Juries, Protests, and Counter-Exhibitions Before 1850

William Hauptman

Tout jury, électif ou non doit être attaqué... un jury, quel soit le mode adopté pour sa formation, fonctionnera mal.

— Ingres

It is agreed by art-historical consensus that the justly celebrated Salon des Refusés of 1863 represented one of the most decisive moments in the development of modern art.\(^1\)

Fundamentally, this landmark exhibition brought into focus the very question of jury decisions, criteria for public exhibitions, and whether the State art establishment had the right to prohibit works from being shown if they were not fully in accord with its own changing aesthetic ideals. In much of the literature devoted to the Salon des Refusés, there are brief indications that other similar expressions of publicly manifested artistic discontent had occurred earlier; yet none of these significant precedents has been examined in depth. Although the prime importance of the Salon des Refusés of 1863 cannot be contested, it must also not be seen as a single protest against the jury, unique in its purpose, but rather as the end result of the conflict between the artist’s assumed right of exhibition and the jury’s assumed right of judging what may and may not be exhibited. The following essay brings to light some neglected documentation concerning the jury system, the problem of the spiraling number of artists’ works refused, and, finally, how these artists expressed their indignation in the form of protests and counter-exhibitions. The facts themselves provide insights into a largely hidden aspect of the Salon system in the period discussed.

As is well known, the nineteenth-century Salon\(^2\) was the only viable avenue for public exhibition en masse. During the period of the July Monarchy, more than one million

---

\(^1\) Ingres’ comments were made in connection with a commission organized on October 29, 1848 to discuss the problems of the Salon system after the Revolution. Delacroix, Delacroix, Duban, and Nieuwerkerke also participated, while David D’Angers refused and had to be replaced by Charles Blanc. See J.-L. Fouché, “L’opinion d’Ingres sur le salon,” La chronique des arts, March 14, 1908, 98-99, and April 4, 1908, 129-130. On Ingres’ ideas in general on the Salon jury system, see Amaury-Duval, L’atelier d’Ingres, Paris, 1924, 167-174 and 205f.


\(^3\) Despite the prime importance of the Salons in the history of 19th-century art, there is relatively little literature that discusses the structure, organization, or actual history of these exhibitions or how they were juried. Useful but sometimes awkwardly organized information is contained in Tabarant and Lethève for certain important Salons, as in Lafenestre, 104f. For the period of the July Monarchy, Rosenthal, 227f, is essential. For political and administrative information on the Salon system, see M. Vachon, Études administratives: Le Salon, Gazette des beaux-arts, xxxix, 1881, 104-135, and E. Duranty, “Variations dans le régime des salons,” La chronique des arts, July 14, 1877, 235-37. With regard to the problems of rejected artists and the concept of conservatism within the Salon system, see Ivens, 52-94. Also essential for a list of reviews and articles concerning the Salon exhibitions is M. Tourneux, Salons et expositions d’art à Paris (1801-1870). essai bibliographique. Paris, 1919.
visitors were recorded annually for each Salon, thus providing the exhibiting artist an unparalleled public exposure. For a large majority of that public, the acceptance of a work of art by an established and reputable jury signified a tacit measure of quality. Refusal by the jury, on the other hand, was often equated with critical denunciation, the results of which might severely limit the artist’s means of earning his livelihood. In the most extreme cases, the constant elimination of works by the jury was said to be the cause of suicide: the often cited example of Jules Holtzappfel, who killed himself in 1866 after repeated refusal by the juries, appears to be one only of many. It is no exaggeration to say that the decisions of the jury, whose procedures were by and large unknown to most artists, became for the nineteenth-century artist a fundamental upon which his basic public and private stature depended.

To be sure, the choice of works had always been a matter of debate that frequently divided the critics and the public. Even a cursory examination of the Salon reviews under the July Monarchy reveals that almost all of them, by conservative and progressive critics alike, began by a discussion of the selection; frequently, what the jury decided not to exhibit was as controversial as what it had selected to show. In the evitable battles between artists and juries, there were attempts to bypass the official Salon process by appealing directly to public taste through counter-exhibitions. None of these had the magnitude nor the succès de scandale of 1863, for reasons that will be examined later. But these salons des refusés avant la lettre established important foci for discontent about the seemingly myopic point of view of the jury. This ultimately played a role in the dramatic resolution of 1863.

Until the French Revolution, the Salons were open only to the members of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, and thus constituted an exclusive fraternity in which neither a jury nor refused work was an issue that arose. Artists who were not members were able to exhibit publicly one day a year, usually on the Festival of Corpus Christi, for a period of two hours, in makeshift stalls on the Place Dauphine; since these exhibitions were held outdoors, there was always the danger of cancellation because of bad weather. In 1791, in the esprit d’égalité that abolished the Academy, the Louvre Salons were made available to all artists “français et étrangers” by decree of the Assemblée Nationale, a decree in which the State also guaranteed each artist’s inalienable right to exhibit his works freely as long as they were not offensive to public standards. This procedure likewise obviated the need of a jury, but with the natural increase in number of works exhibited — more than twice the number of the previous Salon — a comité des arts was established to direct the placement of the works and to decide the important récompenses afterwards. The commission, however, had the power to eliminate works it deemed unsuitable, although in the early deliberations it practiced this task only rarely: the engraver Wille, a member of the commission of 1791, noted that all of the works submitted that year were exhibited except “deux petits tableaux faits par un sculpteur.” By 1795, this commission began to act as a de facto jury, in that it exercised its right of censorship more explicitly. The result was that in a supposedly open Salon the commission refused sixty-five works by twenty-seven artists.

The idea of a jury to select or refuse on the basis of its own tastes and system of evaluation was much debated during this period, since it was felt that, with the free Salons, a large number of mediocre works were included with genuine masterpieces. Thus a formal jury, now officially called such and not a comité des arts, was set up for the Salon of 1798, but even this measure brought on the criticism that any jury was prone, by its very mandate of choosing, to intrigue, favoritism, and arbitrary selection. The dilemma of having a free Salon, as decreed in 1791, at the same time subject to a process of artistic and aesthetic control by an appointed body, divided the French press. The authorities, seeing the issue in political terms of the right of free speech, actually suppressed the jury for the Salon of 1799, but re instituted it in 1800 after sharp critical reactions to the large number of mediocre works seen in the Salon. Clearly the indecisive actions of the Government helped to create a climate of uncertainty and mistrust.

4 One case in particular, of many such examples, concerns Jongkind, who sold a landscape a few days before the Salon of 1863 was to open, but had to reimburse the purchase price when the painting was refused by the jury; see Rewald, as in note 2, 70. On the importance of the Salon in regard to the financial situation of artists in the 19th century, see H. C. and A. C. White, Careers and Canvases, New York, 1965, 171.

5 On Holtzappfel (1826-1866), see Tabarant, 439-440. Other examples of suicides apparently caused by the rejections of juries, although they are difficult to verify as such, include César Ducornnet, a painter born without arms, who committed suicide in 1855; see T. Véron, La légende des refusés, questions d’art contemporain, Paris, 1876, who also mentions Varcollier, Vastine — both students of Delaroche — and Fontallard, although it cannot be determined which one of the three took his own life. A petition of artists against the abuses of the jury of 1840 — see below for a discussion of this — also mentions the suicide of Mlle. Camille Eudes. Camille Eudes, who, however, does not appear in any of the standard biographical dictionaries.

6 On the 18th-century Salons, see F. Benoit, L’art français sous la Révolution et l’Empire, Paris, 1892. On the importance of the exhibitions in the Place Dauphine, see C. Caubisens-Lasfargues, 193-214. On various independent exhibitions in the 18th and 19th centuries, Duseigneur, 53f, is essential although not complete.

7 The important background of the decree and its importance to the ideals of artistic freedom during the French Revolution are discussed in Caubisens-Lasfargues, 197; see too the important documents in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Estampes, Collection Deloyens, III, 868f. It is important to note the precise wording of the decree in regard to exhibitions: “L’égalité des droits ... a permis à tout citoyen d’exposer sa pensée; cette égalité légale doit permettre à tout artiste d’exposer son ouvrage; son tableau, c’est sa pensée; son exposition publique, c’est la permission d’imprimer. Le salon du Louvre est la presse pour les tableaux, pourvu qu’on respecte les moeurs et l’ordre du public.”


9 The figures are taken from the Salon dossiers housed in the Archives du Louvre; the dossiers are marked under the code X and classified by the year of the Salon. My sincere thanks to Mme. Cantarel-Besson of the Archives who greatly facilitated my research there.


11 Ibid., 203.
reinforced by the growing number of *refusés* in the succeeding Salons. Seeds of discontent were thus already sown between the artist and the State.

The first tangible signs of dissension and conflict between these two forces came with the Salon of 1806. Only twelve days after the opening on September 15, a petition was filed with the Minister of Police requesting permission to have a special room set aside to exhibit those works which were refused by the jury. The police and the Conseiller d’État, citing the past independent exhibitions on the Place Dauphine, allowed the counter-exhibition to coexist with the Salon, and the former closed fifteen days later. There is, unfortunately, very little information on the contents of this exhibition. But in the annals of nineteenth-century exhibitions it represents the first *salon des refusés* officially sanctioned by the State, and thus constitutes an important prototype for later counter-exhibitions.

The policies governing the Salons during this period continued when in 1816 the Comte de Forbin replaced Vivant Denon as director of the Musées Royaux. In 1817, the jury was composed of eleven members, of whom five were painters, two were architects, and the rest were *amis des arts* and highly placed amateurs. All members of the jury had an equal voice in the process of evaluation and absolute power to establish the criteria for works admitted, with no recourse for appeal by the artists rejected. The very procedure for announcing the refusal of works of art seemed immediately to prohibit any such action, since notification of refusal was often sent after the Salon *livret* was already published. In 1817 no fewer than 229 works were refused out of 1293 submitted, about four times the number of 1795.

