléon III and the Rebuilding of Paris. Princeton, 1958.

Planche, Gustave. "L'Exposition des Beaux-Arts à l'Exposition Universelle de 1855." Revue des

Deux-Mondes, 1, 15 août, 15 septembre, 1, 15 octobre 1855.

_____. "Le Salon de 1857." Revue des Deux-Mondes, 15 juillet, 15 août 1857.

Plessis, Alain. De la fête impériale au mur des fédérés, 1852-1871. (Nouvelle Histoire de la France contemporaine 9). Paris, 1979.

Plinval-Salgues, Régine de. "Bibliographie des expositions industrielles et commerciales en France, depuis l'origine, jusqu'à 1867." I.N.T.D., Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Paris, 1959.

Plum, Werner. World Exhibitions in the Nineteenth Century. Pagaents of Social and Cultural Change. Lux Furtmüller, trans. Bonn/Bad Godesburg, 1977.

Pointon, Marcia. "'From the Midst of Warfare and its Incidents to the Peaceful Scenes of Home': The Exposition Universelle of 1855." Journal of European Studies II (December 1981): 233-261.

Poirier, René. Des Foires, des peuples, des expositions. Paris, 1958.

Poulain, Gaston. Bazille et ses amis. Paris, 1932.

"La Première Exposition de Peinture au Louvre, en 1699." Magasin Pittoresque XVIII (septembre 1850): 305-307.

Prévost-Paradol, Lucien Anatole. Revue de l'Histoire Universelle. Paris, 1854.

Proust, Antonin. "L'Art d'Edouard Manet." Le Studio, 15 January 1901 (Supplement N° 28 to The Studio, London), 71-77.

_____. Manet et son oeuvre. Paris, 1902.

_____. Edouard Manet, Souvenirs. Paris, 1913.

Quinet, Edgar. 1815 et 1840. 2e édition. Paris, 1840.

Quillenbois. "La Peinture réaliste de M. Courbet." L'Illustration, 21 juillet 1855, 52.

Randon, G. "L'Exposition d'Edouard Manet." Journal Amusant, 29 juin 1867.

Raphael, Paul, and Maurice Gontard. Un Ministre de

1'Instruction publique sous 1'Empire autoritaire. Hippolyte Fortoul 1851-1856. Paris, 1975.

Raymon. Les Beaux-Arts en 1867. Paris, 1867.

Réalisme. Jules Assezat and Edmond Duranty, eds. 10 juillet 1856.

Le Rédacteur. An VI - an VII (1798).

Rebérioux, Madeleine. "Approches de 1'histoire des expositions universelles à Paris du Second Empire à 1900." Bulletin du centre d'histoire économique et sociale de la region Lyonnaise 1 (1979): 1-17.

Regnier, Noël. Revue et examen des expositions nationales et internationales en France et à 1'étranger depuis 1798 jusqu'à 1878. Paris, 1878.

Renan, Ernest. "La Poesie de 1'Exposition." Oeuvres complètes de Ernest Renan. Henriette Psichari, ed. 10 vols. Paris, n.d. II:239-51.

Révillon, Tony. "Le Salon de 1868." La Petite Presse, 3, 9, 17 mai, 21 juin 1868.

Revue des Beaux-Arts. Tribune des Artistes fondée sous les auspices de la société libre des beaux-arts. Regular columns: "Mosaïque," "Mélanges," 1855.

Revue Illustrée de 1'Exposition Universelle de 1867. 1867.

La Revue Universelle des Arts. Regular column: "Chronique," 1855.

Rewald, John. The History of Impressionism. 4th rev. ed. Greenwich, Conn. 1973.

Rey. Mémoire sur la nécessité de bâtir un édifice spécialement consacré aux Expositions générales des produits de 1'industrie. Paris, 1927.

Roberts-Jones, Philippe. "Opinion de Quelque Critiques sur la Peinture Française à 1'occasion de 1'Exposition Universelle de 1855." Thèse de Doctorat: Thèse Annexe, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1854.

Rodee, H. D. "France and England: Some mid-Victorian views of one another's painting." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, janvier 1978, 39-47.

Rosen, Charles and Henri Zerner. "The Revival of Official Art." N.Y. Review of Books, 18 March 1976, 32-39.