The *procès-verbaux* of jury deliberations do not record the reasons why certain works were deemed acceptable while others were not. When artists deposited works still in the form of an *esquisse*, as was sometimes the case, these were automatically refused as a matter of course, despite promises by the painter to have the work finished by the opening day of the exhibition. Works that appeared even vaguely contrary to public taste were similarly prohibited, in accord with the decrees of 1791. But certain political motives played a large role in the jury selections during the Restoration, since juries, as representatives of governmental tastes and policies, were particularly sensitive to offending or unflattering themes. In 1819 Géricault’s *Radeau de la Méduse* was hung in the Salon only after the title was changed to the more benign *Une scène de naufrage*, so as not to embarrass the Government in the affair. But in the same Salon, Nicolas Ponce-Camus, a student of David who was decorated in the Salons of 1802 and 1812, was not permitted to exhibit his *Alexandre le Grand visitant Apelle* because the jury saw in its imagery references to Bonapartist ideals. The most extraordinary example of political censorship of the period in this regard occurred in 1822 when all Horace Vernet’s submitted paintings — with the exception of his *Joseph Vernet attaché à un mât* — were rejected for political reasons that were never made clear, including a genre representation of his own atelier which had no ostensible political overtones. Vernet, in a move that was remarkably audacious for the times, reacted by opening his own counter-exhibition in his atelier, where he exhibited no fewer than forty-five paintings. We are told that large crowds were seen there admiring the rejected works. Vernet’s exhibition was one of the first private retrospectives of the nineteenth century, and may be seen as an important prototype for those of Courbet and Manet later.

The notion of organizing a protest exhibition against the Salon became more common in the early 1820’s as a result of the continued severity of the jury, even to the point of appearing as a theme in popular theater. In 1824, Anne’s play *La Rue du Carrousel* included an artist, aptly named Rapin, whose two entries for the Salon, *La bataille des Cannes* and *Germanicus*, were rejected by the hostile jury. Incensed by this injustice, which he felt was politically motivated, Rapin took his rejected works and those of his friends to a rented boutique near the Louvre to form a makeshift *salon des refusés*. Later he confided to a friend that this year he had only hired a small shop for the exhibition, but if he were to be rejected in the next Salon he would rent the Champs-de-Mars, and hang the pictures on the trees if necessary.

---

14 The career of the Comte de Forbin in relation to the Salons is important in this regard and is studied by P. Angrand, *Le Comte de Forbin et la Louvre en 1819*, Lausanne/Paris, 1972.
15 The composition of the jury was the following: Le comte de Radel (directeur de la Maison du Roi), Le comte de Forbin, Le comte Lenones (secrétaire général des musées royaux), M. Boudart (chef de la division des Beaux-Arts au Ministre de la Maison du Roi), the painters Gérard, Girodot, Guérin, Gros, Castellan, and the architects Fontaine and Lemot.
16 Arch. Louvre, Dos. x, 1817.
18 This was already pointed out in *Lettres à David, sur le salon de 1819, par quelques élèves de son école*, Paris, 1819, letter vii, 53.
19 Ibid., 66-67, and G. and J. Lacambre (as in note 17), 334.
22 C. Blanc, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles: Ecole française*, Paris, 1865, iii, 8, in the section devoted to Vernet: “Tout Paris court les voir.” Blanc also provides a list of the works exhibited.
24 Ibid., 13.
Rapin’s remarks proved to be prophetic, for the next Salon — that of 1827, the only one under Charles X — created an enormous outcry over the number of works rejected. The jury for the Salon, now composed of seventeen members of whom only four were painters and two were sculptors,26 eliminated an unprecedented 1635 works out of the 3469 submitted. This figure represents almost eight times the number of objects rejected a decade before, though there were only about 2.5 times as many works submitted. In comparison with 1795, the refusés of 1827 were 225 times greater.27

The alarming number of rejections was already known before the Salon officially opened on November 4, but the exact figure was exaggerated in the ateliers.28 Some critics openly wrote of the jury’s excessive severity,28 but many attempted to minimize the fact and essentially supported the State system. Delécluze, who often sided with the administration, pointed out the need for some form of jury to decide the participants, but also remarked that the tensions created by the severity this year served neither the artists, the State, nor the public. To ease that tension, he suggested “une exhibition particulière”29 of the rejected works so that the public could judge for themselves. One week after the opening of the Salon, it was announced that such an exhibition would take place in the Galerie Lebrun, No. 4 Rue Gros-Chenet.30

The Lebrun venture was formally opened to the public on December 8 — while the Salon was attracting crowds — as an “exposition supplémentaire” containing “une partie des productions non admises au Musée du Louvre”,31 it was not directly advertised as a salon des refusés, although the public clearly understood Lebrun’s intention. In fact, most of the 174 works exhibited were by the refusés of the Salon, but these artists did not always include those works that were actually rejected that year. Some included works executed earlier, while others hung pictures that were never submitted to a jury. Fourteen artists had works exhibited in the Louvre and in the Galerie Lebrun simultaneously.

In spite of the novelty of Lebrun’s exhibition, the crowds were few and critical commentary was harsh on the whole. Delécluze called the exhibition completely void of artistic merit and pointed out that this constituted a just proof that the jury had acted diligently.32 The Journal des artistes, which had promoted the show through constant advertising and appeals to the public, and advocated Salons without juries, also remarked on the mediocrity of the works displayed; of the 174 pictures on view, it could only mention three that might easily have hung in the Salon that year.33

Under the July Monarchy, the organization of the jury was radically modified so that it was composed of the fourth class of the Institute — i.e., painters, sculptors, engravers, architects, and composers; administrators and amateurs, traditionally appointed by the Maison du Roi, were now not directly involved in jury decisions. Under this new leadership, and in the liberal spirit after the Revolution of 1830, the Salon of 1831 witnessed a drastic reduction in the number of refusés. Although there were almost 400 more works submitted than in 1827, a total of only 604 items were rejected, a remarkable reduction of 1031. The statistics for the number of artists rejected are even more dramatic: whereas in 1827 a total of 294 artists had works rejected, in 1831 only thirty were barred from exhibiting.34 But in the next Salon, of 1833 — the Salon of 1832 had to be cancelled because of the cholera epidemic in Paris — the situation reverted to the severity of six years earlier. A record number of 4620 works were submitted to the jury, out of which 1740 were rejected for the exhibition. Before the opening of the Salon, 338 works were reinstated under circumstances that are not clarified in the documents.35

26 The jury consisted of the following members, as shown in Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1827: Vicomte de la Rochefoucauld (chargé du département des Beaux-Arts à la Maison du Roi), Le comte de Forbin (directeur des musées royaux), Le duc de Luynes (directeur honoraire des musées royaux), De Cailleux (secrétaire général), Gérard, Bosio, Fontaine, Desnoyers, Gros, Ingres, Cortot, Percier (architecte), Le comte Lenon (amateur), Boutard (amateur), Le comte Turpin de Crisse (amateur et inspecteur général des Beaux-Arts), Lenormant, and Castellan (who never participated in the sessions).

27 Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1827. In statistical terms the figures represent a rejection of ten percent for the Salon of 1795 and of forty-seven percent for 1827.

28 E. Delécluze, “Beaux-Arts.” Moniteur universel, November 13, 1827, 1559, reported that rumors had established the rejected works as numbering 4735, almost one thousand more than the number of works submitted.

29 See, for example, Le courrier français, November 6, 1827.

30 Delécluze, 559, “Les membres du jury ne sont pas infaillibles; ils peuvent commettre des erreurs, même à leur insu, accorder quelques préférences légères… la possibilité d’une exhibition particulière suffirait pour les retenir dans des justes limites….” The use of the word exhibition rather than exposition is important. The latter signifies a free and official showing of art and thus applies especially to the Salon; the former implies a showing of works of art with a special interest or for private speculation. On the distinction, see C. Lenormant, Les artistes contemporains. Paris, 1833, 1268.

31 Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1827.

32 A notice appeared in the Journal des artistes, 1, 20, November 11, 1827, 171-72; see also Duseigneur, 543; Lethève, 133; and J. Whiteley, “Exhibitions of Contemporary Painting in London and Paris, 1760-1860,” in Haskell, 75. The founder of the Galerie was Jean-Baptiste Lebrun (1748-1813), himself a painter, related to Charles Lebrun; he was the husband of Mme. Vigée-Lebrun. On the Lebrun exhibitions, see Caubisens-Lasfargues, 193f.

33 Exposition de tableaux modernes à la Galerie Lebrun, Paris, 1827.


35 Journal des artistes, 1, 24, December 9, 1827, 788. The three works singled out here were: No. 40, Devouge, La défense de Missolonghi; No. 60, Fontanelle d’Espinasse, Scène du déluge; and No. 119, Pajou (fils), Trait d’amour filial d’Alexandre le Grand; in the next issue of the Journal, 25, December 16, 1827, the work by Fontanelle is described in detail. The fourth work praised by the Journal, in the issue of December 30, 1840, was a painting by Hugues Fauve, Le mariage de Tobie et Sara, which entered the Lebrun exhibition later than the other refused works.

36 Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1831.

37 Ibid., 1833. Presumably there was a second review of the rejected works by the jury.
figure of the rejected works for that year contrasts sharply in percentage with the Salon of 1831, in which only two percent of the works submitted were actually rejected, while in 1833 the figure jumped to about forty-one percent. The number of artists rejected represents more than a tenfold increase over the previous Salon. Ironically, much of the blame for this situation was placed on the individual members of the jury, despite the reorganized form in which amateurs were excluded. It did not go unnoticed that the president of the jury in 1833 was Henri-Montan Bertin, a composer and musician of little note, whose adherence to conservative ideals in music and painting was widely known. Perhaps as a result of the huge amount of criticism of the jury's choices, composers were eliminated from Salon judgments on October 13, 1833.

It is no wonder, then, that under Louis-Philippe virtually the entire artistic community outside of the Academy itself regarded the juries as moribund and capricious, and governmental attitudes toward the Salon system as confusing and sometimes haphazard. During this period, no single group of artists from the various artistic camps was immune from the jury’s prerogative of refusal: the Romantics were most often rejected from the Salons, but so were some pupils of Ingres. In some instances, the reasons for exclusion defied explanation or seemed to have no apparent artistic motive. Jean Gignou, for example, who was decorated in the Salon of 1835, had his painting of Antoine et Cléopâtre rejected in the Salon of 1837, only to have the same painting accepted in 1838, although there was no change in the composition of the jury. Similarly, Louis Boulanger won a medal in the première classe in 1836 for his painting Le triomphe de Pétrarque, but his La mort de Messaline, which represented a decisive return to classicism very much in vogue at the time, was refused in the same Salon.

As a result of these sometimes incoherent decisions, artists from all camps, including such prominent academicians as Abel de Pujol, Delaroche, and Ingres, voiced their disapproval of the established system. In a remarkable gesture, both Vernet and Delaroche resigned from the jury of 1836 in protest against the blatant favoritism of their colleagues. On March 5, 1837, incensed over the rejection of works by Delacroix and Barye, Antoine Etex lithographed and distributed a petition demanding immediate reforms, as did David D’Angers the following year. Virtually all of the major critics recognized the abuses of all the juries and likewise pressed for Government action.

One of the immediate consequences of this growing resentment against the official Salon was the attempt to find alternate arrangements for exhibitions. Private galleries began in increasing number to exhibit first-rate works by leading artists, including some like Ingres and Delacroix who, after 1834 and 1836 respectively, refused to participate in the Salons. The Galerie Colbert held four exhibitions between 1829 and 1830 where Ingres, Delacroix, Scheffer, Boulanger and others exhibited new works. The various exhibitions for charitable causes organized by the Galerie Lebrun in 1826 and 1829, and the Galerie Colbert later, boasted important pictures by the most renowned masters of the period. In 1837 the Galerie Susse, which had earned the reputation of being a branch of the annual Salons, added three new exhibition rooms to its gallery on the Place de la Bourse to accommodate the growing number of contemporary works exhibited, sold, or rented. However, to hold an exhibition of rejected works on a scale comparable to the Lebrun show of 1827 was more difficult. Perhaps as a result of the negative responses to the Lebrun effort, no attempts were made in the 1830’s to exhibit the refusés as a cogent entity. In 1835 the Galerie Colbert made its halls available to the rejected artists of

37 This is especially noted by Hector Berlioz in his Memoires, Paris, 1926, i, 111, and Correspondance générale, Paris, 1972, i, 253 and 349. Berlioz also noted that painters acted as judges for Institute prizes; he wrote in a letter of August 2, 1829, i, 265, that Pradier and Ingres had defended him in the Prix de Rome contest that year. He did not win — no prize in music was awarded in 1829 — but in 1830, when he won the Prix for his cantata (now lost), La Mort de Sardanaple, it was Pradier who first conveyed the news; see Memoires, i, 160.
39 Whiteley, in Haskell, 77.
42 Whiteley, in Haskell, 77.
43 L’artiste, xi, 1836, 36, under “Variétés.” The jury minutes for that year, Arch. Louvre, KK55, indicate that Vernet did in fact attend one session of the jury proceedings, on February 11; he signed the page of decisions. Delaroche, however, never attended the sessions.
44 The letter is reproduced in full in A. Etex, Les souvenirs d’un artiste, Paris, n.d., 220-22. Etex was also to publish an influential brochure, A propos de l’exposition des beaux-arts de 1863, Paris, 1863; see Boime, 413.
45 The petition was announced in the Journal des artistes on March 25, 1838, 187. David was again to protest the jury choice for the Salon of 1847: L’artiste, May, 1847, 93. It might be noted in this context that a check of the jury proceedings for the 1830’s and 1840’s reveals that David consistently refused to participate in the deliberations.
46 Duseigneur, 543. Among the works exhibited in the Galerie Colbert were Ingres’ Oedipe, Scheffer’s La mort de Géricault, E. Devèria’s La naissance d’Henri IV, and Delacroix’s Marino Faliero.
47 These include in 1826, in the Galerie Lebrun, an exhibition for the Greek struggle for independence, which had seven works by David, six by Scheffer, and various works by Delacroix, Delarolco, Cogniet, and Bonington. In 1829 Lebrun organized an exhibition to aid the poor, which exhibited works by David, Ingres, Géricault, Hein, and others.
48 “Les Salons de MM. Susse frères,” L’artiste, xiii, 1837, 53-55. Susse boasted that he often included the best examples of Decamps, Johannott, Roqueplan, Cabat, Scheffer, and Dupré, and that there was always a good stock of English paintings.
that year, but only Chenavard took the opportunity or had the courage to send a work.⁴⁹ Still, on the model of Vernet’s private atelier exhibition, some artists during the 1830’s continued to show rejected works in their studios. The most notable example is Théodore Rousseau, who in 1836 presented his painting La descente des vaches vers Gex in Ary Scheffer’s atelier.⁵⁰ The critic Gustave Planche admired the work highly and advised the public to see it for themselves.⁵¹

With the Salon of 1840 another crisis was reached in the matter of jury evaluations. Even one month before the opening of the Salon, critics were already voicing their lack of confidence in the jury, noting that gross errors were almost certainly to be expected in the choice of works admitted and rejected.⁵² The jury met in the Louvre for the first deliberation on February 14; in the sessions that followed it evaluated, in haphazardly organized groups of genre and media, a total of 3996 works,⁵³ a small increase of almost three hundred works from the year before. The total number of works rejected, however, was staggering — 2147 items rejected as opposed to 1231 in 1839, or, in terms of percentages, more than half rejected in 1840 as opposed to about a third the year before. Among the rejected works in 1840 were four portraits by Gigoux, Chassériau’s Diane surprise, Cabat’s Vie de Venise, and all of the works submitted by Rousseau; Delacroix’s Trajan was also rejected initially, but later admitted on a second view. In his report on the Salon, the secretary general of the museums, Alexandre de Cailleux, justified the high number of refusés by noting that among them were an unusually high number of amateurs who thought themselves to be artistes peintres and who wished to profit from exhibiting in the Louvre; the harsh decisions of the jury in this case were to be seen as no less than justifiable acts of artistic concern wholly in accord with the accepted standards of the State.⁵⁴

The large proportion of the works rejected surprised and alarmed almost all of the critics from the outset.⁵⁵ However, none was more vehement or supportive of the artist’s right to exhibit in the Salon than Étienne Huard, who wrote regularly for the liberal Journal des artistes. In his first report on the Salon, on March 8, he indicated that the Journal would actively support an appeal to the public and the proper authorities against this unjustifiable act of censorship. Furthermore, he and the editors of the Journal would also support a counter-exhibition of the refusés in the Galeries Artistiques in the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle;⁵⁶ he even personally guaranteed that the exhibition halls were of the highest quality and that the lighting was superior to that of the Louvre. In the next issue, it was reported that artists who had already begun to send in rejected pictures, but that even greater participation was necessary: the editor urged all rejected artists to band together as a viable political force.⁵⁷ The appeal was repeated once more on March 22, with the addition that “plusieurs artistes” had responded and that many of the works appeared to be of higher artistic quality than the works in the Salon.⁵⁸

The fate of this exhibition is not known for certain. De Cailleux noted in his report that plans had been made for an exhibition in the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle, but that it never materialized.⁵⁹ The Journal des artistes reported on June 7 that in fact very few artists had actually sent their works, of submission and registration.


⁵⁰ A. Sensier, Souvenirs sur Theodore Rousseau, Paris, 1872, 84. Boime, 424, n. 4, says the painting Rousseau had exhibited was Une vue prise à Freleuse; but this is a confusion with the painting of that title exhibited by Philippe Rousseau in the Salon of 1836, No. 1634 of the livret. On T. Rousseau’s painting, now in the Musée Mesdag, La Haye, see M.-T. des Forges, “La descente des vaches de Théodore Rousseau,” La Revue du Louvre, xiii, 2, 1962, 85-90, and idem, Théodore Rousseau, Paris, 1967, unpag. Rousseau’s Vie du Château de Broglie, commissioned by the Duc de Broglie for Guizot, was similarly refused by the jury that year; it is not clear whether Rousseau also exhibited it privately.


⁵² H (uard), “Rapport sur l’exposition de 1840,” Journal des artes, xiv, 5, February 2, 1840, 65f. Huard noted that the jury system represented nothing more than a lottery prone to chance and error.

⁵³ “Enregistrement des ouvrages. Salon de 1840,” Arch. Louvre, KK⁵⁷, and “Rapport sur l’exposition de 1840,” in Doss, x, 1840. The report is unsigned but shows the handwriting of Alexandre-Achille de Cailleux, who was then the secretary-general of the museums. The procès-verbaux show that the jury evaluated the works in no order other than that of their dates of submission and registration.

⁵⁴ (De Cailleux), “Rapport . . . 1840” (as in note 53): “Tout le monde est artiste, chacun cherche à faire de l’argent de ses œuvres.”

⁵⁵ See, for examples, C. Blanc, in La revue du progrès politique, social et littéraire, iii, 1840, 217f; T. Gautier, in La presse, March 11, 1840; P. Haussard, in Le temps, April 19, 1840 (which includes a humorous review of the jury activities); J. Janin in L’artiste, 2nd ser., v, 1840, 181 (which included an incomplete list of the rejected works): A. Royer in Le siècle, March 6, 1840; G. Planche in Revue des deux-mondes, xxii, 1840. In this regard the Magasin pittoresque, which did not normally review the Salons, published an oblique reference to the problems in April, 1840, by reprinting a review of L’Abbe Languier’s 1771 publication, Manière de bien juger des ouvrages de peinture.