Rosenthal, Léon. Du Romantisme au Réalisme. Paris, 1914.

Rouart, Denis and Daniel Wildenstein. Edouard Manet, Catalogue raisonné. 2 vols. Lausanne/Paris, 1975.

1867. Paris. Notice des études peintes par M. Théodore Rousseau exposées au Cercle des Arts, Paris, juin 1867.

1967-68. Musée du Louvre, Paris. Théodore Rousseau 1812-1867.

Rousseau, Théodore. "Correspondance." Le Figaro, 16-17 août 1867.

S. "Lettres sur l'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts à Paris." La Revue Universelle des Arts, 15 juin, 15 juillet, 15 août, 15 septembre, 15 novembre, 15 décembre 1855, 15 janvier, 15 février 1856.

Saint-Santin, M. de (Philippe de Chennevières). "M. Heim." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 janvier 1867, 40-62.

Saint-Victor, Paul de. "Salon de 1857." La Presse, 26 juin, 10, 11, 18, 26 juillet, 4, 11, 16, 29, 30 août, 27 septembre 1857.

_____. "Salon de 1867." La Presse, 9, 23 mai, 8, 26 juin, 8 juillet 1867.

_____. "Salon de 1868." La Liberté, 10, 13, 19, 29 mai, 4, 13, 21, 30 juin, 7 juillet 1868.

Sand, George. Correspondance. Georges Lubin, ed. 15 vols. Paris, 1964-79.

Sandblad, Nils Gösta. Manet, Three Studies in Artistic Conception. Lund, 1954.

Sensier, Alfred. Souvenirs sur Th. Rousseau. Paris, 1872.

Silvestre, Théophile. Histoire des artistes vivants, français et étrangers. Etudes d'après nature. Paris, 1855-56.

_____. A Messieurs de la cour impériale de Paris. Première chambre. Audience de mardi, 7 juillet 1857. Mémoire de Théophile Silvestre contre Horace Vernet. Paris, 1857.

_____. "Les Artistes vivants au Champ-de-Mars et aux Champs-Elysées." Le Figaro, 21 avril, 4, 14, 15, 21

mai 1867.

_____. "Funérailles de Th. Rousseau à Barbizon." Le Figaro, 26 décembre 1867.

Simian, Charles. François de Neufchâteau et les expositions. Paris, 1889.

Sloane, Joseph C. French Painting Between the Past and the Present. Artists, Critics and Traditions from 1848 to 1870. Princeton, N.J., 1951.

_____. Paul Marc Joseph Chenavard, Artist of 1848. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1962.

Society for the Study of Japonisme in Art. Japonisme in Art. An International Symposium. Yamada Chisaburo, ed. Tokyo, 1980.

Sonolet, Louis. La Vie Parisienne sous le Second Empire. Paris, 1929.

Soubies, Albert. Les Membres de l'Académie des Beaux-Arts depuis la fondation de l'Institut. 2e Série: 1816-1852; 3e Série: 1852-1876. Paris, 1906-11.

Spencer, Eleanor P. "The Academic Point of View in the Second Empire." Courbet and the Naturalistic Movement. George Boas, ed. Baltimore, Md., 1938, 58-72.

Swart, Koenraad W. "'Individualism' in the Mid-Nineteenth Century (1826-1860)." Journal of the History of Ideas XXIII (January-March 1962): 77-90.

_____. The Sense of Decadence in Nineteenth Century France. The Hague, 1964.

Tabarant, A. La Vie artistique au temps de Baudelaire. Paris, 1942.

Tamir. Les Expositions Internationales à travers les âges. Paris, 1939.

Tardieu, Alexandre. "L'Exposition Universelle des Beaux-Arts." Le Constitutionnel, 7, 14, 21, 28 août, 4, 25 septembre 1855.

Thierry, Edouard. "Exposition Universelle de 1855. Beaux-Arts." Revue des Beaux-Arts, 202-205, 227-30, 247-51, 268-72, 286-89, 308-12, 327-31, 347-51, 373-77, 392-98, 411-14, 434-38.

Thoré, Théophile. Trésors d'art exposés à Manchester en 1857 et provenant des collections royales, des collections publiques et des collections particulières de la Grande-Bretagne par W. Bürger. Paris, 1857.

_____. Salons de W. Bürger 1861 à 1868 avec une préface par T. Thoré. 2 vols. Paris, 1870.

Adolphe Thiers. "Eclectisme." In La Grande Encyclopédie. Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts par une Société de savants et de gens de lettres. 32 vols. Paris, 1886-1902. S.v.

Tintamarre-Salon. Exposition des Beaux-Arts de 1868. Paris, 1868.

Tourneux, Maurice. Salons et expositions d'art à Paris (1801-70), essai bibliographique. Paris, 1919.

Trapp, Frank Anderson. "The Universal Exhibition of 1855." The Burlington Magazine CVII (June 1965): 300-305.

_____. "Expo' 1867 Revisited." Apollo, February 1969, 112-31.

Treasure, G. R. R. Seventeenth Century France. London, 1966.

Trout, Andrew. Jean-Baptiste Colbert. Boston, 1978.

Uzanne, Octave. Monument esthématique du XIXe siècle. Les Modes de Paris. Variations du goût et de l'esthétique de la femme 1797-1897. Paris, 1898.

Valon, Alexis de. "Le Tour du Monde à l'Exposition de Londres." Revue des Deux-Mondes, 15 juillet 1851, 193-228.

Vermersch, Eugène. "A Propos du Salon." Le Hanneton illustré, satirique et littéraire, 14 mai 1868.

_____. "Courbet." Le Hanneton illustré, satirique et littéraire, 13 juin 1867.

1980. Ecole nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Paris. Horace Vernet: 1789-1863.

Véron, Dr. Louis-Désiré. Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris. 6 vols. 1853-55.

_____. Nouveau mémoires d'un Bourgeois de Paris. Le

Second Empire. Paris, 1866.

Vervynk, D. and E. Dubois. Histoire des expositions industrielles (depuis 1798 jusqu'à nos jours). Paris, 1867.

Viel-Castel, Comte Horace de. "L'Exposition Universelle. Beaux-Arts." L'Athenaeum Français, 19 mai, 2, 16 juin, 7 juillet, 11 août, 6 octobre 1855.

_____. Mémoires du comte Horace de Viel-Castel sur le règne de Napoléon III, 1851-1864. L. Léouzon Le Duc, ed. 6 vols. Paris, 1883-84.

Vignon, Claude (Noémi Cadiot). Exposition Universelle de 1855: Beaux-Arts. Paris, 1855.

Villarceaux, X. de. "Les Prix de 1867." L'Artiste, 1 septembre 1867, 429-41.

Villemessant, Hippolyte de. "Feuilleton de Figaro." Le Figaro, 30 décembre 1855.

Vitet, Louis. L'Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture. Paris, 1861.

White, Harrison C. and Cynthia A. White. Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World. N.Y., 1965.

Wildenstein, Daniel. "Le Salon des Refusés de 1863." Gazette des Beaux-Arts, septembre 1965, 125-52.

Wildenstein, Georges. Ingres. London/Paris, 1954.

Will, Frederic. Flumen Historicum. Victor Cousin's Aesthetic and its Sources. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1965.

Williams, Roger L. Gaslight and Shadow. The World of Napoleon III, 1851-1870. N.Y., 1957.

Willoch, Sigurd. "Edouard Manets 'Fra Verdensutstillingen' Paris 1867." Konsthistorisk tidskrift XLV (December 1976): 101-108.

Wolff, Albert. Notes upon Certain Masters of the XIX Century. N.Y., 1886.

Zeldin, Theodore. The Political System of Napoleon III. London, 1958.

_____. France 1848-1945. 2 vols. Oxford, 1977.

Ziegler, Jean. "Baudelairiana. Madame Sabatier (1822-1890). Quelques notes biographiques." Bulletin du Bibliophile (1977): 365-82.

Zola, Emile. Ed. Manet, Etude biographique et critique. Paris, 1867.

_____. "Edouard Manet." L'Evénement Illustré, 10 mai 1868.

_____. "Quelques bonnes toiles." L'Evénement Illustré. 9 juin 1868.

_____. "Causerie." La Tribune, 20 décembre 1868.

_____. Salons. F. W. J. Hemmings and Robert J. Niess, eds. Geneva/Paris, 1959.

_____. Correspondance 1858-1871. B. H. Bakker, ed. Paris, 1978.

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

527-570, Illustrations, 1-88

UMI