⁵⁶ “Salon de 1840,” Journal des artistes, xiv, 10, March 8, 1840, 149. The appeal for a counter-exhibition is noted on p. 145, n. 1, and again on p. 150. The Journal published the following notice on p. 159: “L’administration du Journal des artistes engage fortement MM les artistes (refusés) à exposer leur ouvrages dans les Galeries Artistiques, Boulevard de Bonne-Nouvelle.” The notice added later that the journal would review periodically those works exhibited. On the Bazar de Bonne-Nouvelle and its role in private exhibitions in the 1840’s, see Tabarant, 45f.


⁵⁸ Ibid., 12, March 22, 1840, 191. Here the Journal noted the high quality of a portrait by Emile Mascre, who does not appear in any of the traditional biographical dictionaries.

⁵⁹ (De Cailleux) “Rapport” (as in note 53), 1840.
and we learn in the next issue that fewer than thirty works by the refusés were on display among the Old Masters.60 The earlier reports were clearly intended as a journalistic ploy to give the refusés an aura of confidence so that they would send their works. No information is available on why the participation was so low. It may be assumed that the fear of reprisals in the form of diminished commissions and sales or the public shame of having been rejected were significant factors.

However, as before, there were private exhibitions in the artists’ ateliers. Pierre-Louis Delaval, for example, a student of Girodet who helped decorate the Château de Compiègne,61 exhibited two large paintings that had been commissioned by the Minister of the Interior and the esquisses for them which had already been approved by the administration.62 Similarly, Pierre-Joseph Redoute, then eighty-one years old,63 opened his respected private atelier to exhibit the rejected works of four of his pupils, three of whom had been decorated in previous salons.64 There appears to have been no critical or public response as to the merits of these works, although in each case the respectability of the artists involved was noted.

If the rejected artists of 1840 did not band together to exhibit publicly as an ensemble, they nevertheless let their resentment be known, and even had their representatives act in the Academy. Soon after the opening of the Salon, the respected sculptor and academician Pradier read a proposal for jury reform in the Academy.65 Noting the apparent injustice of the jury of 1840, he suggested the formation of a committee to investigate a more equitable method for selecting the Salon entrants. He advocated as well the organization of works into specific categories by genre and medium while the jury was deliberating, so that the members might more easily judge the entirety of the works submitted in each category, a proposal that was to be adopted for the next Salon.66 Pradier also called for the artists themselves to act as a kind of jury in limiting their submissions in each category; the artist, forced himself to select his best work in any category, would lighten the load of the jury and help to eliminate its errors. Pradier likewise proposed that Academy members be hors de concours so that the jury could concentrate more explicitly on the works of younger artists. Eventually all of these reforms would be enacted.

The only act of solidarity among the rejected artists was a letter of protest filed on March 18, 1840 with the Chambre des Pairs. The letter, signed on behalf of the artists involved by David D’Angers, Maindron, Diaz, Delaroche, Corot, Ary and Henry Scheffer, Etx, and others, condemned once again the wholesale injustice of this jury’s actions, and called for the elimination of all juries for the Salons. A paragraph was appended later — in the copy of the Louvre archives, it was noted in pencil that it was composed by Delaroche — demanding that the artist’s rights to exhibit be protected by laws especially prescribed by the Government. The added paragraph bore the signatures of Etx, Drolling, and Delaroche.67

The fate of this letter is not known, since no deliberation on its contents is noted in the official reports of the Chambre des Pairs’ proceedings. But by mid-April,68 probably because no response was forthcoming from the Chambre, it was decided to expand the letter into a petition of reform addressed to both Chambers. The petition (Appendix 1), now carrying 213 signatures, was not deposited with the authorities until November 28, 1840. We learn later that neither Chamber acted on the petition, that in effect it was simply filed away without debate, possibly on orders from the Louvre officials.69 Moreover, despite the extraordinary protests against the decisions of the jury in 1840, no discernible alterations were made for the Salon of 1841, except for minor changes in the classification of works and a new method of casting votes.70 As if to remind the new jury of previous abuses, the Journal des artistes reprinted in full the petition of 1840, while the jury of 1841 was deliberating its new choices.71 Not surprisingly, the jury was much more liberal that year, and there were relatively few complaints from all sides,72 except that many critics lamented the overall mediocrity of the works exposed.

---

60 “Galeries artistiques du Boulevard Bonne-Nouvelle,” Journal des artistes, xiv, 23, June 7, 1840, 357, and 24, June 14, 1840, 378. Among the works singled out were those by Chalamel, Perrot, Deneux, and Girard. The Old Masters in the exhibition included works of Perugino, Claude, Girodano, Boucher, Watteau, and several attributed to students of Rembrandt.

61 On Delaval, see Bénézit, iii, 148.

62 Journal des artistes, xiv, 12, March 22, 1840, 191, and Journal des débats, March 22, 1840. The two works in question were Une jeune aveugle recourant la vue and Une jeune fille recevant des mains de Sainte-Genève l’habit de son ordre.

63 Redouté was a flower painter of great reputation; in 1805 he was named as the official peintre de fleurs by the Empress Josephine.

64 Journal des artistes, xiv, 15, April 15, 1840, 239. Redouté died two months later.

65 “Proposition lue à l’Académie par M. Pradier, statuaire” (probably Pradier), a copy of which is in the Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1840.

66 Arch. Louvre, KK54, shows the manner in which the works were arranged. Because of the huge overlap of certain subjects, such as portraits, several sessions contained a mixed arrangement of subjects and media.

67 Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1840 contains a transcribed or rough-draft copy, with several notations in different handwriting.

68 Journal des artistes, xiv, 16, April 19, 1840, 255.

69 De Cailleux notes the action taken on the petition in his “Rapport sur le Salon de 1843”; on this see below.

70 J. Baget, “Du jury académique et sa nouvelle organisation,” Journal des artistes, xv, 1, January 3, 1841, 1-4, and xv, 2, January 10, 1841, 17-21. On February 28, the Journal noted, 9, 131, that the jury this year would use paper ballots on which each member would indicate his view by marking T-B (très bien), B (bien), P (passable), or M (mauvais). Those ballots with a P would be reviewed again before a final decision was made; those with M votes were automatically eliminated.


72 See, for example, E. de Montlaur, “Salon de 1841,” Revue du progrès, May 1, 1841, 263.
The increasing complaint against the capriciousness of the jury once again reached a point of crisis with the Salon of 1843, scheduled to open at 11 A.M. on March 15. Rumors were already heard in the ateliers a week before that the jury this year was even more severe than previous ones, and that a pitiless wholesale elimination of young artists' works had taken place.73 The administration had established February 20 as the deadline for submitting works to the jury, but artists this year were exceptionally slow in depositing their efforts in the Louvre. By the evening of February 17, only 825 pictures were registered; two days later, that figure had tripled.74 On midnight of February 20, De Cailleux closed the register of submitted items with 3989 works recorded, a figure that represents some six hundred fewer items than a decade before.75

The jury for the Salon, as was usual by this time, comprised thirty-four members. Of these, nine did not participate in any session of evaluation: Vernet and Schnetz were not in Paris — the former in Russia, the latter in Rome; Ingres was involved with a royal commission and therefore excused; Hersent and Richomme were both ill; Tardieu, then eighty-seven years old, asked to be excused because of his age; Delaroche, Drolling, and David D'Angers never appeared before the séances de jugement, whether out of protest or uninterest is not recorded.76 Huard would later claim that "plusieurs musiciens" were on the jury and partially responsible for bad judgments; this was totally untrue and surely meant to inflame an already critical situation.77

After the works were organized according to genre and medium, the process of selection was begun on February 21 and continued in twelve uninterrupted séances until March 4. Each session began between eleven and noon and never finished before five in the evening. A procès-verbal recorded by two secretaries at either end of the room noted the works admitted and rejected. Unanimous decisions were recorded by a check in the appropriate column; in the case of disagreement, the numbers for and against were duly entered. A tie vote always went in the favor of the artist. Not all of the jury members were required to express their views, but nine votes were necessary as a minimum. Of the twenty-five jury members who participated in this se-

73 See, for examples, L'artiste, 1843, 177; Les beaux-arts, 1, 1843, 7; H. "Salon de 1843," Journal des artistes, xvii, 9, February 26, 1843, 132.
74 Journal des artistes, xvii, 8, February 19, 1843, 115, and 9, February 26, 1843, 132.
75 De Cailleux, "Rapport à l'Intendant Général," dated February 26, 1843, in Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843. De Cailleux added later in several letters that requests had come to the Salon authorities to waive the deadline in some cases because of difficulties in shipping works from abroad, especially from Belgium. Demands were received as late as March 1. It is not certain how many of these works were admitted to the Salon; De Cailleux was to note later that the Salon had received four thousand submissions (my count is 4,041).
76 The jury members who participated are the following, taken from the Louvre dossier: Abel de Pujol, Bidault, Blondel (who was the president of the jury that year), Bosio, Caristie, Cortot, Couder, Debret, Desnoyers (the vice-president), Dumont, Fontaine, Galle, Garnier, Gauthier, Granet, Heim, Huvé, Lebas, Leclerc, Nanteuil (the sculptor), Petitot, Picot, Pra-
77 See, for examples, L'artiste, 1843, 177; Les beaux-arts, 1, 1843, 7; H. "Salon de 1843," Journal des artistes, xvii, 9, February 26, 1843, 132.
78 "Liste de MM. les membres du jury de l'exposition de 1843," Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843. The actual procès-verbaux of the jury deliberations, including how they voted in each case, is in the Arch. Louvre, KK50. These deliberations were always signed by each jury member, thus indicating their presence or absence for each session.
79 The Salon livret lists 1597 items in the exhibition, but the discrepancy is owed to the fact that some works, especially prints and drawings, were framed with several examples within the same frame, all of which counted as one catalogue number.

dier, Ramey, Vaudoyer. This jury was divided among eight painters, seven sculptors, eight architects, and two engravers. The high percentage of architects is remarkable since the architecture section of the salon comprised only twenty-one numbers in the livret out of 1597.

The statistics of the breakdown of categories, subjects, and themes for works submitted to the Salon of 1843 can be examined as typical of the trends in nineteenth-century exhibitions. The fifth séance, devoted to prints (except lithographs), seascapes, and flower pictures, had the largest number of works examined by the jury in any one sitting, a total of 681 items. The séance with the fewest number of works was the sixth, devoted in part to landscapes, with 199 works. Portraits were the most numerous category, accounting for 975 works in two sessions and half of another. The average number of works examined by the jury at each session was three hundred.

The figures regarding the rejections as recorded in each session are equally interesting. In only one — the eleventh, devoted to history painting — were more pictures admitted than refused, 161 against ninety-one, with one painting by Heim withdrawn by the artist himself, who was also on the jury. This figure is in stark contrast to the Salon of 1840 where in five sessions more works were admitted than refused, with one session having an equal number of both. The largest proportion of works rejected in 1843 in any single session was in the fourth — watercolors, lithographs, drawings, and pastels — where 250 out of 344 works were marked as refusés. Of all of the portraits submitted, almost seventy percent were rejected.

When the selection process was over, De Cailleux recorded only 1637 works accepted by 896 artists,78 the lowest figure since 1817 and the smallest in the sixteen Salons under the reign of Louis-Philippe. The rejected items totalled 2363 by 957 artists, the highest number since the establishment of the Salons. Compared to the Salon of a decade before, when about 650 more works were entered for the jury selection, the refusés of 1843 were almost double.

Clearly it is not possible to list all of the artists whose works were refused, but the names included many well-known figures from the past and those who were to achieve celebrity in the future. Among those who had at least one of their works rejected in this year were L. Boulanger, Calamatta, Cals, Corot, Courbet (two paintings), Couture
(four paintings), Daubigny, E. Devéria, A. and H. Flan-
drin, Glaize, Hesse, Huet (five landscapes), Millet, and the
sculptors Barye (five works), Clésinger, Duseigneur (by a
vote of seven for, nine against), and Préault. It was even
claimed that Ingres was refused indirectly, because a stu-
dent of his had submitted a drawing that had been executed
under his supervision and corrected by the master himself
before the jury decided its fate.61

The statistics of refusés by age group — although not all artists who submitted works listed their date of birth — support the claim made in the press that the youthful beginner was the most harshly affected by the decision. But the rejected group also included 187 artists who were in their thirties, sixty-five in their forties, twenty-two in their fifties, four in their sixties, and one in her seventies — Aï-
méé Duivivier, a seventy-seven year-old student of Greuze,
who had began exhibiting in the Place Dauphine in 1786.62
Moreover, the students of major masters of the period were
excluded irrespective of their studio education: sixty-two
students of Delaroche were refused entry into the Salon
despite the fact that his teaching atelier was widely rec-
ognized as the most important training studio in Paris. Sim-
ilarly, twenty-seven students of Ingres and thirty-six of
Cogniet were listed among the rejected; only Drolling’s stu-
dents fared well with the jury.

The critical reaction to the announcement of the jury’s
decision was swift. Louis Peisse devoted almost all of his
first article on the Salon to discussing the abuses of the jury
and noted that it “a procédé cette fois par des exécutions
en masse,”63 a theme graphically echoed in L’artiste, which
opened its review with a vignette of men hanged from a
tree.64 Peisse vehemently attacked the credibility of the jury
in the most prosaic manner, by calculating that under the
circumstances it had about one minute for evaluating an
admission or rejection for each work, less if such factors
as fatigue, boredom, discussions, and natural pauses were
taken into consideration.65 All of the other major critics
likewise criticized the exclusions with a vehemence seldom
seen in the French press,66 while noting as well, almost
unanimously, how mediocre the admitted pictures were.
Even the conservative critic Délecluze, who had defended
the jury in 1827 and castigated the Lebrun exhibition, wrote
of the obvious need for major reform.67 The only jury mem-
ber who was cleared of dishonesty and prejudicial
judgment was Abel de Pujol, who was credited with sup-
porting the admittance of the widely acclaimed works of
Cogniet, Gleyre, Papyet, and Robert-Fleury.68 In contrast,
Drolling, Hersent, Ingres, and Vernet were publicly chas-
tised for their non-participation in the jury deliberations.69
It is ironic, in the light of the twentieth-century view of
these artists, that in 1843 all of them were considered lib-
eral, so that the absence of their votes produced a majority
of conservative judgments.

As might be expected, much attention was devoted to the
sheer number of rejected works and to the fact that
among these were artists who were often high in public
esteem. L’artiste, which had championed the refusés in
the 1830’s, made a point of making its readers aware that Cor-
ot’s Incendie de Sodome was among the rejected, despite
being, in its opinion, the artist’s most ambitious and ac-
complished work to date.70 Likewise, the rejection of a port-
rait by Hippolyte Flandrin was reported with incredulity,
as was Ingres’ proclamation that if the portrait were not
reinstated he would resign from the Academy.71 But none of
the rejected paintings received as much publicity as Bou-
langer’s La mort de Messaline. Boulanger had had much
success in the Salons — he had exhibited twenty-eight works
between 1827 and 1843 — and was by this time regarded
as a highly acceptable and popular artist; the rejection of
his Messaline, already rejected in a slightly different ver-
sion in 1836, was seen as an indication of the myopic vision
of the jury as a whole. L’artiste, particularly outraged at

60 “Liste de non-admis,” Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843, and the procès-
verbaux, KK. In some cases, the list of non-admitted artists contains
information on how many works were submitted in each category and,
infrquently, the titles of these works.
61 Les beaux-arts, 1, 1843, 56. The student is not named.
62 These figures were calculated by the author from the “Liste de non-
admis,” which in most cases gave the date of birth for the artists involved.
For Aimée Duivivier, see Bénézit, 11, 458. The youngest refusée was Mlle.
Adrienne Dubois, who had just passed her fourteenth birthday.
than twenty pages of this overview of the Salon treat the problem of the
jury in past Salons, noting in particular some elements of its structure
and organization. Peisse often repeats his own view that the jury is unnec-
essary, and that the Louvre could accommodate twice as many works
as could be seen in the average Salon. Peisse also concedes that without
a jury many mediocre works would surely be exhibited, but that the public
would also have the opportunity to see dozens of valuable works that
otherwise might be neglected because of the jury’s abuses.
64 “Salon de 1843” (second article), L’artiste, Ser. 3, iii, 1843, 193.
65 Ibid., 93. Curiously, this same calculation had been made earlier about
the Salon of 1840; see L’artiste, 2nd ser., iv, 1840, 397.
66 For examples see the critiques of La presse, Le national, La revue in-
dépendante, Journal des artistes.
68 L’artiste, 1843, 194.
69 See ibid.; H, “Salon de 1843,” Journal des artistes, xvi, 9, February
26, 130; Les beaux-arts, 1, 1843, 26; among others. The latter review was
the most damaging to these artists because it noted that after the jury
deliberations, they washed their hands of the matter, like Pilate, and
claimed simply that it was not their fault because they were not there.
Later Véron also accused these artists of the same fault, in a poem of
April, 1861, “La Morgue, à MM. Ingres, Delacroix, H. Vernet, Couder,
et Dumont, qui s’abstennent au jury . . .”; reprinted in his Légende des
refusés, 127.
70 “Salon de 1843,” L’artiste, 1843, 178. See also A. Robaut, L’oeuvre de
Corot, Paris, 1965, 11, 168, No. 460 where the work is entitled La dé-
struction de Sodome. Corot later sent the same picture, unaltered, to the
Salon of 1844, where it was accepted, No. 593 of the livret. The work as
it existed in 1843-44 is no longer extant since Corot reworked and cut the
canvas twelve years later and reexhibited it, in the Salon of 1857, No.
593 of the livret.
71 L’artiste, 1843, 178; Les beaux-arts, 1, 1843, 25.
this judgment, published an illustration of the picture shortly after the Salon opening.92

As in previous years, artists expressed their dissatisfaction and frustration immediately. A very typical letter of protest sent to the press was that of Henri Serrur, a pupil of Regnauld who had begun exhibiting in the Salons in 1819 and who was decorated in 1836 and 1837.93 Serrur expressed the disappointment of many mature artists — he was almost fifty in 1843 — who, in spite of a lack of acknowledged brilliance, struggled to maintain their livelihood through their painting:

Privé de fortune, sans autre appui que mon courage et ma persévérance, je suis parvenu des nombreuses difficultés qui se sont rencontrés sur mon passage. Des acquisitions, des commandes, des médailles, ont été la récompense de mes constants efforts. Avec ses titres, bien faibles sans doute mais honorablement acquis sans intrigue, je pouvais espérer que mes ouvrages continuèrent à être acceptés par le jury. . . . Tous les ouvrages que j’ai envoyés cette année. . . . ont été refusés sans pitié; aucun n’a pu trouvé grâce auprès de ce tribunal sans nom. Certes, je n’ai pas la ridicule prétention d’avoir fait des chefs-d’oeuvres, et nul n’a plus besoin que moi d’indulgence . . . .

Serrur ended his letter by offering to open his atelier so that the public could judge his work and asked to be informed whether the rejected artists would produce a collective protest since he intended to participate.94

Similarly, a painter named Augustin Despréaux, about whose works nothing is known,95 printed and distributed at his own expense, on May 3, 1843, a broadside attacking the jury for two particular injustices with respect to the rejection of his and his daughter’s works.96 The nature of his attack bears some discussion here since they include issues rarely mentioned in the press or in the art-historical literature. The first accusation concerned a deliberate prejudice on the part of the jury toward artists who were self-taught. In 1841, the Salon regulations required that an artist list the name of the master under whom he was trained when he deposited his work for consideration.97 The unstated purpose of this gesture was to have an easier means for quickly eliminating the works of the amateur sans maître which each year crowded the jury deliberation. It also gave the jury the opportunity to exercise an unofficial censorship against artists whose training did not conform to that of the Academy; both Jules Dépré and Barye were victimized in this way because of their lack of accepted atelier formation.

Despréaux’s second accusation, concerning the rejection of works by his daughter, centered on prejudicial judgment against women artists. The issue in itself was not new to this Salon; only one year before, the jury had rejected a painting of Sulamite by a female painter named Rhéal. Her husband, Sébastien Rhéal, published an appeal to the public stating his accusation in bold terms.98 The four-page tract included a letter of support from his wife’s teacher Evariste Fragonard and quoted from Anthoni Deschamp’s notice published in the February 20 issue of France littéraire. The accusation of the specific rejection of works by women artists is borne out in the records of the Salons where it becomes evident that about twice the number of women artists as men were rejected systematically.99 Although never an official policy of the administration, the exclusion of women from the Salons, when possible, was sanctioned as early as 1824 when La Rochehoucauld wrote to the Comte de Forbin that “Quant aux ouvrages de femmes et d’amateurs, il faut les repousser impitoyablement . . . .”100

Beside these individual letters of protest and private atelier exhibitions,101 a more formal petition against the harsh jury was launched only ten days after the Salon opening. Unlike the petition of 1840 directed to the two chambers, this letter was sent directly to Louis-Philippe. The five and a half-page document contains 143 signatures, representing a veritable cross-section of all artistic schools and trends, and includes the names of artists admitted into the Salon and even one jury member.102 Although it is not known who

---

92 “Album du Salon de 1843: La Mort de Mesaline par M. Louis Boulangier. Tableau refusé par le jury.” L’artiste, 1843, 186-88; the illustration appeared between pages 192 and 193. L’artiste had reproduced rejected works before, in the 1830’s, as noted by Rosenthal, 231, n. 1.

93 On Serrur (1794-1865), see Benezit, vii, 721.

94 The letter was published in “Actualités-Souvenirs,” L’artiste, 1843, 189-190.

95 He does not appear in the traditional biographical sources, nor is his name listed in previous salon livrets. The Louvre dossier notes his age as fifty-four in 1843.

96 “Appel au public sur un deni de justice du jury de peinture, 3 Mai, 1843.” a copy of which is in Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843. A copy of the tract was published in Journal des artistes, xvii, 19, May 7, 1843, 300-02. The jury rejected four works by Despréaux along with two by his daughter. These were shown privately in his studio during the Salon.

97 Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1841. On the consequences of the requirement, see Ivens, 64.

98 Exposition du tableau de la Sulamite refusé par le jury de peinture de 1842. Paris, 1842. No information has been located concerning her or her works.

99 Whiteley, in Haskell, 76. Benoit (as in note 6), 230, reproduces a list of exhibitions from 1791 to 1812, noting the number of women artists in each Salon.

100 Cited in Whiteley, in Haskell, 85, no. 116.

101 To those mentioned in the text can be added the private exhibition of Nicolas-Auguste Gallimard—sometimes written Galimard—who was the nephew of Hesse and a pupil of Ingres; he was decorated in the Salon of 1835. He exhibited a portrait, rejected in 1843, in his studio; see the notice in L’artiste, 1843, 190.

102 A copy of the letter is in Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843; the signatures include the following: Ingres, David D’Angers, Corot, Delacroix, Delaroche, Huet, Moine, L. Boulangier, Gigoux, Court, Marilhat, Lami, P. Flandrin, Barye, Isabey, Fleury, Drolling, Maindron, Ete, Couture, Duseigneur, Papety, Gleizes, G. Nanteuil, Abel de Pujol (the only jury member), Aligny, Chopin, Francois, Millet. Included as well were the signatures of Chalamel, who edited the popular series Albums de Salon, and Paul Lacroix, better known as the Bibliophile Jacob.
composed the letter, it is possible that Ingres may have had a hand in it, since his signature, in especially bold form, appears in the center. It is surprising under the circumstances of 1843 that this petition is so placid in tone. The first half praises the King’s efforts for the visual arts and cites the major projects completed under his reign. Only on the third page does the letter mention the problem of the excessive refusés, noting in particular the harsh treatment of the artistes décorés and the Rome pensionnaires. The only specific request made was to find a more equitable method for evaluating the works submitted, but there were no practical suggestions on how this could be accomplished. There was no demand to eliminate the jury altogether. In contrast to the strong language of the petition of 1840, that of 1843 appears more as a desperate plea than a statement of action.

The reaction of Louis-Philippe to the petition is not recorded, as there is no official response noted in the dossier. It was reported in the press that “le roi lui-même . . . avait témoigné les injustices,” but the report added that “(il) n’a pas assez de crédit pour ouvrir les portes de son Louvre aux tableaux refusés.” Nonetheless, De Cailleux took it upon himself to discredit the petition in his unusually long annual report on the Salon, which he signed on May 18. He explained that the 143 signatures actually represented a small proportion of Parisian painters since more than two thousand individuals in 1843 listed their occupations as artistes peintres. As to the issue of previously decorated artists, the task of the jury was to evaluate the works submitted, not past accomplishments; he noted that a painter who had won a medal in the history class could not automatically paint an accomplished landscape or portrait. Furthermore, the previously decorated artists and the Prix de Rome winners had the special recourse of taking part in the numerous Government commissions for public places, thus adding to their incomes and reputations, and making their works visible to large audiences. The harsh treatment of younger artists, although not directly an issue in the petition, was also countered by De Cailleux by elaborating the system of encouragements; a certificate of talent and need was sufficient for some form of financial aid or a commission for a copy. Funds for these purposes, De Cailleux added, were never higher than under the present régime. The rebuttal concluded that although juries can make errors, this one had acted with a great deal of diligence and its judgments benefited both the artists and the public.

In the immediate shock over the number of refusés, it was already thought that a large private exhibition of the rejected works might again be attempted. On March 17, Fabien Pillet, the regular critic of the official Moniteur universel, who condemned on the whole the works that were hung in the Salon, suggested that “une salle ouverte” might be employed to house a counter-exhibition. The idea was readily picked up by the Librairie Techener, which from 1842 had taken over the direction of the Galerie Artistique of the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle. Techener himself had had a notice distributed on March 21 asking all rejected artists to meet with him to organize the exhibition. By April 9, announcements began to appear that Techener’s counter-exhibition would open shortly, and that among the works refused would be hung first-rate pictures by some of the leading artists of the day.

On April 20, 1843, Techener published the following advertisement:

Aujourd’hui jeudi ouverture des Galeries des Beaux-Arts pour l’exposition des tableaux modernes, dessins, sculptures, etc. au profit des habitants (sic) de la Guadeloupe, boulevard Bonne-Nouvelle, 22. La Mort de Messaline, La Mort de Bailly, de M. L. Boulanger; le Supplice du Fouet, le Dévouement de Mlle Sombreuil, La Madeleine, La Pensée du Crime, de Verdier; des tableaux de M. Corot, Français, etc. Prix d’entrée: 25 c., le vendredi 50 c.

Techener’s ploy of donating the proceeds of the entrance fees to the victims of an earthquake in Guadeloupe was intended to give the venture the aura of a charitable exhibition like the previous models, and thereby attract a larger audience. Unfortunately a large number of charity drives for the victims took place at the same time, thus removing the uniqueness of Techener’s idea. The King him-

103 “Salon de 1843,” Les beaux-arts, i, 1843, 25.
104 “Rapport sur le Salon de 1843,” Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843, written to the Intendant Général de la Liste Civile. The annual reports were usually between fifteen and twenty pages in length, summarizing the events, prizes, sales, and the most important works in the Salon. De Cailleux’s report of 1843 was forty pages long, because, as he explained, it was necessary to counteract all of the charges leveled against this year’s selections. In effect, De Cailleux tried to demonstrate with basic statistics from previous Salons that this year’s jury was no more severe than any other.
106 The Librairie Techener was founded in 1827 by Jacques-Joseph Techener (1802-1873). The bookstore was particularly celebrated for its rare documents and books; it often served as a meeting place for philosophical discussions. Techener himself wrote various learned studies and edited the Bulletin du bibliophile for more than thirty years. The Galerie Artistique of the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle had become in the early 1840’s an enormously popular gallery; in 1842 more than ten thousand visitors saw an exhibition there of some works of Raphael.
107 A copy of the notice is contained in the Arch. Louvre, Doss. x, 1843. Techener gave May 28 as the deadline for receiving the works in the gallery.
108 L’artiste, 1843, 240. The notice gave the opening date as April 15, but this was postponed for five days without explanation.
109 Journal des débats, April 20, 1843.
110 The earthquake took place on February 8, 1843, but news of the event reached Paris only on March 10. More than two thousand lives were lost immediately; almost fifteen thousand people, virtually the entire population of the island, were left homeless. See Moniteur universel, March 12, 1843, 415, for various accounts of the tragedy. As early as March 25, an anonymous reviewer of the Salon for the Revue indépendante, viti, 1843, 242, suggested using the profits of the sale of the livrets to aid the victims.
self arranged a large exhibition of works to be sold in the Palais Royal for the same purpose just one week later; more than forty thousand visitors were recorded per day. The result for the Techener enterprise was that no donation from the gallery appeared in the weekly lists of donations printed in the major journals, suggesting exceptionally low attendance. De Cailleux was to note in his annual report that the halls of the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle were always empty.

But it was not only the competition that played a role in the failure of this Salon des refusés. While the initial announcements of Techener's exhibition had brought critical hopes of finally visualizing the jury’s unfair treatment, the press showed neither enthusiasm nor support when the exhibition opened. The Journal des artistes, which for sixteen years had actively campaigned against jury abuse and helped to sustain interest in counter-exhibitions, made no mention of the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle show once it had opened to the public. And such liberal journals as L'artiste, which fully sided with the complaints of the refusés and had illustrated two examples refused by the jury virtually ignored the presence of the Techener exhibition in its reportage. Even Pillet, who advocated the public exhibition of the rejected works in the first place, wrote one month later that this “galerie des réfugié,” as he called it, held little interest for the critic and the public and that the only admirable work present was Boulanger’s La mort de Bailly, which was, however, not without its faults.

Techener’s exhibition contained 230 items altogether, each annotated by the individual artist; there were 125 different artists represented. It is certain, as in previous counter-exhibitions, that not all of the rejected works had been rejected by the jury that year. A cross-check of the names in the Techener exhibition with the Louvre documents reveals that twenty-six of the artists had in fact submitted no works at all to the 1843 jury. Moreover, the paintings by Boulanger noted in Techener’s advertisement, evidently intended as artistic highlights, had both been rejected by earlier juries: the Messaline, as noted earlier, in 1836, while the Bailly had been rejected in 1831 and had not been resubmitted in 1843. The work by Corot also listed in the advertisement was not the Incendie de Sodom, which had been hailed by L’artiste as one of his major paintings, but rather a lesser work entitled Paysage dans le Morvand. Of Marcel Verdier’s paintings announced by Techener, the most important was probably Le supplice de fouet, a brutal representation of the punishment of a black slave in the colonies, which, it was said, was rejected by the jury because its harsh theme would have offended the colonial ambassadors in Paris.

The failure of Techener’s project raises the question of why it and its predecessors were so ineffectual in demonstrating the sometimes unjust and often prejudicial judgments of the juries in each instance. To say that the lack of success of these ventures was owed to a singular lack of quality in the works exhibited is too facile. Although it is true that none of the counter-exhibitions could boast of

113 Journal des débats, April 27, 1843, mentioned that the sale had continued for three days; a fourth day was assigned to special guests.

114 Fab. P., “Salon de 1843,” Moniteur universel, May 15, 1843, 1119 (ninth article). Boulanger’s Mort de Bailly was a huge canvas (420 x 522 cm) containing about two hundred figures. The subject was drawn from Thiers’ colonial ambassadors in Paris. De Cailleux, Souvenirs d’un directeur des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1979, 19-34, for his meetings with her in Italy. Her work was systematically noted in the history of 19th-century art, but her life represents an interesting example of the independent woman artist who went against the Establishment. She numbered among her close friends both Ingres and Delacroix; she studied with Hersent and modeled for Ary Scheffer. As an ardent Royalist, she actively participated in the uprisings against Louis-Philippe, was imprisoned, and later exiled. See P. de Chennevière, Souvenirs d’un directeur des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1979, 11, 19-34, for his meetings with her in Italy. Her work was systematically refused by the jury because of her political views. In 1839 she exhibited her remarkably Gothic Miroir de la société privately after it was refused by the jury; see Magasin pittoresque, viii, 18, May 1839, 137-38, and S. Lami, Sculpteurs de l’école française, Le dix-neuvième siècle: Paris, 1919, 11, 346-48. Mlle. de Fauveau showed a large holy water font in the Techener exhibit which had been finished by 1839, when it was briefly shown in the Galerie Susse. It might be noted that in the sculpture section of the 1843 salon, only one work by a woman was exhibited: a plaster of a bull by Rosa Bonheur, No. 1392.

115 The list cited above includes twenty-six names marked with an X in pencil but with no indication as to what this means. I checked these names against the registration of works submitted to the jury, and determined that the X signified no works submitted that year.

116 Magazine pittoresque, viii, 18, May 1839, 137-38, and S. Lami, Sculpteurs de l’école française, Le dix-neuvième siècle: Paris, 1919, 11, 346-48. Mlle. de Fauveau showed a large holy water font in the Techener exhibit which had been finished by 1839, when it was briefly shown in the Galerie Susse. It might be noted that in the sculpture section of the 1843 salon, only one work by a woman was exhibited: a plaster of a bull by Rosa Bonheur, No. 1392.

117 Journal des artistes, which for sixteen years had actively campaigned against jury abuse and helped to sustain interest in counter-exhibitions, made no mention of the Bazar Bonne-Nouvelle show once it had opened to the public. And such liberal journals as L’artiste, which fully sided with the complaints of the refusés and had illustrated two examples refused by the jury virtually ignored the presence of the Techener exhibition in its reportage. Even Pillet, who advocated the public exhibition of the rejected works in the first place, wrote one month later that this “galerie des réfugié,” as he called it, held little interest for the critic and the public and that the only admirable work present was Boulanger’s La mort de Bailly, which was, however, not without its faults.

118 The list cited above includes twenty-six names marked with an X in pencil but with no indication as to what this means. I checked these names against the registration of works submitted to the jury, and determined that the X signified no works submitted that year.

119 Marie (as in note 41), 47f.

120 It is not certain which landscape this was; L’illustration, 1, 1843, 197, described it as a small landscape with a woman and goat in the foreground. Robaut (as in note 90), ii, 164, lists several landscapes of this period known to have been executed in Morvand, but none with a young woman and goat; see for examples, Nos. 427f.

121 In this form of the title, as illustrated as such in L’illustration, 1, 1843, 197. It was listed in the catalogue published by Techener, as Château du quatre piquets dans les colonies, No. 109; the annotation cited the literary source as Victor Schoelcher’s Des colonies françaises.

122 Although the work was in fact known by that title and illustrated as such in L’illustration, 1, 1843, 197, it was listed in the catalogue published by Techener, as Château du quatre piquets dans les colonies, No. 109; the annotation cited the literary source as Victor Schoelcher’s Des colonies françaises.

123 Marcel Verdier (1817-1856) entered the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in 1832 and studied for a while with Ingres. He began exhibiting in 1835 and was awarded a third-class medal in the Salon of 1837. See Bénédizt, viii, 517.

124 Of course, Boulanger’s La mort de Bailly, which was, however, not without its faults. The failure of Techener’s project raises the question of why it and its predecessors were so ineffectual in demonstrating the sometimes unjust and often prejudicial judgments of the juries in each instance. To say that the lack of success of these ventures was owed to a singular lack of quality in the works exhibited is too facile. Although it is true that none of the counter-exhibitions could boast of
including major works by the titular heads of modern art, as in the case of the exhibition of 1863, the fact remains that we possess very little pictorial documentation of what was actually exhibited, thus prohibiting critical evaluation. In any case, other factors played a significant role, one of the most important being that none of the counter-exhibitions was truly a cohesive representation of the works refused by the jury that year. In the statistics documented in this study, it is clear that a relatively small percentage of the refusés had participated, and then often by including works that had been rejected earlier. When in 1843 the critic Jules Baget called upon the refuses to band together as a cooperative movement against the jury’s injustices, he was pleading for an artistic solidarity that already existed for petitions of reform, but never for non-Salon exhibitions. Moreover, the fact that these counter-exhibitions were generally mounted by commercial dealers created in the public view the suspicion that the refused artists’ motives were not as highminded as it appeared. In this regard, it is probably true that the dealers were primarily interested in promoting their own galleries and even in directing discontented artists away from the Salons so as to increase their own reputations as principal exhibitors of contemporary art; their exhibitions of rejected works were, in effect, secondary to merchandising. Ironically, the Salon des Refusés of 1863, with its official sanction by the administration, helped greatly to solidify the refusés of that year into a cogent and cohesive political force and thus assured a unified view against the jury’s abuses.

The upheavals of 1843 produced no discernible modification in the structure of the Salon, despite De Cailleux’s promise in his report that the artists’ complaints would be given attention. In November, 1843, the regulations for the forthcoming Salon indicated that the administration refused to concede any point made by the artists or critics, prompting L’artiste to lament that the situation seemed hopeless. Actually, the jury for 1844, under pressure from its audacious decisions of the year before, was remarkably lenient, and admitted many of the works rejected in 1843, thus unwittingly reaffirming its own capricious nature. But in 1846 the jury once more rejected an unusually large number of works, about three hundred more than in 1843 — including examples by Corot, Decamps, Diaz, Flers, Gudin, and Mottez (who was to be named “chevalier de la légion d’honneur” later that year) and astonishingly, virtually all of the sculpture submitted by the students of Rude. While Baudelaire mentioned none of these exclusions or approached the problem of the refusés in his celebrated review, Théophile Thoré was so outraged that he openly accused the entire jury of jealousy and rabid persecution. The same harsh attitudes were repeated in 1847 with the refusal of works by Chassériau, Corot, Daubigny, Gigoux, Hesse, Maindron, and many others, causing Clément de Ris to issue his famous pamphlet on the present oppression in the visual arts in which he demanded that the selection of the jury be given to the artists themselves. Delécluze, who exactly twenty years earlier had proposed the “exhibition particulière” (which he harshly criticized when it was held), now noted the importance of establishing laws to protect the artist’s right to exhibit — thus aligning himself with the signers of the 1840 petition — and reaffirmed the urgent need for jury reform.

The impetus of the Revolution of 1848 could not fail to have a direct impact on the problems of the Salon. For the Salon of that year, the jury was suppressed on orders of Ledru-Rollin, creating the first fully open Salon of the century. However, a liberal jury was imposed in 1849 which admitted, although sometimes hesitatingly, many artists who had been constantly refused under the July Monarchy. One may note in this regard that the attitudes of the administration towards the Salons after the Revolution of 1848 paralleled remarkably the decisions of the Government after the events of 1789, in that a fluctuating and sometimes conflicting policy was proposed for the composition of the jury. In 1852, for example, important modifications were introduced, dividing the jury equally between members elected by the artists and those appointed by the administration. Yet in 1857 the artists’ right of elec-

---

121 In a poem “Aux artistes (à propos des ouvrages injustement exclus au Louvre),” in Journal des artistes, xvii, 13, March 26, 1843, 202-05.
123 See Ivens, 72.
124 Section xi of his “Salon de 1847,” first published in Le constitutionel and reprinted in Salons de T. Thorb, Paris, 1848.
125 De l’oppression dans les arts, Paris, 1847. This tract was expanded by Clément de Ris, Villot, and Boissard in early 1848 to L’exposition et le jury, but its distribution was interrupted by the events of February, 1848.
126 In the latter publication, the authors demanded a jury elected by the artists themselves, to be organized into two divisions: the second division was supposed to review the judgments of the first. This idea had already been proposed by an anonymous reviewer of the Revue indépendante, vii, 1843, 233-34. On Clément de Ris and the impact of his pamphlets, see Lafenestre, 126f.
128 Lethevé, 119.
129 T. J. Clark, The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France, 1848-1851, London, 1973, 32, discusses this briefly, noting as well that despite the liberal jury two works by Préalault were refused. On how the liberal jury decided the issue of the récompenses after the exhibition, see “Procès-verbaux du jury des récompenses, Salon de 1849,” Archives Nationales, Paris, F1, 527. It is worthwhile noting here that the jury had nine members, including Delacroix, Robert-Fleury, Cogniet, and Isabey, but Horace Vernet, who was assigned the task, refused to participate. The liberalism of the jury explains why Tassaert was awarded a first-class medal with seven votes; Courbet had received one vote — it is not recorded who cast it — but was awarded a second-class medal with six votes.
130 The full text of the decree, signed by Nieuwerkerke, now director of the museums, and De Persigny, Minister of the Interior, was published in the Journal des débats, February 1, 1852. The decree consisted of three sections, concerns respectively with the submission of works, the jury makeup, and the medals and récompenses. Two reforms instigated here should be noted: Section 1, Article 11 prohibits the copying of works exhibited without written permission from the artist; Section 2, Article 10 exempts members of the Institute and previously decorated artists from jury judgments.
tion was revoked and the task of selection was given back to the Academy, causing more vocal denunciations and further private exhibitions in the ateliers, but significantly no public counter-exhibitions on the level attempted in the 1840’s. ¹²⁰ Five years later, the breach between the artists and the State became so marked that the stage was irrevocably set for the resolutions of 1863.
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Appendix

Note publiée par l’assemblée des artistes dont les ouvrages n’ont pas été admis à l’exposition de 1840. Pétition adressée aux deux Chambres. (Archives du Louvre, Dossier x, Salon de 1840)

Des journaux ont annoncé que les artistes dont les productions n’ont pas été admises au Louvre se sont réunis pour aviser au moyen de faire une exposition particulière. Ils se sont vus obligés de renoncer à ce projet, aucun local convenable et assez spacieux n’ayant été trouvé au centre de Paris. D’un autre côté, ils ont reconnu qu’à part la question du local, l’exposition projetée aurait nécessité des dépenses hors de proportion avec les ressources pérennes de la plupart d’entre eux, alors surtout que leurs moyens d’existence et leur avenir viennent d’être si cruellement compromis.

Les artistes présents à la réunion ont voté des remerciements aux écrivains de la presse périodique pour la chaleur généreuse avec laquelle ils ont pris unaniment leur cause en main. Grâce à la presse, il est aujourd’hui de notoriété publique que beaucoup d’ouvrages refusés sont supérieurs à une grande partie des ouvrages reçus.

Toutefois, la réunion des artistes non admis au Salon n’a pas été stérile: ils ont résolu d’adresser à la Chambre des pairs et à celle des députés, la pétition qu’on peut lire à la suite de cette note. Ils espèrent que le plus grand nombre des artistes de Paris et des départements feront de semblables pétitions, et ils ne sauraient douter de la sympathie publique.

Pétition
adressée aux deux chambres

Messieurs,
Permettez-nous de demander que les expositions des Beaux-Arts soient réglementées par une loi spéciale et placées dans les attributions du ministre de l’intérieur.

Actuellement, le Jury qui exclut ou admet les ouvrages présen-tés, et qui se prononce par là même sur la considération, la fortune et l’avant des artistes, ne tient ses pouvoirs d’aucune loi; de sorte que les artistes repoussés du Louvre peuvent dire, en s’appliquant une parole historique, qu’ils n’ont pas été condamnés par justice, mais par commission.

Plusieurs membres du Jury protestent contre cet état de choses, en s’abstenant constamment d’exercer leurs fonctions.

Nous exprions le voeu que la loi à intervenir n’institue pas un jury d’examen préalable, et que tous les ouvrages présentés soient admis, sans autre exception que pour les cas d’offense aux lois ou aux moeurs; plus de faveurs alors, plus de jugements influencés par des idées systématiques ou par des rivalités d’écoles, plus d’erreurs.

Quelle que soit la constitution d’un jury, plusieurs de ses membres seront toujours accessibles aux considérations personnelles; de là les admissions par faveur.

Il n’en est point des oeuvres d’art comme d’une vérité scientifique: ce n’est point d’après des règles positives et certaines que l’on peut les juger, c’est une affaire de sentir plus encore que de raison; or un jury ne peut pas faire abstraction de sa manière individuelle de sentir; il ne le doit même pas pour rester consciencieux; de là les jugements par système; la préférence accordée de bonne foi à des ouvrages médiocres sur des ouvrages supérieurs.

Quant aux rivalités d’écoles, on sait que, de tout temps, elles ont été fort ardentes dans les différentes branches des beaux-arts; la peinture en offre aujourd’hui des exemples frappants. L’artiste qui a adopté tel maître pour chef de file est à peu près certain de n’avoir pas le suffrage des jurés qui suivent une autre bannière.

Ces éléments inévitables d’injustice n’existeraient pas, qu’il y aurait encore des erreurs, car il est impossible à un juré de faire une comparaison exacte, de juger entre trois ou quatre mille objets d’art qui passent successivement sous ses yeux; la capacité de l’esprit humain ne va pas jusque là.

Craint-on les médiocrités, en admettant, sous la réserve que nous avons indiquée, tous les ouvrages présentés? Mais, sans par-ler de l’artiste admis, qui se croit toujours un talent, l’artiste refusé se regarde toujours comme victime d’une injustice; le sentiment de l’injustice l’exalte et l’irrite, au lieu de l’abattre et de le décourager; il persiste pendant plusieurs années à poursuivre une carrière pour laquelle il n’a qu’une fausse et trompeuse vocation; et, quand il finit par connaître sa médiocrité, il est trop tard pour entreprendre une autre carrière. Tout au contraire, si dès ses premiers ouvrages il comparaisait devant le public, ce juge qu’ils ne saurait récuser, le dédain, les rires moqueurs, les sarcasmes à brûle-pourpoint lui feraien connaitre sa vraie valeur; son amour propre n’aurait plus de retraite, et bientôt il abandonnerait les beaux-arts pour une autre profession.

On objecte aussi contre les expositions générales l’insuffisance de la localité. Nous ferons observer que le nombre des ouvrages admis à plusieurs des expositions dernières approchait du nombre des ouvrages présentés en 1840, et que cependant jamais plus de la moitié de la grande galerie du Louvre n’a été affectée à l’exposition; qu’au reste on pourrait limiter le nombre des ouvrages que chaque artiste aurait le droit de présenter, le borner, par exemple, à deux ou trois, sauf les exceptions qui seraient déterminées. D’ailleurs, la question du local est accessoire; et, si elle de-

¹²⁰ These private studio exhibitions include, in 1857, a showing of Chaplin’s Étoile du matin in Nadar’s studio, an important precedent for the more famous Impressionist exhibition there eighteen years later. In addition, Mme. O’Connell exhibited her Eve et Satan with the dealer Détromond, after the work had been rejected on the pretext of indecency; see Tabarant, 298-99. An important counter-exhibition was similarly mounted in the studio of Bonvin in 1859, in which Fantin-Latour, Whistler, Ribot, and Legros participated; see G. P. Weisberg, Bonvin, Paris, 1979, 59. It is certain that Whistler showed his At the Piano here where it was greatly admired by Courbet; see Rewald (as in note 2), 32, and A. M. Young, et al., The Paintings of James McNeill Whistler, New Haven and London, 1980, 1, lx. Fantin-Latour showed a self-portrait and a portrait of his sister; see Mme. Fantin-Latour, Catalogue de l’oeuvre complet de Fantin-Latour, Paris, 1911, 18, Nos. 112 and 113, and From Realism to Symbolism, Whistler and His World, New York, 1971, 75-76. No information has come to light on the works by Ribot and Legros included.
vait faire naître, sous d'autres rapports encore, des difficultés sérieuses, s’opposer, par exemple, à ce que l’exposition des beaux-arts rentrât dans le domaine de la loi, vous n'hésiteriez pas, sans doute, Messieurs, à afféter à ces expositions une localité spéciale.

Nous l’avouons, c’est la rigueur, et vous apprécierez sans doute la mesure de cette expression, c’est la rigueur dont le Jury a cru devoir user cette année qui nous a déterminés à vous adresser cette pétition; nous osons espérer qu’elle sera admise favorablement, malgré ce qu’il peut y avoir de personnel dans nos motifs, car nous demandons ce qu’on refuse à aucune autre classe de citoyens; nous demandons que nos intérêts et notre honneur soient placés sous l’égide des lois.

Nous sommes, etc.

Suivent les signatures:

MEMBRES DE L’INSTITUT
MM. Horace Vernet, Paul Delaroche, Drolling, David (d’Angers)

Hommes de lettres
MM. Jules Janin, Félix Payot, Thoré, Théophile Gautier, Jules Baget, Huard, Hippolyte Barbier, comte Louis de Girardin, Eugène Barreste, Gault de Saint-Germain, Contagrine, Ricourt, Anthony Deschamps, Anatole Dauverne, de Beaurepaire, Deuleuse, Dubois, Berault de Milaine, Trianon.

Sculpteurs

Graveurs

Lithographes

Peintres, dessinateurs, architectes
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